



INSTITUTE OF DISTANCE EDUCATION **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University



MAPOLS-501

Modern Political Analysis -I

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

3rd Semester

Rajiv Gandhi University

www.ide.rgu.ac.in

MODERN POLITICAL ANALYSIS-I

MA [Political Science]
[Third semester]
MAPOLS 501



RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY

Arunachal Pradesh, INDIA-791112

BOARD OF STUDIES	
1. Prof.PKPanigarhi Department of Pol. Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Chairman
2. Prof. M N Das Department of Political Science Dibrugarh University Dibrugarh, Assam	Member
3. Mr.NNHina Department of Pol. Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Member
4. Dr.AshanRiddi Director, <i>IDE</i>	Member Secretary

Authors

Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty (Units: 1,4,7) © Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty

Dr Biswaranjan Mohanty (Units: 8,10),

Rukmana Meher (Units: 2,3) © Rukmana Meher,

Ms Shaiiza Singh (Unit: 5) © Ms Shailza Singh,

Pradeep Kumar Jena (Unit: 9.3-9.4) © Pradeep Kumar Jena,

Vikas Publishing House (Units: 6,9.0-9.1,9.2,9.5r9.9), Revised Edition 2021.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

"Information contained in this book has been published by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, IDE-Rajiv Gandhi University, the publishers and its Authors shall be in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use"

Vikas® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: 576, Masjid Road, Jangpura, New Delhi 110 014

• Website: www.vikaspublshing.com • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

About the University

Rajiv Gandhi University (formerly Arunachal University) is a premier institution for higher education in the state of Arunachal Pradesh and has completed twenty-five years of its existence. Late Smt. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, laid the foundation stone of the university on 4th February, 1984 at Rono Hills, where the present campus is located.

Ever since its inception, the university has been trying to achieve excellence and fulfill the objectives as envisaged in the University Act. The university received academic recognition under Section 2(f) from the University Grants Commission on 28th March, 1985 and started functioning from 1st April, 1985. It got financial recognition under section 12-B of the UGC on 25th March, 1994. Since then Rajiv Gandhi University, (then Arunachal University) has carved a niche for itself in the educational scenario of the country following its selection as a University with potential for excellence by a high-level expert committee of the University Grants Commission from among universities in India.

The University was converted into a Central University with effect from 9th April, 2007 as per notification Of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

The University is located atop Rono Hills on a picturesque tableland of 302 acres overlooking the river Dikrong. It is 6.5 km from the National Highway 52-A and 25 km from Itanagar, the State capital. The campus is linked with the National Highway by the Dikrong bridge.

The teaching and research programmes of the University are designed with a view to play a positive role in the socio-economic and cultural development of the State. The University offers Undergraduate, Post-graduate, M.Phil and Ph.D. programmes. The Department of Education also offers the B.Ed, programme.

There are fifteen colleges affiliated to the University. The University has been extending educational facilities to students from the neighbouring states, particularly Assam. The strength of students in different departments of the University and in affiliated colleges has been steadily increasing.

The faculty members have been actively engaged in research activities with financial support from UGC and other funding agencies. Since inception, a number of proposals on research projects have been sanctioned by various funding agencies to the University. Various departments have organized numerous seminars, workshops and conferences. Many faculty members have participated in national and international conferences and seminars held within the country and abroad. Eminent scholars and distinguished personalities have visited the University and delivered lectures on various disciplines.

The academic year 2000-2001 was a year of consolidation for the University. The switch over from the annual to the semester system took off smoothly and the performance of the students registered a marked improvement. Various syllabi designed by Boards of Post-Graduate Studies (BPGS) have been implemented. VSAT facility installed by the ERNET India, New Delhi under the UGC-Infonet program, provides Internet access.

In spite of infrastructural constraints, the University has been maintaining its academic excellence. The University has strictly adhered to the academic calendar, conducted the examinations and declared the results on time. The students from the University have found placements not only in State and Central Government Services, but also in various institutions, industries and organizations. Many students have emerged successful in the National Eligibility Test (NET).

Since inception, the University has made significant progress in teaching, research, innovations in curriculum development and developing infrastructure.

About IDE

The formal system of higher education in our country is facing the problems of access, limitation of seats, lack of facilities and infrastructure. Academicians from various disciplines opine that it is learning which is more important and not the channel of education. The education through distance mode is an alternative mode of imparting instruction to overcome the problems of access, infrastructure and socio-economic barriers. This will meet the demand for qualitative higher education of millions of people who cannot get admission in the regular system and wish to pursue their education. It also helps interested employed and unemployed men and women to continue with their higher education. Distance education is a distinct approach to impart education to learners who remained away in the space and/or time from the teachers and teaching institutions on account of economic, social and other considerations. Our main aim is to provide higher education opportunities to those who are unable to join regular academic and vocational education programmes in the affiliated colleges of the University and make higher education reach to the doorsteps in rural and geographically remote areas of Arunachal Pradesh in particular and North-eastern part of India in general. In 2008, the Centre for Distance Education has been renamed as "Institute of Distance Education (IDE)."

Continuing the endeavor to expand the learning opportunities for distant learners, IDE has introduced Post Graduate Courses in 5 subjects (Education, English, Hindi, History and Political Science) from the Academic Session 2013-14.

The Institute of Distance Education is housed in the Physical Sciences Faculty Building (first floor) next to the University Library. The University campus is 6 kms from NERIST point on National Highway 52A. The University buses ply to NERIST point regularly.

Outstanding Features of Institute of Distance Education:

(i) At Par with Regular Mode

Eligibility requirements, curricular content, mode of examination and the award of degrees are on par with the colleges affiliated to the Rajiv Gandhi University and the Department(s) of the University.

(ii) Self-Instructional Study Material (SISM)

The students are provided SISM prepared by the Institute and approved by Distance Education Council (DEC), New Delhi. This will be provided at the time of admission at the IDE or its Study Centres. SISM is provided only in English except Hindi subject.

(iii) Contact and Counselling Programme (CCP)

The course curriculum of every programme involves counselling in the form of personal contact programme of duration of approximately 7-15 days. The CCP shall not be compulsory for BA. However for professional courses and MA the attendance in CCP will be mandatory.

(iv) Field Training and Project

For professional course(s) there shall be provision of field training and project writing in the concerned subject.

(v) Medium of Instruction and Examination

The medium of instruction and examination will be English for all the subjects except for those subjects where the learners will need to write in the respective languages.

(vi) Subject/Counselling Coordinators

For developing study material, the IDE appoints subject coordinators from within and outside the University. In order to run the PCCP effectively Counselling Coordinators are engaged from the Departments of the University, The Counselling-Coordinators do necessary coordination for involving resource persons in contact and counselling programme and assignment evaluation. The learners can also contact them for clarifying their difficulties in then respective subjects.

SYLLABI-BOOK MAPPING TABLE
Modern Political Analysis

Syllabi

UNIT 1: Approaches to Political Analysis

- Traditional Approaches and their Critique
- Emergence of scientific approach and Value-Fact Dichotomy
- Nature of Political Analysis and its Orientations, Normative, Empirical and Semantic.

Mapping in Book

Unit 1: Approaches to Political Analysis

UNIT 2: Behaviouralism

- Development and Decline
- Post-Behaviouralism

Unit 2: Behaviouralism

UNIT 3: Systems Theory and Approach

- David Easton's Model
- Gabriel Almond's Structural-Functional Model
- Karl W Deutsch's Communication Model

Unit 3: Systems Theory and Approach

UNIT 4: Decision-Making Approach

- Richard Snyder

Unit 4: Decision-Making Approach

UNIT 5: Game Theory

Unit 5: Game Theory

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

UNIT 1 APPROACHES TO POLITICAL ANALYSIS

Introduction
Unit Objectives
Political Analysis: Nature, Significance and Scope
Scope of Political Analysis
Traditional Approaches
 Emergence of Scientific Approach and Value-Fact Dichotomy
 Scientific Approach
 Value-Fact Dichotomy
 Orientations of Political Analysis—Normative, Empirical and Semantic
Normative Political Analysis
Empirical Political Analysis
Semantic Political Analysis
Summary
Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

UNIT 2 BEHAVIOURALISM

Introduction
Unit Objectives
Behaviouralism: Development and Decline
Post-Behaviouralism
Summary
Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

UNIT 3 SYSTEMS THEORY AND APPROACH

Introduction
Unit Objectives
David Easton's Model
Gabriel A. Almond's Structural Functional Model
Karl W. Deutsch's Communication Model
Summary
Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

UNIT 4 DECISION-MAKING APPROACH

Introduction
Unit Objectives
Fundamentals of Decision-Making Theory
 Decision-Making Approach of Richard Snyder
 Summary

Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

UNIT 5 GAME THEORY

Introduction
Unit Objectives
Game Theory
Usage of Game Theory in International Relations
Security Analysis and Game Theory in International Relations
Game Theory and Economic Relations among Nation-States
Summary
Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Traditionally, political science as an academic discipline has tried to address issues of institutional governance and functioning of structures of authority. Recently, there is an evident shift of emphasis in the realm of political analysis, fundamentally, in terms of its focus on a scientific investigation of behaviour of individuals as members of larger groups functioning in the political system. Further, political analysis at present takes cognizance of the interactions between the various variables of the political system operating against the backdrop of the larger socio-political environment.

This book, *Modern Political Analysis*, contains topics such as approaches to political analysis, behaviouralism, systems theory and approach, decision-making approach, game theory, political culture and political socialization, political development, political analysis, concepts related to social change and the centre-periphery and dependency model.

This book has been designed keeping in mind the self-instruction mode (SIM) format and follows a simple pattern, wherein each unit of the book begins with the **Introduction** followed by the **Unit Objectives** for the topic. The content is then presented in a simple and easy-to-understand manner, and is interspersed with **Check Your Progress** questions to reinforce the student's understanding of the topic. A list of **Questions and Exercises** is also provided at the end of each unit. The **Summary, Key Terms** and **Activity** further act as useful tools for students and are meant for effective recapitulation of the text.

This book is having five units:

Unit 1: Describes different approaches to political analysis.

Unit 2: Discusses the concept of behaviouralism.

Unit 3: Covers the systems theory and approach.

Unit 4: Discusses decision-making approach.

Unit 5: Introduces you to game theory.

UNIT 1 APPROACHES TO POLITICAL ANALYSIS

Structure

Introduction
Unit Objectives
Political Analysis: Nature, Significance and Scope

Scope of Political Analysis
Traditional Approaches
 Emergence of Scientific Approach and Value-Fact Dichotomy
 Scientific Approach
 Value-Fact Dichotomy
 Orientations of Political Analysis—Normative, Empirical and Semantic
Normative Political Analysis
Empirical Political Analysis
Semantic Political Analysis

Summary
Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will learn about the various approaches to political analysis. Political analysis is that part of social analysis which deals with the foundations of the state and principles of government. The study of political science is, hence, referred to as political analysis. This science is concerned with matters of the state and seeks to explore, understand as well as comprehend the state in its various conditions — in the nature of its existence and the manifold forms in which it develops itself. Basically thus, this is an exploration of the state and the government.

Political scientist Richard Glenn Gettell termed it the historical investigation of the state; an analytical study of the matters of the state and what constitutes it as well as a politico-ethical understanding of what a state should be like in its ideal form. "The study of politics limited itself with the life of man in relation to organized states," said British political theorist Harold Joseph Laski. On the other hand, British political scientist Sir George Edward Gordon Catlin argued that 'political science means the study of activities of political life and activities of various organs of the government'. In the same breath, American political science professor James Wilford Garner said, "In short, political science begins and ends with the state." These arguments by some of the best scholars in political science suggest that it is the study of state, government and political organizations.

At the same time, however, these definitions have viewed political science from the traditional realm of the narrow legal institutional approach. After the end of the Second World War, a popular approach adopted to this study was the Behavioural Revolution approach. This approach brought a change to the analysis in the field of political analysis. Rather than institutional dynamics, this approach stressed on political behaviour. In the beginning of the 20th century, social scientists like Arthur Bentley, Graham Wallas and Charles E. Merriam used this approach and emphasized on some crucial aspects of political analysis like the social and psychological aspects.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss the nature of political analysis
- Describe the emergence of scientific approach and value-fact dichotomy
- Explain the orientations of political analysis from normative, empirical and semantic aspects

POLITICAL ANALYSIS: NATURE, SIGNIFICANCE AND SCOPE

Political phenomena and its analysis has a long history. Classically, its roots are traced to Greece, where famous Greek philosopher Aristotle termed politics as master science. Through this statement, Aristotle referred to political analysis as an activity through which individual lives could be improved and a greater society be built.

However, the study of political analysis involves two complexities. First, bias can easily enter it and the need to reduce it increases manifold. It is important to remember that political analysis is not an ethical activity which is undertaken in order to make a Utopian society. At the same time, it is not completely evil. Therefore, the study of political analysis can only be meaningful when it is freed from every preconceived bias.

Second, the term political analysis is itself defined in different ways and there is no agreement on one. There are many debates and differences about its usage. For instance, is political analysis about making decision? Does it lead one to allocate scarce resources better? Due to these uncertainties, the different viewpoints of political analysis need to be elaborated upon.

Different perspectives define political analysis differently but commonly it refers to the analysis of the political phenomena. The subject originated in Greece, which was divided into numerous independent city-states in the ancient times. The most important city-state at that time was Athens. Therefore, the definition originating from Greece could be taken to mean the analysis of the affairs of the 'polis' or the state. Since it is a government which conducts the affairs of the state, politics is also taken to refer to the affairs of the government. Therefore, politics itself is taken to refer to the affairs of the state and government.

However, this is an extremely narrow view of political analysis. While it is true that politics refers to the affairs of the state, yet it cannot be deemed to be state-bound. In the present times, it is no longer possible for the state only to manage all the complex matters of a society and it is supported by a number of organizations in its day-to-day

affairs. Those theorists who argue that political analysis is limited to the state believe that politics is not played out in the realm of the civil society.

The civil society comprises all non-state bodies such as family and kinship organizations as well as class, educational and business organizations. While the state can be referred to as a 'public' entity, the civil society is called the private entity. However, even this view is not complete in itself. It can be argued that civil society is the realm of the private since it is not funded by public money. Civil society is also public because its membership is open for all. At the same time, the civil society strongly influences public policies since it has the backing of the public. Civil society, hence, carries a lot of legitimacy or moral standing.

Feminists, on the other hand, argue against the belief that politics is solely public-centric. They criticize view-points that believe that the state must not enter the 'private' domains of families. Feminists say since within society, women are dominated by men, the state must come to end the oppression and manipulation of women at the hands of men. The feminists though reject this division of the public and private. They assert that power is not limited to the realm of the state but also is found in non-state bodies like the family and other organizations. Kate Millet, in her book *Political Analysis* (1969), argues that power-structured relationships define political analysis; it is an arrangement wherein one group of persons control the other. Feminists, thus, view the relationships within families, between husbands and wives, and between parents and children, as much political relationships as those which are between employers and workers, or between governments and citizens.

Political analysis has often been referred to as the 'art of the possible', because it is possible for the state to take care of the law and order without the usage of force. While dissent may not be welcome, it is not necessary to crush it and

conflicts could be resolved with negotiation and even compromise. Thus, political analysis with this viewpoint is considered to be as a civilized and civilizing force and not evil. Conflict is perpetuated when there is a scarcity of resources and is supported by infinite interests. Politics, therefore, becomes a struggle for power over scarce resources and power also becomes a means through which this struggle is carried forward.

Marxists too view political analysis in terms of class. They view political power is the superstructure while economic relations become the sub-structure. They argue that economic is political. However, for both the feminists and Marxists, political analysis is not completely a negative force. They believe it can be turned into a positive force. While the feminists call for a sexual revolution to end patriarchy or domination of women by men, the Marxists believe a revolution by the proletariat will end class struggle and lead to the formation of a classless society.

In his famous book titled *Introduction to the History of the Science of Politics*, Sir Frederick Pollock has differentiated between theoretical analysis and applied analysis through the following steps.

In theoretical political analysis, these are the steps taken:

- Different aspects of the state can be understood through theoretical knowledge
- It gives theoretical education about government and administration
- Theoretical meaning of law-making can be understood
- The presumption is that the state is made up of individuals and this model deliberates upon relationship between the state and individuals as well as international law.

Applied political analysis:

- It gives a good idea about state formation
- It gives real knowledge about the administration and functions of the government
- It discusses law making and powers of the judiciary
- The real relations among states are described

American political scientist Harold D. Lasswell and philosopher Abraham Kaplan have argued that in the study of political science, "political analysis is policy science. Political science, in the analysis of politics, is a study of shaping and sharing power." Its aim is to establish the harmony between 'power' and 'freedom'. It believes that the power of the state and freedom of the individual are indispensable. This, thus, makes political science too indispensable for the organized and constructive life of human beings. In this way, political analysis becomes the science of who gets what, when and why. In his famous work *Political Analysis in The Study of Political Science Observes: Who Gets What, When, How!*, Harold Lasswell makes the same note. Eminent social scientist Max Weber observed: "Political science is both positive and normative and studies human behaviour in its justice seeking aspect." For David Easton, "Political science is concerned with the authoritative allocation of values for a society."

More recently, the word state has been replaced by political system. This marks a shift in the perspective of study of political science, where is it no longer confined to the study of the state. Now, it covers even those subjects which were traditionally not considered to be within the realm of political analysis. It is believed that politics concerns itself with 'legitimate coercion'. Robert Dahl has observed: "The political system is any persistent pattern of human relationships that involves to a significant extent power, rule or authority." Politics ensures integration and harmony among citizens only with the help of legitimate power. Merki has observed: 'Politics is the process through which man orders the society in which he lives according to his political ideas about the ends of man.'

The philosophers quoted above have all dealt with political analysis within the domain of the state, government and legal system. These have been the traditional focus of political analysis. However, with time, its scope has widened. Political behaviour now finds an increased focus in the study of political analysis than institutions and laws. In social sciences, political analysis has emerged as an important branch. Present theorists contend that the main objective of political analysis is to forge a relationship between individuals and also to establish a relationship between individuals on one side and the society and state on the other. The primary motive is to establish harmony between the power of the state and the freedom of the individual. Yet, in the present times, political analysis now also studies international relations and cooperation among states.

Significance of political analysis

The study of political analysis has assumed greater popularity and significance in modern times. Man is a political animal and in his actions he is directly concerned with politics. The study of political analysis has proved socially useful on a number of counts.

Political scientist Robert A. Dahl rightly observes: 'Political analysis is one of the unavoidable facts of human existence. Everyone is involved in some fashion at sometime in some kind of political system.' Study of political science imparts knowledge to the individual with regard to the state, government and a host of other political institutions and processes. State is the most universal and powerful of all social institutions and politically enlightened people are capable of playing a useful part in social and political affairs.

Statesmen, legislators, administrators and diplomats who conduct the affairs of the state require sound knowledge of political analysis. E. Asirvatham writes: 'If it is true that where there is practice, there should be theory also, a study of political theory is invaluable to political practice.' Political analysis is the science of statecraft. If the political system can be shaped and improved by positive human effort, no study is more valuable than political analysis. Politics was taught in Plato's 'Academy' and Aristotle's 'Lyceum' with a view to preparing prospective statesmen and administrators.

The same tradition is being followed in modern state to impart knowledge of political analysis to administrators and diplomats. Good citizenship and knowledge of political science go together. Political science has high educative value for citizens in all democratic countries. The study of political science makes the citizens politically conscious which is a prerequisite for the successful operation of democracy. Citizens must be alert, vigilant and intelligent to safeguard their rights and check the despotic tendency of the government. Political science equips a citizen to understand the complexities of modern government and make his own contribution to the proper working of the political system. The citizen can develop a sense of participation in the affairs of his state if he is intellectually equipped by studying political science.

One of the main objects of the study of political science is to find a proper balance between the individuals and the state. The liberty of individuals and the authority of the state should be properly reconciled. Political analysis determines the limits of political control and the area of freedom in each politically organized society. Again it teaches the lesson of cooperation, toleration and national integration. It broadens the outlook of people by freeing them from narrow bounds of parochialism, regionalism, casteism, communalism and aggressive nationalism. It aims at a just world order characterized by peaceful coexistence and a high degree of cooperation among nations.

Apart from these utilitarian considerations, the study of political science enriches man's mind and makes a rich contribution to the realm of knowledge. Knowledge of political analysis expands the intellectual horizon of man and enables him to understand the happenings in the world around him. British historian A. L. Rowse writes: '... is that a people that neglects politics cannot as a people be happy.' George Bernard Shaw stresses the crucial significance of political science when he says: 'Political analysis is the science by which alone civilization can be saved.'

The framework and theories for political analysis are legion. While each theory has certain distinct advantages over the other, it is not possible to accord a universal status to one theory. For, this would amount to paying scant attention to social reality and applying it indiscriminately on every political phenomenon. Political life defies strait-jacketing under any fixed schematic framework. It eludes all attempts at confining social reality in any over-arching theory so far developed in the social sciences. Hence, all efforts to organize the entire range of low level, middle level and over-arching theories under one cosmic political theory end up as 'utopian' construction at best. It is, therefore, not possible or even correct to judge the fundamental premises of these analytical frameworks in absolute terms. But a discussion on the strength and weaknesses of each of these frameworks is both imperative and worthwhile. It would enable us to spell out in clear terms what level and what kind of theories are meaningful and relevant today.

Political theory tends to isolate the parts from the whole in the course of investigation and the danger in this approach is quite obvious. For, in doing so, it may lose sight of the whole whose parts are being put to observation. The outcome is not only unrealistic and partial but sometimes harmful. All behavioural and empirical theories suffer from this weakness.

Another shortcoming is a proliferation of partial theories having no relation whatsoever with one another. These

unrelated partial theories have been compared with planes flying at different altitudes and in different directions. To link and expand all these disparate partial frameworks, a general theory is needed. A general theory is in the nature of philosophical reflection. The aim of such a general theory is to connect earth-bound partial theories with sky-bound theories of the middle and broad range. In the absence of general theories, partial theories remain scattered, unrelated and aimless. They lose much of their relevance. However, when they are brought under the concept of a general theory, these partial theories acquire much needed coherence, orientation and relevance.

A general theory seeks to provide us with a conceptual framework for asking relevant questions in our area of research. It enables us to ask pertinent questions about politics, society, universe or man in general. A general theory of politics presupposes a general theory of society. This in turn calls for a general theory of man and human nature. Such a general theory or meta theory can be built only in the context of a general theory of the universe.

This explains why a philosophy of life is found permeating the works of Plato, Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas. It is also seen manifested in the writings of political philosophers like Hegel, Marx, Aurobindo and Gandhi in the form of reflections on the universe, man and his nature as well as society and politics, in a single sweep. Any attempt at theory building in social sciences without such an eschatological 'theory of theory' will be in vain.

Manipulative theory is also known as policy science. It is the outcome of an invasion of scientism into the social sciences. It claims that whatsoever is possible in the physical science can be accomplished in social sciences as well. This theory is spurred by two forces, viz., political science and the accompanying public administrative science. It has grown largely out of a reform-zeal or curative urge, on the one hand, and an engineering-itch among the social scientists on the other. Nonetheless, this theory seems to have outgrown these curative urges. Still it continues some of its older tendencies. For example, the old scientific dream of a discipline endowed with power to predict and build a scientific society is still a dominating trend. Many of its present day adherents hope to become something like the spiritual leaders in this movement.

Notwithstanding the zeal of the technocrats or exponents of the manipulative theory, it suffers from two obvious shortcomings, one being at the practical level and the other at the ethical level. At the practical level, policy scientism is often the advocacy of policies based on a view of the situation which is both narrow and limited. Policy scientism is only one form of impatience and is the worst enemy of systematic theory in any field. Stanley Hoffman rightly points out that concentration on the policy periphery of our discipline is premature. As long as we know little about the theoretical centre that commands the periphery, our efforts at theory-building will not bear fruit.

The perspective provided by the manipulative theory or policy science is limited on account of three reasons:

1. Only certain factors have been taken into account.
2. The assumptions behind the measures proposed have not been made sufficiently explicit.
3. The value implications of such advice have not been spelt out.

Thus, ethically speaking, the present day theory suffers from a possible shift in the wrong direction. The social scientist is now moving away from the quest for truth to

the study of efficiency in political life. While it is legitimate to study the ways in which certain values can be realized, the social sciences today are facing the danger of policy-ideology, particularly when the social scientist switches over to a study of manipulation. He attempts to accomplish this through excessive insistence on the skills of policy-making available to the decision-makers or the political elite to whom advice is offered. From this, it is only too easy to slip into the task of justifying the decisions made by such elite. Thus, from a profession of serving truth the social scientist ends up in the cult of elite behaviour. He is thus, quality of policy idolatry.

However, this does not mean that manipulative concerns have no role to play in our efforts at theory-building. Our foremost concern, in fact, should be to build such theories as would expose the hidden reality and, thus reveal the concrete and puzzling problems of our field of enquiry. In laying bare hidden truth plus concrete problems in their complexity, manipulative theory becomes not only legitimate, but also a necessary follow up to theory-making in general. Behavioural or empirical theory insists on separation of the 'is' dimension from the 'ought' dimension in the social sciences. Here one may ask the question: Should we limit ourselves to concerns of causative or empirical theory or should we also engage in normative theory-building? An answer to this question calls for a critical appraisal of behaviouralism with special focus on this question. Behaviouralism is a mood, an orientation and a protest

movement in the social sciences. It is marked by at least six distinctive characteristics.

By the end of the Second World War, the theoretical and methodological approaches of political sociology and psychology had been subsumed in political analysis. With the emergence of new states all over the world—in Asia, Africa and Latin America—the need for a proper understanding of the political developments in these countries was felt in great proportion. It was realized the development could not be broken in parts, but had to be studied in its totality and comprehensiveness. Consequently, a real movement towards the social science rather than social sciences began to take shape. Various approaches and frameworks that had their origin in sociology and anthropology such as the systems approach and the structural functional approach were now adapted to the analysis of political phenomena. The discipline moved to policy science and action-oriented research, from abstract theorizing and philosophical speculation. In so far as the policy decisions had a bearing on the problems of poverty, race or urban government, greater reliance was placed on the application of resources in an optimum way to obtain certain agreed objectives within the system. Moreover, there was an increasing acceptance of the utility of mathematical and statistical models, sophisticated and refined tools and techniques of analysis. In this way, various social sciences like economics, sociology, anthropology and psychology were brought closer to political science. Thus, the inter-disciplinary research became the new trend in social sciences and this shift of focus came to be visibly reflected in modern political analysis.

Alternative conceptions of political analysis

The meaning of politics has never been precise or static. There is a wide variety of interpretations and conceptions of politics.

We can classify these into five major sections for analytical convenience.

1. Classical conceptions of Greece and Rome: Greek masters of political thought like Socrates, Plato and Aristotle interpreted political analysis as an activity of the 'polis' (city state). According to Ernest Barker, English political scientist, polis is all-inclusive. It includes all aspects of life, such as economic, cultural and ethical. The Greek conception of political analysis in the study of

politics was primarily philosophical and idealistic as the governing ideals of politics, society and individual conduct were goodness, virtue and knowledge. In contrast, the ancient Romans gave a juristic or a legal interpretation of politics. Politics was an activity concerning the empire (*Regnum*). It was governed by a set of general and definite rules.

During the middle ages, 'politics became a branch of theology'. There was a dual centre authority — empire and church. Political authority took care of the material well-being of society while the church took care of spiritual and religious matters. Political authority was subordinate to the authority of the church and as such not autonomous.

2. Liberal conception: The Liberal view is a product of Renaissance and Reformation. It has dominated Western thinking from the 16th century to the present. This view was developed by the writings of Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Mill, and Green. The task of politics is to maintain peace, order, and harmony so as to enable competing individuals and groups to have free play. Modern liberals stress upon the role of the political system to serve the common good of the community and to secure justice and welfare. They look upon it as a mediator between diverse group interests or at best as the final arbiter between them.

3. Marxian conception: Marxism puts forth a sociological analysis of politics. The modes of production or economic factors are most fundamental in determining the political, legal, social, moral and cultural conditions of societies. On the basis of relations of production, class divisions (haves and have nots) of society take place and politics reflects the struggle between classes. The state becomes an instrument of the economically dominant class over the economically weaker sections. The ultimate goal for exploited and oppressed people is to achieve a classless society which can be brought about by revolutionary struggle, in a classless society there is no need for the state and hence it 'withers away'.

4. Indian conceptions: In ancient India, the study of political analysis was called 'Rajaniiti' or 'Rajyashastra'. 'Dandaniti' and 'Nitishastra' were other terms used for the subject. The most effective term for the science of politics, however, was 'Arthashastra' used by Kautilya. All the different schools of political analysis shared a common emphasis on 'dharma', that is, obligation to the doctrine of natural justice on the part of the ruler. Political analysis in ancient India remained mostly ethical. Politics in medieval India was more autonomous than in the medieval West.

During the freedom movement, activist politics replaced philosophical orientation. In recent times Indian politics combines political theory with political practice as in the West.

5. Modern conceptions: The views of modern political scientists bring out three marked elements of political analysis, namely power, conflict and consensus.

(i) *Politics as influence and power.* Machiavelli, Max Weber, Bertrand Russel, Lasswell, Kaplan, Catlin and Morgenthau interpret politics in terms of power. Lasswell and Kaplan write: 'The concept of power is perhaps the most fundamental in the whole of political science; the political process is shaping, distribution and exercise of power.' One advantage that power has over earlier concepts of politics is that it

focuses attention on a process, not on a legal abstract such as state. Political science studies the way power is accumulated, used and controlled in modern society.

(ii) *Politics as conflict and controversy:* J. D. B. Miller writes, 'Politics is a natural reflex of the divergences between the members of a society.' American political scientist Quincy Wright says, 'Political analysis exists only when ends or means are controversial.' Karl Marx viewed conflict as the central subject in the study of politics. Alexi de Tocqueville was the first to support the idea that 'democracy involves a balance between the forces of conflict and consensus.'

(iii) *Political analysis as cooperation and consensus:* Human interests not only clash but also coincide. Sometimes fundamentals are agreed on and only specifics are the subject of argument but there are times when even the basics become the area of debate. Political systems encompass not only the competing demands but also aggregative and integrative forces. There is scope for consensus and harmony among groups and individuals because the interests of each party are acknowledged and accommodated. The integrative function of the political system promotes the much needed consensus in society.

The subject matter of political analysis has grown both in nature and in scope with the passage of time. With modernization, more and more political factors have come to acquire significance in various types of political systems across the world.

Scope of Political Analysis

The scope of political science implies its area of study or subject matter. It is a very comprehensive and expanding social science. An attempt was made by the International Political Science Association in Paris in 1948 to delineate its scope. It classified the same into four zones, namely political theory, political institution, political dynamics and international relations. We may attempt to describe its scope as follows:

1. Political theory: It deals with the definition and meaning of fundamental concepts of political science like state, government, law, liberty, equality, justice, sovereignty, separation of powers, methods of representation, forms of government, grounds of political obligation and various ideologies. A clear understanding of these basic terms and concepts is essential for the study of political science.

2. Political philosophy: It is concerned with the theoretical and speculative consideration of the fundamental principles used by political science. Eminent political philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Hegel, Mill, Marx and Gandhi have expressed their views on the nature and functions of political philosophy.

3. International relations and international law: International Law Commission is a body of general principles and specific rules which regulate the relationship among states and international institutions. The study of international relations is a growing area of political science. It covers important subjects such as diplomacy, international politics, foreign policies and international organizations. In view of world peace, cooperation and even 'world government,' the need for strong international laws and sound international relations can hardly be exaggerated.

4. Relationship between state and individual: The perennial and central problem, with which political science in the study of political analysis is concerned, is to establish proper relationship between the state and individuals. The state guarantees certain rights and freedoms to individuals and regulates their conduct and actions through the legal system. The proper adjustment between the authority and power of the state and liberty of the individuals is a tricky problem. Political science deals with the proper sphere of state action, the limits of political control and the area of individual freedom.

Thus, the scope of political analysis covers studying political phenomena from different diverse perspectives. It has been expanding in recent times. The social life of man has direct or indirect influence on his political life. Political analysis enters any sphere of life which has political implications. Modern political science in the era of post-behaviouralism deals with both empirical facts and value preferences. It is a combination of both science and philosophy. Hence, it is a dynamic social science and its scope is ever-expanding.

Traditional Approaches

Philosophical nature of political analysis

The philosophical nature of political analysis concentrates on the values which a political system should set for itself. It emphasizes that a political system should be based upon certain ideals and that it should strive to give shape to them. Plato, the Greek philosopher, represented best this philosophical tradition of politics. He said it was the duty of the philosopher-king to establish the ideal society based on justice. In the medieval period, this tradition was continued by Augustine and Aquinas.

The philosophical approach of political analysis is also known as the traditional approach. It involves an analytical study of ideas and doctrines which have long formed the core part of political thought. However, this approach has been criticized on grounds that it cannot be scientific as it ignores objective reality.

Empirical nature of political analysis

The empirical approach stresses on 'experience' or ground reality in the study of politics. Though this approach took a systematic theoretical shape in the 17th century as a result of the influence of John Locke and David Hume, this approach is almost as old as the philosophical approach. The first practitioner of this approach was Aristotle who studied a large number of constitutions in order to prepare a classification of constitutions. Machiavelli's 'Prince', which is an objective account of statecraft and Montesquieu's sociological theory of government and law belong to this empirical tradition.

Behaviouralism in politics has been a product of the empirical tradition. It focuses on the study of political behaviour. The philosophical approach is normative; it is based on values and norms. On the contrary, the empirical approach is based on ground reality. Further, the philosophical approach is prescriptive, because it makes judgments and recommendations. But the empirical approach is descriptive because it tries to objectively study political analysis without any bias and prejudice.

Critique of Traditional Approaches

To study the state, government and law, Plato and Aristotle adopted the traditional approaches to the study

of political science which were widely prevalent till the outbreak

of the Second World War. These approaches were primarily normative and idealistic. Plato laid emphasis on universal values and reasoning. He had his own concept of the ideal state which was the embodiment of morality, justice and truth. He drew his conclusions on the basis of the first major premise. In other words, Plato proceeded from the universal to the particular, which is the main characteristic of the deductive method.

Aristotle on the other hand, used the inductive method in the study of political science. He preferred to proceed from a particular to a general conclusion. He observed, analysed and compared different constitutions of the city-states and then drew the model of an ideal constitution. In this case, a general conclusion was established from the particular facts. This is the inductive method. Aristotle was the first political philosopher who adopted this method in the study of political science. Since the early days, both deductive and inductive methods were used for the study of political science and afterwards the other methods used for its study are historical method, comparative method, philosophical method, observational method, experimental method, psychological method, statistical method, sociological method and juridical method. These are known as the traditional methods used for the study of political science.

Modern political scientists like David Easton, Lasswell, Kaplan, Almond, and Robert Dahl have suggested some new methods and approaches to the study of political science. The modern or contemporary approaches are concerned with a scientific study of political science. Among them, the behavioural method, the system analysis and the structural-functional analysis are important. What the traditionalists call 'methods', the modernists call 'approaches'. An 'approach' is a set of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data for economic purposes. In short, methods or approaches are kphing but looking at problems from different angles.

Despite the seeming triumph of the empirical approach among modern political scientists, many influential contemporary political thinkers continue to defend and uphold the traditional classical political theory. Their criticism of the empirical-analytical approaches remains unabated. Despite their small number, their influence over contemporary thought is noteworthy. Michael Oakeshott, Hannah Arendt, Bertand de Jouvenal, Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin are some of the exponents of the theme of the revival of political theory in modern times. Oakeshott took over the chair of political science in London School of Economics and political science from Harold Laski in 1951. He has been identified with the resurgence of conservative thinking in England. Oakeshott's major effort is directed towards the resurgence of political theory as a tradition of enquiry. He has been keen to achieve for political science the possibility of a critical theoretical analysis: Philosophical analysis has to be based on experience, its chief objective being to rediscover the multi- dimensionality of experience denied to it by ideological and positivistic writers.

Philosophy and science are basically two different kinds of activities. Oakeshott, therefore, discounts any attempt to transfer the methods and concerns of one to the other. The notion that philosophy has anything to learn from the methods of scientific thought is altogether false. As a tradition of enquiry, philosophy, therefore, must be pursued for its own sake. It must maintain its independence from all extraneous interests, and in particular, from practical interest.

Political philosophy is a limited activity. It is comprehensible only within the context of the larger role of philosophy. This limits seeing one particular mode of experience, i.e., practical experience from the standpoint of the totality of experience. Reflection about

political life is possible at a variety of levels, and is prone to flow from one level to another. But in political philosophy, Oakeshott believes, our concern is not only with the world of political activity, but also with another world. Our aim is to explore the coherence of two worlds together. Political philosophy is the consideration of the relation between politics and eternity.

Political philosophy fulfils an end which it cannot itself bring about. It is not, as the behaviouralists claim, a progressive science. It does not accumulate solid results and reach conclusions upon which further research can be based. On the contrary, political philosophy has a close link to history. In a sense, it has nothing but a history, a history of doctrines. It is a history of problems which philosophers have discovered and

the manner of solution they have proposed.

Hannah Arendt is a prolific writer of enormous erudition. She has written at length on the major problems of political theory. She is widely acclaimed as a thinker of exceptional originality. Being a believer in the uniqueness and responsibility of the individual human person, she is an implacable opponent of totalitarianism of all kinds. She is also a bitter critic of the behaviouralist approach in social sciences. She blames this approach in paving the way for totalitarianism. She warns that behaviouralism in its search for uniformity in human behaviour will itself contribute to the making of a uniform stereotyped man. Commenting on behaviouralism and the validity of its 'laws', Hannah Arendt says that the more people there are and the more likely they are to behave, the less likely they are to tolerate misbehaviour.

Following Hannah Arendt, another notable thinker well known for the revival of political theory is Bectand de Jouvenal. Jouvenal considers politics as a potentiality for creative activity. He believes that politics should not be changed into the dead uniformity of administration. Both Arendt and Jouvenal are opposed to totalitarianism. They provide an analysis of its moral and intellectual roots. Both believe that political science cannot and should not be value-free. Instead of attempting to discover mere uniformities in human behaviour, political science must evolve valid criteria for evaluating major developments in the life of society. Jouvenal defines politics as an activity that builds, consolidates and helps the well-being of aggregates of men. In his view, society 'ultimately rests on authority rather than on force or consent.' Consent is not something spontaneous, but has to be aroused or promoted.

Some scholars these days draw a distinction between methods and approaches. For example, they prefer to speak of historical, philosophical, sociological and behavioural approaches do not like to use the word 'methods'. It is difficult to point out a clear distinction between methods and approaches, as the former include the latter also. Political scientists are not unanimous regarding the connotation of the word 'method'. According to Salvadori, 'It needs no more than a glance to observe that the word "method" is understood in many different ways.' Only a few authors deal with method, properly so called, that is rational workings of the mind in its quest for knowledge for political reality ... sometimes 'method' is used in the sense of technical devices for gathering data. More often it implies the points of view adopted by 'specialists'. An 'approach' simply means a particular orientation or point of view. At times, it may be expressed in the form of technique or method.

The terms 'method' and 'approach' are often used as synonyms. The dichotomy between 'methods' and approaches' is a matter of degree and not of kind. It is mainly based on traditional and modern political analysis. A method is a way of investigation for arriving at a particular result. It implies a systematic study of a subject. It helps to verify facts and examine the results and generalizations made on the basis of facts. Various methods have already been examined which help in proper understanding and study of political science.

What are called 'approaches' to the study of political science imply different modes of political analysis which are usually associated with modern thinking. Approaches imply different types of perception of political phenomena in systematic manner. They constitute a variety of orientations of looking at the world of political science. The approaches are helpful in organizing and ordering the apparently disorganized and fragmented political phenomena. They proceed on the basis of a set of assumptions and explanations of certain political factors. Using a model or a particular set of concepts, an approach seeks to provide a framework for explanation and predictions.

It is familiar to study political science in recent times through different approaches. While traditional political analysis is normative, philosophical legal and institutional bias, modern political analysis, on the other hand, is supposed to be empirical, value-free and behavioural.

EMERGENCE OF SCIENTIFIC APPROACH AND VALUE-FACT DICHOTOMY

There is no unanimity about the way political analysis should be studied. Over the years opinions on this have varied. For a long time politics was considered as coming within the scope of philosophy, history or law. However, in the late 19th century, there was a shift in this view.

Scientific Approach

An attempt was initiated to make the study of political analysis scientific. The philosophical tradition of political analysis gradually yielded to the scientific tradition of political analysis.

Emphasis was shifted from political norms and values to political behaviour. Since late 19th century, behaviouralism has dominated the study of political analysis. However, of late, emphasis on values in the study of political analysis has been revived. It is now realized that while scientific method is useful for studying politics, the study of politics would be directionless and meaningless if it does not aim at realizing some values. This renewed emphasis on norms and values in studying politics has given birth to post-behaviouralism.

Those who sought to make the study of political analysis scientific argued that for every analysis hypotheses could be verified on the basis of objective quantifiable data. In 1950s and 1960s, the study of politics assumed a new form called 'behaviouralism' or 'behavioural persuasion in politics'. This doctrine, marking the theoretical development of the scientific tradition of the study of politics, made a big impact. But before long it faced criticism and challenge. In 1970, a group of scholars argued that behaviouralism narrowed down the scope of political science and undermined its quality by ignoring the value or values and norms in the study of politics. They stood for going back to political values and norms without discarding the scientific method of collecting and processing data. This new phase in the study of politics has been known as post-behaviouralism. The writings of John Rawls and Robert Nozick reflect this trend.

Scientific nature of political analysis

Scholars have argued for a long time if political analysis was a science or an art. For Aristotle, political analysis was the master science. On the other hand, modern writers like who termed it just a science included Godwin, Hobbes, Vico, Hume, Frederick Pollock, John Seely, and Lord Bryce. Critics like Mosca, Burke, Buckle, Comte and Maitland have questioned the judgments behind referring to it as a science, stating that political analysis failed in every aspect to live up to the 'standards of science'.

Questions have thus been asked: how far legible is it to call political analysis a science? However, we must remember that no science, whether 'natural' or 'social', is completely scientific at all times and under all the circumstances. Two propositions can be stated when it comes to political science. The first is that it is futile to believe that political science will become scientific. Secondly, it is true that it is more scientific than it was in the past.

Below are the arguments that have been advanced against the claim that political analysis should be treated as a science:

1. Political scientists do not agree on its methods, principles and conclusions.
2. Universally valid uniform principles or laws are lacking to political science. Laws are frequently described as the generalizations of natural sciences. However, those generalizations that are forwarded by social sciences, including political analysis, are often disputed. It is contended that they do not possess the same degree of certainty or universality. They are often called just 'tendencies' and not 'laws'.
3. It is difficult to unearth the exact and definite views and conclusions when it comes to the political behaviour of man, which is unpredictable. Predictability is a quality that generalizations in social sciences lack. This is a major characteristic of 'laws' of natural sciences because it makes forecasts about future developments possible.
4. Rigorous scientific methods of investigation cannot be applied to political analysis. It is also difficult to establish general statements because verifiability always remains a problem. It is said that uncertainty, variability and a lack of order and continuity characterize political phenomena. In political science, laboratory experiments are not possible as in the case of physics or chemistry. However, social phenomena are much more complex. They are based on human behavior, which are constantly undergoing change. Therefore, political analysis is not about experimentation but has more to do with the science of observation.
5. Political science lacks objectivity that characterizes the study of physical sciences. A total impartial, value-neutral attitude cannot be taken by political analysts while dealing with political issues and affairs. A political observer's judgment of political problems, which are subjective, can be coloured by his/ her biases

and thus their opinions can be one-sided.

Therefore, these arguments reveal that unlike physics, chemistry and mathematics, political analysis cannot be an exact science. Political analysis is a social science like sociology, psychology and economics. Science can be broadly defined as 'a body of systematized knowledge'. In so far as it uses the scientific methods, political science can legitimately claim to be a science.

Some of the essential features of this method are: (a) Nothing is taken for granted; (b) Generalizations should be based on the basis of observed facts; (c) No generalizations

are accepted as final and irrevocable; (d) A scientist should be objective. He/she should not get carried away by personal preferences or subjective bias in the formulation of the findings of research.

However, despite arguments, one can contend that it has the valid claim of being called a science because its principles have been formulated after a systematic study of political phenomena. It is, however, generally agreed upon that principles of all social sciences, including that of political science, are neither universally valid nor always exact and precise. It is for this reason that Lord Bryce equated political science to meteorology, which was a relatively underdeveloped and inexact natural science at that time. On the other hand, Sir Frederick Pollock argued that 'there is a political science in the same sense that there is a science of morals.'

Ever since political analysis underwent a behavioural revolution, political studies has been enriched with the usage of advanced tools and techniques of research, concepts and models borrowed from other sciences. This has imparted even a greater scientific character to political analysis. Thus, while the claim of political science to be accepted as a science is legitimate, the reservation that like all social sciences, it is also an inexact or non exact science has to be maintained.

The practical application of knowledge in order to achieve a particular end is •popularly now defined as political analysis. A systematized body of knowledge is political science, which can be used to draft a constitution, in daily state administrative businesses, in legislation and foreign policy but most importantly in ensuring all round development *fff the state. Therefore, political science and its knowledge is used by statesmen, diplomats, administrators, social reformers and activists to reach their own objectives. One can thus see that the knowledge of political science has practical utility and is not limited to theory only.

Value-Fact Dichotomy

It is said that an attempt at concept control led to the development of the doctrine of value-fact dichotomy. Starting with the eighteenth century, few Enlightenment thinkers contended that values (for example moral obligations) were devoid of facts. Howard Kendler has observed: "The naturalistic fallacy rejects the possibility of deducing ethical statements from non-ethical statements. This principle, more precisely described as the value-fact dichotomy, denies the possibility of logically deriving what ought to be from what is.'

For instance, it is a fact that citizens of a nation where education levels are high enjoy better lives than people in those countries where education was rare. However, it did not seem to imply and also that it failed to imply that education was good and it should be adopted as a public policy choice. Such a claim could be called a value choice.

Logical positivists, who were a group of scientists-turned-philosophers, elaborated upon the idea of value-fact dichotomy in the twentieth century. It is said that they were uneasy with the idea of god, religion and morality being discussed in the 'scientific world'. Thus, they developed philosophy that not only explained the dichotomy between value-fact but held that only the 'fact' disjunction was of any worth. Ernest R. House has observed:

The logical positivists thought that facts could be ascertained and that only facts were the fit subject of science, along with analytic statements like '1 plus 1 equals 2' that were true by definition. Facts were empirical and could be based on pristine observations, a position called foundationalism. On the other hand, values were

Something else. Values might be feelings, emotions, or useless metaphysical entities. Whatever they were, they were not subject to scientific analysis. People simply held certain values or believed in certain values or did not. Values were chosen. Rational discussion had little to do with them.

For the positivists, truth was what was derived out of facts, which in turn were taken from experiment and observation.

They also rejected anything to do with values, i.e. ethics, morals, religion, philosophy, calling them preferences without foundation and also meaningless, non-cognitive babble. Values were termed as only matters of taste and things which could not be discussed rationally or objectively. For instance, to ask whether one prefers a chocolate or an ice-cream and the answer in turn is only a matter of personal taste, without any foundation in truth or reality because no experiment was performed to reach this understanding.

After philosophers pointed that positivism's foundational claim was involved in a self-referential absurdity, the movement died out.

Obviously, if the only kinds of statements capable of meaning are synthetic statements [statements of observable fact], then the answer is going to be along the lines that a statement is meaningful when it is either directly confirmed by experience, or reducible to such direct confirmation. Such a criterion is itself not directly confirmable, and so the criterion of meaning renders itself meaningless.

The claim of the positivists that only those statements which have been made out of observable facts have meanings was itself not made out of observation. Their claim thus stands no meaning. The philosophical basis for positivism was thus refuted. However, the end of the philosophy did not end the value-fact dichotomy. The ideas of the positivists remain popular to the present day. Philosopher Hilary Putnam, in his book *The Collapse of the Value-fact dichotomy*, has observed:

There are a variety of reasons why we are tempted to draw a line between 'facts' and 'values'—and to draw it in such a way that 'values' are put outside the realm of rational argument altogether. For one thing, it is much easier to say 'that's a value judgment,' meaning, 'that's just a matter of subjective preference,' than to do what Socrates tried to teach us: to examine who we are and what our deepest convictions are and hold those convictions up to searching test of reflective examination.

Any insistence on complete dichotomy between fact and value is also a ploy to avoid involving values in scientific or other activity. This dichotomy, however, does not lead to the removal of values from existence and also from science. What this does is to allow the dichotomist to ignore his/her own values rationally or on the basis of how well or even whether they work. No dichotomist will accept value judgments in a discussion if offered by a critic but it is true that it is not necessary for a dichotomist to identify or examine his/her own values. Putnam has concluded: 'The worst thing about the value-fact dichotomy is that in practice it functions as a discussion-stopper, and not just a discussion-stopper, but a thought stopper.'

Errors resulting from the value-fact dichotomy

While it is true that value judgments are rejected by people who instead insist on relying on facts, the dichotomy of value-fact involves a cornucopia of errors. The statements below have been derived from dichotomy thinking, which are false:

- Since facts and values are separate, with facts being solid and provable and values being matters of personal values play no role in the realm of facts (that is, in science)
 - Values are not involved in the determination of what is a fact
- Values are not involved in scientific descriptions of fact
- Values are not intermixed in the statement of scientific theories or facts
- Values, being matters of personal taste, cannot be reasoned about
- Values are completely subjective and have no objective qualities

When explored in detail, one can see not only why these are errors but also the dichotomy in the value-fact perspective and why it fails to represent accurate reality.

1,4 ORIENTATIONS OF POLITICAL ANALYSIS — NORMATIVE, EMPIRICAL AND SEMANTIC

Political analysis has been considered from normative empirical and semantic aspects as we shall discuss

subsequently.

Normative Political Analysis

Normative political analysis is characterized by the philosophical foundations of the state. It is value-based political theory where there is value and fact analysis. Teaching of normative political science in Plato's *Academy* and in Aristotle's *Lyceum* was done with a view to preparing future statesmen, administrators, demagogues and constitutional experts for the Greek city-states. Even these days, students are studying political science with a similar motive. The primary aim of the study of political science is to inculcate the knowledge of the state: its origin, nature, structure and functions. Knowledge about the state is of great significance to modern man. Moreover, in democratic states all citizens must possess at least rudimentary knowledge about political science and its principles. This will make them conscious of the state. They will be able to keep a vigilant eye over the rulers and assert their supremacy over them.

The classical political theory, by and large, was philosophical, normative, idealistic and to some extent, historical. Ideologically, modern political theory can be classified into two opposing divisions the liberal, including the individualist, the elitist and the pluralist on the one hand, and the Marxist, including the dialectical-materialist on the other. The liberal tradition, beginning from 15th—16th centuries, arose as a reaction against the classical political theory and after travelling through its institutional-structural voyage reached scientific-positivist-empiricist goals to give way for the behavioural and the post-behavioural political theory. The Marxist political theory offered a diametrically opposite view to the one advocated in whole of the West.

Having found the classical political theory, sufficiently inadequate to answer the questions posed by the changing times of the 18th and 19th centuries in the West, the modern political theory, as it came to be expressed in the institutional-positivist, imperialist-behavioural and post-behavioural trends, dubbed the whole classical tradition as dull. Their advocates, from lowest, Merriam and Key down to Dahl, Lasswell, Easton, deplored the historical-normative-evaluative tradition of the classical political theory. Instead, they laid emphasis on the scientific-empirical-behavioural study as the most plausible one to understand the intricacies of politics. They sought to lay stress on 'present' rather than 'past', 'living' rather than 'dull', 'immediate' rather than 'remote', 'objective' rather than 'subjective', 'analytical rather than 'philosophic', 'explanatory rather than 'descriptive', 'process-oriented' rather than 'purpose-oriented', 'scientific' rather than

theoretical. They attempted to build a science 'of politics: objective, clinical, value-free, observational and measurable, operational.

Historically stated, modern political theory, as it arose in the West, emerged from the shadow of positivism and empiricism. Until then, political theory, largely classical, was confined to a marginal role, being conceived at best as a body of classic texts of mostly historical interest, and usually found in philosophy, history, and logic. Positivism empiricism denied early political theory the status of a legitimate form of knowledge and enquiry. According to the positivist and empiricist outlooks, all knowledge is found in sensory observation; concepts and generalizations represent only the particulars from which they have been abstracted; values cannot play any role in the formation of knowledge. As the meaning of concepts and theories, the positivist empiricists believe, is directly tied to empirical observations, value judgments, therefore, should not be accorded the status of knowledge. Accordingly, the normative statements of political theory may be characterized as mere declarations. Though positivism and empiricism did not last long, its legacy thrived for a long time to come, particularly in North America. This legacy was scientism. The influence of scientism on the emerging behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism was both apparent and real. Behaviouralism, on its own, had certain features: it encouraged the systematic introduction of quantitative methods of analysis as the supreme methods of inquiry; it is sought to displace the theoretical frameworks of normative political theorists by the development of empirical theory; and it decisively rejected the history of political theory as the primary source of interpretation. Post-behaviouralism was an extension of behaviouralism, adding the credos of 'action', 'relevance' and 'values' to behaviouralism. Thus, the challenge to behaviouralism came from within, from post-behaviouralism.

The administrators, statesmen and diplomats, who conduct the affairs of the state, also require sound knowledge of political science in order to perform their functions with efficiency. An administrator who has no knowledge of political

science is bound to be a failure. Consequently, all new entrants to the Indian Administrative Service have to undergo a course in political science at the National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie. Similarly, the recruits to the Indian Foreign Service, who are expected to conduct India's foreign relations, are also imparted through knowledge of diplomacy, international relations, international law and other specialized branches of political science. Political science is said to be a science of statesmanship and leadership.

But apart from these utilitarian considerations, the acquisition of knowledge of political science enriches one's mind and widens one's intellectual horizon. In order to know what is happening in the world around us, at least an elementary knowledge of political science is necessary. Those who specialize in various fields of political science conduct research to discover hitherto unknown principles underlying political phenomena and make a rich contribution to the realm of knowledge. If the ultimate philosophy of human life is to enrich knowledge, then political science makes a major contribution to the storehouse of knowledge. Sidgwick observes, 'What, as students of political science, we are primarily concerned to ascertain, is not the structure of functions of the government in any particular historical community, but in the distinctive characteristics of different forms of government in respect of their structure or their functions, not the particular process of political change in Athens or England but the general laws or tendencies of change exemplified by such particular process'.

Thus, normative political analysis lays down principles which are to be followed in the conduct of public affairs. One, who has no knowledge of politics is at a great

disadvantage and in one's own interests and in the larger, interests of the society as a whole, it is advisable to have adequate knowledge of political science. To know the national and international affairs, the conditions of the various institutions, the nature and conduct of the government, the programmes and policies of political parties and various other matters, a knowledge of political science is indispensable. However intelligent, efficient and strong-minded the leaders at the helm of affairs may be in a country, high standard of administration is impossible, without strong material and moral support from the people. When governments commit mistakes or move along the wrong path, strong and healthy public criticism can make them mend their ways and bring them to the proper path. The principles and norms established by the political scientists are of immense utility to both the rulers and the ruled.

Normative political theory was the practice of systematic enquiry whose aim was) to acquire reliable knowledge about matters concerning the people. As a philosophical pursuit, theory sought to establish a rational basis for belief; as a politically inspired pursuit, it sought to establish a rational basis for action.

The normative political theory identified the political with common involvements, which men shared as partners. The Greek *Polis*, the Roman *respublica* and the medieval time's usage of commonwealth denoted a sharing of what is common. Its basic unit of analysis had always been the polis, the republic or the commonwealth and in the process, attempting to specify the significant parts of the whole, how they functioned and what their effect was on the quality of life in the political whole i.e., the state.

Normative political theory, in its classic form, thus, came to view the state as composed of, and dependent upon, various interrelated structures, and the structures denoting activity, relationships and belief: activity, for example, may relate to ruling, warfare, education, religious practices, production of commodities; relationships may involve those between social classes, between types of superiority and inferiority, between the authorities and the subjects; belief may mean anything, i.e. concerning gods, justice, equality, natural law and the like.

The notion that political theory related itself to the political whole, the state, gave way to an idea of system, an order and the resultant conceptions of balance, equilibrium, stability and harmony. No wonder if classical political theory tried to analyse the sources of conflicts, anarchy, instability and revolution and on it attempted to enunciate the principles of justice which would form a guide for the discharge of duties in the political community.

The classical political theory thrived on the significance of comparative studies for supplying a more comprehensive of explanation and a wider range of alternatives. That was the reason that the classical political theory developed a classification for political forms (e.g., monarchy, aristocracy, democracy and their variants) and a set of concepts, such as law, citizenship, justice, participation so as to prepare the way for an explanation that would account for differences or similarities. The normative political theory had been, largely, ethical in nature.

Empirical Political Analysis

Empirical Political Analysis is studied in a systematic and scientific way. It is a value-free science. In order to study it in a systematic and empirical manner, some methods are usually followed. Without these methods, political analysis cannot be studied properly. These methods make the study of political analysis interesting and easier. Each subject,

whether a science or an art, has its own method of study. Modern political scientists like David Easton, Lasswell, Kaplan, Almond and Robert Dahl have developed methods of political analysis and suggested some new methods and approaches to the study of political science. Among them, the behavioural method, the system analysis and the structural-functional analysis are important. What the traditionalists call 'methods', the modernists call 'approaches'. An 'approach' is a set of standards governing the inclusion and exclusion of questions and data for economic purposes. In short, methods or approaches are nothing but looking at problems from different angles.

The chief aim of empirical political analysis is explanation, and derivatively prediction of observable phenomena. This is achieved through observational or experimental laws. Indeed the laws themselves are justified and explained by underlying theory. Empirical political analyses are means of evaluating arguments put forward to support these experimental laws, scientific theories and the explanations they afford.

For the scientifically oriented, the results of the enquiry could only reflect the particular theorists' mental processes and normative patterns. They might not indicate any necessary relation to those of other persons. Hence they might have little significance for society. However, for the theorists, in contrast, norms and theorizing about them are closely related. If norms, by definition, represent goals for which men consciously strive, then a rational analysis of the difficulties involved in integrating any institution would indicate the direction in which society is moving. What the theorist concludes from this study, would give an advance indication of what that society would probably do in the long run.

Many of those who entered the field of theory opted for behaviouralism. The doubts that scientism raised about tools and methods induced most analysts to choose what seemed to be mere armchair philosophy. Furthermore, scientism favoured practical knowledge of scientists as contrasted with the impractical theory of political philosophers. Since the advice given by the behaviouralists necessarily involves normative judgements, the results have not been impressive. For, unlike the theorist, the behaviouralist has not been compelled to analyse his own norms. Behaviouralism and society both insist on relativism. This fact is made clear by the close relationship between what the behaviouralist undertakes to investigate and the condition of the society whose problems are to be solved. The social scientist cannot pretend to do anything more than study situations created by a society in most cases, his own. For him the assertion of independence can take one form only - the expert must determine policy. He, of course, is not in a position to do this if he has accepted norms with any kind of absolute validity. Our society makes no such assertion. But if the social scientist is to achieve independence similar to that of the physicist, then his claim to the pursuit of truth and knowledge must be replaced by an assertion of the validity of relativism.

Relativism alone can supply him with freedom of action, necessary to pursue his investigations which demand respect. For the social sciences, the stance of scientific objectivity has to take the form of relativism. For the physical scientist on the other hand, objectivity means that, to the best of his ability, he will avoid introducing irrelevant norms into his investigations. Only if the behaviorist is allowed to determine how the fact is to be fitted into a normative scheme of what is important or not important, useful or not useful, can he gain prestige among the physical scientists. For the social scientist, the normative 'ought' imposes a serious limitation not only on the ease with which he conducts his investigations, but on the worth of their results.

To be successful, an empirical approach in the social sciences needs a non-empirical faith in the appropriateness of methodology. Human behaviour is much more complex than that studied by the physical sciences. It is a fact that can be empirically observed. Only an empirical analysis could lead to still greater efforts and more complex techniques of analysis. The real problem for the empiricist is that an empirically based theory in the social sciences could describe only the particular phenomena from which it is derived. There is no evidence that any given condition in man invariably leads to a given behaviour. Even experimentally induced conditioned response - which achieved spectacular results in animals - would work consistently only among very young human beings. The empiricist, then, must resort to an act of faith to continue his investigations. He must say that despite evidence to the contrary. He would affirm that choice was an illusion. He must uphold the view that man is bound as tightly in a chain of cause and effect as the universe.

The real reason for the failure of empiricism in the social sciences is the complexity of subject matter. It is not easy to

distinguish the multiple causes behind even the simplest human behaviour. A particularly popular plea among behaviouralists of various schools includes more refined tools of analysis, bigger computers to process data, more complex surveys, and more ingenious methods of overcoming the difficulties of investigating social phenomena. Behaviouralists believe that these difficulties are not only capable of being recognized and investigated, but of altering their behaviour accordingly.

It was understandable with the cause-effect premise of science which was considered unavoidable. The introduction of choice into such a system would, of course, place the social sciences in a special category, having no clear relation to the rest of the sciences. Indeterminism would make it now less obvious why empiricists should attempt to establish an empirically based theory in the social sciences. Yet the alternative to empiricism in the social sciences does not even have an adequate name. To talk about it, we must invent one, for example, normativism.

The normativist bases his approach on the premise that human behaviour is goal-directed rather than caused and that the goals or norms are put into rational, orderly patterns. However, they do not necessarily resemble the patterns from which they are derived. The assumption is that the pattern formed by the individuals is almost orderly and that an observer gives some of the norms. It is by doing so that a social scientist could predict some of the patterns. Besides he, by himself manipulating the norms, can foresee the consequences to both the individual and society. This would become all the more easy if certain norms are accepted which are based on:

- excellent empirical evidence.
- analysis of norms and empiricist methodology

Empiricism does not discredit the normativists' assumption about normative patterns. Indeed, many attempts to refine empirical methodology are based on the same assumption. The empiricist returns to his field studies, and by manipulating his techniques, attempts to discover what the man's norm really is. He also tries to find the factors that made his respondents say that he believed in the norm when in fact he did not. The empiricist's very methodology leads him to the conclusion that he must either refine his technique or give up the belief that normative statements exert any impact on behaviour. Paradoxically, it is the normativist who remains much closer to what empirical observation reveals. It is perfectly possible for a man to assert a norm and then fail to observe all its requirements. This is evidenced from the lack of empirical studies of normative patterns in both individuals and societies. It reveals that the empiricist is hostile to normative approaches and in fact avoids them.

The recognition that a regularity or law had, in effect, been imposed might help to explain the tendency toward an empirically based theory in the social sciences. The hypothesis that such regularities exist obviously influences empiricists in the social sciences. It is assumed that beneath the great diversity of human behaviour, the same kind of regularities could be observed when suitable methods of observation had been developed. In contrast, physical sciences begin with observable regularities which they make universal through the concept of the ideal. They do not have to assume that the regularities are there. Needless to say, the regularity which permits experiment, prediction and testing in the physical sciences, is not present in the social science hypotheses. If the regularity is not always observable, the regularity in the social sciences is the hypothesis and not the source of it.

The empiricist eschews theory and assumes that the search of regularities would permit genuine theory. His watchword is facts first and theory afterwards. This makes him uphold the narrower thesis of empiricism, that is, that the entire science cannot be reduced to empirical observation. A theory involves a selective principle concerning empirical observations, or an assumption about possible relation. This is how physical sciences have developed.

The bulk of social science is now directed by the requirements of social policy in the society in which it is planned and implemented. It is practical rather than theoretical. Social scientists, when they supply information about voting behaviour and factors in race riots, are not creating any useful theory from such studies. For, the problem they investigate is set and defined by social norms, not by facts in the usual sense. A most serious limitation of pure empiricism is its inability to deal adequately with normative behaviour. As a matter of fact, empirically based analysis of the latter does not allow us to draw any conclusions.

Furthermore, in view of the nature of normative exceptions which are expression of interactions between norms or inconsistencies, the significance of the relations would vary according to the normative sets that are accepted. The relativists assume that normative behaviour is not logical in so far as people do not usually change their behaviour when inconsistencies are pointed out. Consequently, normative behaviour is not logical and cannot be studied by logical

analysis. This implies that all political theorizing is a waste of time.

The normativist believes that only logical analysis is able to distinguish between inconsistency and exception. In being able to do so, it alone can deal with normative behaviour. Normative theory yields conclusions that permit action, but those other than what empiricism does. Moreover, the empiricist almost inevitably confuses elementary distinctions that are self-evident to the theorist. Therefore, the recommendations of the empiricist could be misleading and even dangerous to society.

The relativist is committed to the view that norms are expressions of tastes, attitudes and desires. He is necessarily committed to a single way of interpreting evidence of inconsistencies in normative behaviour. He would dwell on this as if it were the only evidence. But to the relativist any change in norms is mysterious and so is the communication of norms within society and the continuance of any normative patterns. In contrast, the normativist is not committed to excluding evidence. In his view, anything that maintains an historical continuity should find a logical place in a social scheme which it pretends to explain or even describe. He does not believe that inconsistencies are illogical. He can perceive them as quite logical exceptions. They are the result of an

interaction between norms in which the exceptions indicate the presence of a norm having a higher position of some normative scale.

Empiricists hold that their theory would be a guide to action. Thus, we can envisage life itself as one huge experimental field for a game theory. Instead of applying the latter to some life situations, which at present political theory aims to do, life can be imagined as serving the purpose of testing the game theory and other theories including even those that are likely to emerge. This is done in order to clarify them and foresee the implications of various alternatives. Principles and standards would be but rules of the game that one adopts for the purpose of a particular game only. Political theory would become a super-set of rules which are applicable to a situation desirable for a particular life game. They could be duly programmed into a computer. Hence, anything that cannot be programmed will no longer qualify as theory.

Computerized game-playing as a substitute for living would not be limited merely to games. It would be an inevitable step-towards using the computer to create new rules of the game. This could be done by programming into it the ingredients of rules or various sets of rules, also called values. It is with the help of these that not only new rules but also new games could be invented. In the socio-political realm, this would afford possibilities of creating experimental ideologies, hitherto practised in only a limited fashion by totalitarian systems. In traditional totalitarian systems, any experimentation is likely to be slow in inception, cumbersome in application and uncertain in results. But its computerized experimentation would provide the possibility of rapid testing and general availability of experience through participation in instant systems.

Semantic Political Analysis

The growth of semantic political analysis needs to be understood in the context of two important developments in social sciences in the recent past. On the one hand, there has taken place professional compartmentalization leading to birth of several new disciplines and sub-disciplines dealing with different aspects of the social life and languages. On the other hand, advance in behavioural research has made evident the need and importance of interdisciplinary approach which encourages the birth of new disciplines or sub-disciplines making use of the knowledge and methods of more than one discipline.

Although the meaning and nature of semantic political analysis are not free from controversy, there is agreement among scholars on the point that political sociology is interdisciplinary in origin and nature - a product of cross-fertilization between politics, society and languages. It is relevant to point out here that both languages and political sociology claim that political science belongs to them. It is not surprising that semantic political analysis is taught in many universities in the departments of Political Science and Sociology.

Contemporary political science today is faced with a danger of losing its identity as a discipline. The danger arises from the close identification of political science with either science or philosophy. It is feared that political theory might end in some kind of scientism or moralism.

Norman Jacobson is the exponent of the view that political science is neither scientism nor moralism. It is neither completely identified with science nor with morality. He asserts that political science must remain separate from both and

preserve an identity of its own. He laments the fact that contemporary political science is anything but political science. He points out: 'It would seem that politics is psychology, or it is sociology, that

it is moral philosophy or theology-that it is almost anything but politics'. In efforts to mould political science in the perfect image of science, so argues Jacobson, there is no harm in applying methods and procedures of science. Likewise, there is no harm in utilizing the knowledge of one field for the better understanding of another. Yet the basic distinction between the two fields must not be effaced. The boundaries and nature of science and politics must be fully grasped.

According to Jacobson, politics is a special variety of political activity. One may pursue it more effectively by drawing upon the best, which fields of enquiry in other disciplines, offer. But one must not fail to acquire a better insight into political phenomena. This means achieving deeper and fuller understanding of politics. In short, politics has to be studied in its own right. Exclusive emphasis on the scientific or philosophical character of political science would reduce political science to scientism or moralism, respectively. If science is taken out of political theory, it may become nothing but an ethical or moral residue. Similarly, if philosophy is taken out of it, what remains is mere methodology.

If there is danger of political science being subsumed in other disciplines, or to be lost in scientism or moralism, the danger of having a superficial perspective of the realities of politics cannot be ignored. It is important that both the scientific and philosophic aspects of political theory should be properly grasped and highlighted.

Science has been described as a branch of knowledge dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged and showing the operation of general laws. A scientific approach involves two things: (i) the agreement on methods, and (ii) the training in scientific works. Friedrich's definition takes note of both the elements. He defines science as a body of ordered knowledge that is known to and progressively enlarged by the specialists in the field. This is secured through the use of methods which they, as a group, accept as workable ways for arriving at that particular kind of knowledge. In short, science is an organized knowledge involving consistency in methods used for the collection, and analysis of data. The data thus generated are given logical coherence. This renders scientific statements capable of validation by other political scientists. This, however, does not imply that the same techniques apply to all sciences. In fact, the tools and techniques evolved and applied in one discipline do not necessarily apply to another science. In one respect, they are identical, i.e., they operate with precise quantitative data.

The scientific element of science, however, has nothing to do with quantification. Science demands not only accuracy but also relevancy. It even invests adequacy to results leading to a great progress in science. A more scientific study of sources of data generation and a more critical use of the other types of supportive evidence also contributes to the advancement of science. In the words of Friedrich, neither the degree of generalization, nor the degree of quantification, are in themselves 'absolute' criteria of scientific progress but must be evaluated in relation to the material in hand and to be assessed.

Political science deals with the territorial state, which is the largest organized form of society. This fact turns political science into a comprehensive discipline. Its unit of analysis, i.e., state and government, change its character, form and goals, from time to time, and from region to region. This calls for not one but several methods because each change may involve a different approach or method, or sometimes a combination of different approaches and methods. To continue to have a scientific character, does not necessarily involve using the natural science methodology in social sciences, nor does it involve using the methodology of social sciences other than political science.

A good political theory has to be philosophical as much as scientific. As against scientific knowledge, philosophic enquiry deals with the most general causes and principles of being. In other words, philosophy consists of two things: (a) a theory as to the nature of the world; and (b) an ethical or political doctrine as to the best way of living. According to Friedrich, philosophy concentrates on problems which can be comprehended within the framework of existing knowledge, but may also attempt to go beyond it. It may ask metaphysical questions, and seek to answer them either on rational or on non-rational grounds. Understood thus, philosophy is clearly distinct from science. If political science brings to philosophy both facts and generalizations, it in turn receives from philosophy the capacity of abstract theorizing and reflection. Political science like philosophy 'must deal with problems, not in an isolated manner, but comprehensively.'

The semantic analysis of political science must attempt to perform the purpose of social criticism. To achieve this goal, it must not, in fact, detach itself from its philosophical moorings, though contemporary political scientists, particularly those belonging to the behavioural persuasion, attempt to detach themselves from such teleological views. They seek to concentrate more on the non-normative and non-philosophical aspects than on normative questions. Their main goal is to construct a positive science of politics. For the sake of proving their scientific element, political scientists may try to break away from philosophy.

According to Friedrich, philosophers like Leo Strauss, the Existentialists like Sartre, Paul Tillich and Maurice Cranston have been influential in political science. Their influence stems from the fact that they have written at length on the role of power, law, freedom and authority in politics, and other similar political concepts. They have influenced, and will continue to influence the substance of politics as well as allied areas and doctrines. Even those who differ from them as also those who deal with these concepts must discuss them and, if necessary, contradict. Friedrich rightly sums up that political science and political philosophy are intimately tied. The study of one cannot be pursued without the other. Political science, in this respect, is not at all different from other sciences which likewise are linked with philosophy.

Towards Interdisciplinary Focus of Semantic Analysis of Political Science

Political science has always drawn heavily from allied sciences. Plato presented his ideal state in terms of the structure of the family, nature of education and the scheme of functional specialization. Aristotle's concern lay in the distribution of wealth and status in the polis of his day. He sought to ensure the stability of the political regime prevailing in the model polity. Marx saw the primary source of political behaviour in the level of technological development and class structure, the modes of production, i.e., topics which fall under the rubric of sociology.

Gabriel A. Almond makes the comment that classical political theory is more apolitical sociology and psychology, more a normative political theory than it is a theory of the political process. The Platonic, Aristotelian and later Roman classification of types of political system are far more explicit on the consequences of varieties of social stratification and their representation in the political system, for their forms and their performance than they are regarding political decision-making processes. Thus, the bases of their political classification are sociological rather than political. The Greek and Roman theory of political development is a social- psychological theory. It treated the pure forms of rule (monarchy, aristocracy or democracy) as inherently unstable because of their susceptibility to corruption stemming from sociological

and psychological processes. This has been particularly true of sociologists.

The general criteria of semantic political analysis are: (1) operational capability, (2) logical consistency, (3) scope, and (4) simplicity. Failure to meet the requirements of operationalization means that a theory is not testable. It means that its results are not empirical. If a theory is not logically consistent, it is impossible for all its statements to be true. But this alone cannot be a ground for rejecting it. Given two theories, both of which explain data, that theory which applies to a wider range of phenomena, that is, which has a larger scope, has to be preferred. Above all, the simpler of the two theories means a theory which has fewer adhoc hypotheses. This also includes those having little, if any, confirming evidence and fewer qualifications. A theory that is simpler in these respects, is more amenable to falsification. This is because there are fewer ways to explain apparently disconfirming instances.

None of the criteria listed above provides an error-free method for evaluating attempts at scientific explanation. At best, the conclusions are not totally true or false. This tentative nature of scientific findings casts doubts about the genuineness of scientific knowledge. If deductive proof from self-evident premises provides the only standard of genuine knowledge, the results of scientific enterprise are seen to fall short. But so do the results of ordinary observation. In neither case does the mere possibility of their non-verifiability render them unfit for scientific knowledge. The job is done by connecting the key elements in the concept of grounds and evidence in scientific evaluation. The proper identification of indicators leads from truths to further truths. Such a use leads to true predictions. However, it does not contradict other uses of clarification and explanations. The study of semantic political analysis typically contains the three following components:

1. Observational (evidence of statement of languages)
2. Observational (experimental) laws of languages
3. Theories of languages

The relationship of these components with each other constitutes two central formulations in any science, namely:

- (a) Explanation of observed phenomena by appeal to laws and theories, and
- (b) Evaluation of laws and theories by appeal to observed phenomena

Theories are key to the scientific understanding of empirical phenomena/When it is claimed that a given phenomenon is scientifically understood, it simply means that science can offer a satisfactory theoretical account of it. Empirical theory is a systematically related set of statements. It also includes some law-like generalizations that are empirically testable.

Following are features of semantic political analysis:

1. The relationship is asymmetrical.
2. The cause constitutes a necessary and sufficient condition for the occurrence of the effect.
3. The relation holds between spatially contiguous phenomena.
4. The cause and effect are continuous in time.
5. The relationship between independent and dependent variables is uniform or invariant-same cause, same effect.

ACTIVITY

Research on the Internet and write a report on how normative and empirical political analysis are applicable in the Indian political scenario,

DID YOU KNOW

Karl Marx was sharply critical of capitalism, which he saw as a stage on the way to a classless socialistic economy. In his view, the capitalist structure contains a fundamental contradiction in the tension between the owner's desire to keep the wages low and the workers' desire to raise them while prices fluctuate according to the law of supply and demand. Under capitalism, the two struggling classes are the bourgeoisie and the proletariat (workers).

Marx predicted that the demands of the bourgeoisie would result in an evergrowing proletariat whose living conditions would continue to decline until the proletariat would rise up in violent revolt and destroy the bourgeoisie and capitalism, leading to the next historical epoch, socialism.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- The analysis of political phenomena has had a long tradition and can be traced back to classical Greece. Aristotle, the Greek philosopher, called politics 'the master science.' By this he meant that political analysis referred to that activity through which individuals sought to improve their lives and build a great society.
- The word **political analysis** has been derived from different perspectives, which means analysis of political phenomena. In ancient times, Greece was divided into a number of independent city-states, and the most important among them was Athens. Thus, political analysis may be interpreted as referring to the affairs of the polis or the affairs of the state.
- Those who argue that political analysis is state-bound contend that politics is not played in 'civil society.' **Civil society** consists of non-state bodies such as family and kinship organizations, class and educational and business organizations. The state is a 'public' entity while the 'civil society' is a private entity.
- **'Politics** is the process through which man orders the society in which he lives according to his political ideas about the ends of man.'
- Robert A. Dahl rightly observes: 'Political analysis is one of the unavoidable facts of human existence. Everyone is involved in some fashion at sometime in some kind of political system.'
- The scope of political science implies its area of study or subject matter. It is a very comprehensive and expanding social science. An attempt was made by the International Political Science Association in Paris in 1948 to delineate its scope. It classified the same into four zones, namely: political theory, political institution, political dynamics and international relations.
- Contemporary political science today is faced with a danger of losing its identity as a discipline. The danger arises from the close identification of political science with either science or philosophy. It is feared that political theory might end in some kind of scientism or moralism.
- Empirical political analysis is studied in a systematic and scientific way. It is a value-free science.

- The normativist bases his approach on the premise that human behaviour is goal-directed rather than caused and that the goals or norms are put into rational, orderly patterns.

KEY TERMS

- **Behaviourism:** It is an approach to psychology that emphasizes observable measurable behaviour.
- **Empirical:** Something that is based on, concerned with, or verifiable by observation or experience rather than theory or pure logic.
- **Normative:** Establishing, relating to, or deriving from a standard or norm, especially, of behaviour.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. In 1948, the International Political Science Association classified political science into four zones, namely, political theory, political institution, political dynamics and international relations.
2. The study of international relations is a growing area of political science. It covers diplomacy, international politics, foreign policies and international organizations.
3. Robert A. Dahl defines political analysis as: 'Political analysis is one of the unavoidable facts of human existence. Everyone is involved in some fashion at sometime in some kind of political system.'
4. Aristotle was the first to consider political analysis as master science. On the other hand, modern writers like who termed it just a science included Godwin, Hobbes, Vico, Hume, Frederick Pollock, John Seely, and Lord Bryce. Critics like Mosca, Burke, Buckle, Comte and Maitland have questioned the judgments behind referring to it as a science, stating that political analysis failed in every aspect to live up to the 'standards of science'.
5. Logical positivists were a group of scientists-turned-philosophers who elaborated upon the idea of value-fact dichotomy in the twentieth century. It is said that they were uneasy with the idea of god, religion and morality being discussed in the 'scientific world'. Thus, they developed philosophy that not only explained the dichotomy between value-fact but held that only the 'fact' disjunction was of any worth.
6. Normative political analysis is characterized by the philosophical foundations of the state.
7. Explanation
8. The following are the two features of semantic political analysis (1) The relationship is asymmetrical; (2) The cause constitutes a necessary and sufficient condition for that occurrence of the effect.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Why is political analysis also known as the art of governance?
2. What are the Indian conceptions of political analysis?
3. What is the relationship between the state and the individual?
4. What are the different levels of theory?
5. What are the features of the modern political theory of the West?
6. Why is political analysis called science?
7. What are the arguments against treating political analysis as science?
8. What is value-fact dichotomy? What are the arguments for and against it? **Long-Answer Questions**

1. List and explain the alternative conceptions of political science.
2. Explain the nature and scope of political analysis.
3. Write a short note on normative political analysis.
4. Discuss empirical political analysis.
5. What do you understand by semantic political analysis?

FURTHER READING

Pruthi, R. K.; *The Political Theory*, Sarup & Sons, India, 2005.

Freeden, M.; *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*, Clarendon Press, Gloucestershire, 1996.

Lively, J. *Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx: Key Debates*, Routledge, UK, 1989.

Arora, N. D. and Awasthy S. S.; *Political Theory and Political Thought*, Har-Anand Publications, India, 2007.

UNIT 2 BEHAVIOURALISM

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Behaviouralism: Development and Decline

Post-Behaviouralism

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will study about politics as a science with a focus on behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism, and positivism and logical positivism. Behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism are the two contemporary approaches to the study of politics. In contemporary social science, the behavioural approach has shown increasing concern with solving the prevailing problem of the society, in this way, it has significantly absorbed the 'post-behavioural' orientation within its scope. Positivism refers to a set of epistemological perspectives and philosophies of science which hold that the scientific method is the best approach to uncover the processes by which both physical and human events occur.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Comprehend the significance of behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism approaches in the study of political theory
- Discuss the role of positivism and logical positivism to understand political theory
- List the characteristics of systems theory approach of international relations
- Interpret the structural functional and the power approach for the study of political theory
- Evaluate the decline and revival of political theory, with a focus on the contribution of political thinkers

BEHAVIOURALISM: DEVELOPMENT AND DECLINE

Behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism are the two contemporary approaches to the study of politics. The development of the contemporary approaches signifies a departure

from traditional approaches in two aspects: (i) they attempt to establish a separate identity of political science by focusing on the real character of politics; and (ii) they try to understand politics in totality, transcending its formal aspects and looking for those aspects of social life which influence and are influenced by it. Here, we will begin the discussion with behaviouralism.

Till the mid 1900s, political science as a discipline, was based on qualitative-philosophy and depended on cases studies, which were incapable of probing the causes in a way that could be measured. The discipline was descriptive and legalistic. Calling it a science was inappropriate.

The revolution brought about by the behaviouralists in the 1950s, laid emphasis on an empirical model, based on a social scientific system. Despite experimentation being indispensable in the field of research, be it psychology or the hard sciences, the technique was confined to being merely a curiosity among political scientists. Those behavioural scientists who were keen to study individual-level political behaviour, resorted to the technique of survey research as it was felt that experimentation was not the appropriate method for the investigation of real-world politics.

American political scientist, David Easton, was the pioneer in distinguishing between behaviourism and behaviouralism in the 1950s. 'Behaviourism' in the early 1940s, was said to be a behavioural science, which came to be known as behaviourism over a period of time. Easton, however, chose to differentiate the two disciplines.

The behaviouralism approach in political science attempts to provide an objective and quantified model that would explain and forecast political behaviour. The approach is based on the natural sciences and pertains to the rise of the behavioural sciences. Behaviouralism aims to analyse the behaviour, actions and acts of individuals instead of the features of institutions like legislatures, executives, and judiciaries, and groups from various social settings. It seeks to interpret this behaviour in relation to the political system.

Before the behaviouralist revolution took place, the very fact that political science was a science was strongly debated. Many criticized that studying of politics was mainly a qualitative and normative activity. They believed that it did not have a scientific method required for it to be called or declared a science. Behaviouralists would employ rigid methodology and empirical research to confirm or authenticate their study as a social science. The innovativeness of the behaviouralist approach was evident when it transformed the attitude of the objective of inquiry, progressing toward research supported by verifiable facts. As it became more popular in the 1960s and the 1970s, behaviouralism questioned models based on realism and liberalism. The behaviouralists referred to these as 'traditionalism', under which they included all the studies of political behaviour that did not rely on fact. The techniques used by behaviouralism to comprehend political behaviour were: sampling, interviewing, scoring and scaling, and statistical analysis.

It was David Easton's belief that behaviouralism aimed to be 'analytic not substantive, general rather than particular, and explanatory rather than ethical'. It looks at evaluating political behaviour without 'introducing any ethical evaluations'. According to Rodger Beehler, the behaviouralist wished to insist on differentiating between 'facts and values'.

Behaviouralism is the belief that social theory should be constructed only on the basis of observable behaviour. The behavioural approach to political analysis developed out of positivism, adopting its assertion that scientific knowledge can be developed only on the basis of explanatory theories that are verifiable and falsifiable. Behavioural analysis

typically involves the collection of finite data through research surveys, statistical analysis and the construction of empirical theory that have predictive capacity.

Behaviouralism is an approach to the analysis and explanation of political phenomena. It is particularly associated with the works of American political scientists after the Second World War (1939-45). David Easton, in his book *Political System: An Enquiry into the State of Political Science* (1953), appealed for building up a behavioural political science. It has to be closer to other social sciences and would take part in the decision-making process. However, the origins of the behaviouralist approach can be stressed back to the works of Graham Wallas and Arthur Bentley who wrote two famous books *Human Nature in Politics* and *The Process of Government*, respectively, which was published as early as 1908. In their works, they laid great emphasis on the informal process of politics and less on political institutions alone.

Graham Wallas in his book *Human Nature in Politics* tried to introduce a new realism in political studies in the light of the new findings of contemporary psychology. He was influenced by the new psychological teachings which revealed that man was not a rational creature following his self interest, and his political actions were not totally guided by self-interest as stated by classical economists and laissez-faire theorists. It is very difficult to explain the human nature in utilitarian perspective. Graham Wallas, to overcome this problem, insisted on exploring facts and evidence for understanding human nature and its manifestations in human behaviour. The gist of his argument was that the political process could be understood only by analysing as to how people actually behaved in a political situation and not merely by speculating on how they should or would behave. On the other hand, Arthur Bentley who is a pioneer of 'group approach' to politics, says that only the description of political activity is not enough. He sought to provide for new tools of investigation. He laid emphasis on the study of informal groups. He almost completely ignored the formal political institution. Unlike Graham Wallas who is influenced by psychology, Arthur Bentley was inspired by sociology. In his study, the roles of pressure groups, political parties, elections and public opinion in the political process are highlighted.

Another prominent advocate of the behaviouralist approach was Charles E. Merriam (1874-1953). He was the president of the American Political Science Association in 1925 when he exhorted political scientists to look at political behaviour as one of the essential objects of enquiry in his presidential address. Thus, Merriam was an exponent of the scientific method for the study of politics. At the same time, he was a champion of democracy. He called for employing science into the service of democratic principle. Thus, he believed that democracy and science can be promoted together, and hence were complementary to each other. The school has done pioneer works in the development of the behavioural approach. Merriam was a vehement critic of contemporary political science. In his book *New Aspects of Politics* (1925) and in his article 'The Present State of the Study of Politics', which was published in *American Political Science Review*, argued that contemporary political science lacked scientific rigour. He criticized the work of historians for ignoring the role of psychological, sociological and economic factors in human affairs. He advised that the student of politics should take the help of recent advances in social sciences in the study of politics. He argued that this will help to build an interdisciplinary and scientific character of the political science. He called for the use of the scientific approach in the study of politics. He sought to develop a 'policy science' by using quantitative techniques already developed in the fields of sociology and psychology. In this way, Charles Merriam contributed at length to the evolution of the behavioural approach.

Behaviouralism in political science was systematically developed only after the Second World War. The behaviouralism had its philosophical origins in the writings of Auguste Comte in the nineteenth century and in the logical positivism of the Vienna Circle in the 1920s. However, behaviouralism did not accept all the philosophical arguments of the positivists. The contribution of American political scientists in this regard was quite significant. Some of the works of these American political scientists is worth mentioning here, such as *The Impact on Political Science of the Revolution in the Behavioural Sciences* (1955), *The Behavioural Approach in Political Science: Epitaph for a Monument to a Successful Protest* by Robert Dahl which was published in the American Political Science Review in 1961, *The Impact of the Behavioural Approach on Traditional Political Science* (1962) by Evron M. Krikpatrick, *The Correct Meaning of Behaviouralism 'in Political Science* (1967) by David Easton and Heinz Eulau's article on 'Political Behaviour' in the International Encyclopedia of the Social Science, which was published in 1968. It can be said that behaviouralism stood for a shift of focus in the study of politics from the formalism and normative orientations of the legalistic and philosophical schools to political behaviour, that is, the behaviour of articulators in the political field, such as, power-holders, power-seekers as well as voters. Thus, behaviouralism is understood as more than the mere study of political behaviour, though it was its main focus.

The growing importance of behaviouralism sought to account for the psychological and social influences on the behaviour of the individual in a political situation. It called for the study of such processes and factors as political-socializations, ideologies, culture, participation, communication, leadership, decision making, political violence, etc. These processes involve interdisciplinary and cross-disciplinary research. Behaviouralism as a movement in political science did not remain confined to the study of individual-based political behaviour but developed into a set of orientations, procedures and methods of analysis. In practice, it embraced all that lends a scientific character to the modern political science. A behaviourist like a positivist ascertains the correctness of an explanatory theory. It is the stress on empirical observation and testing that characterize the behavioural approach. A behaviourist systematically compiles all the relevant facts, quantitative and qualitative, for an evaluation of a theoretical statement. Furthermore, behavioural analysis asserts that all scientific theories and/or explanation must in principle be capable of being falsified.

David Easton outlined eight major tenants of behaviouralism, which are as follows:

- (a) *Regularities* or uniformity in behaviour which can be expressed in generalizations or theory
- (b) *Verification* or the testing of the validity of such generalizations or theories
- (c) *Techniques* for seeking and interpreting data
- (d) *Quantification* and measurement in the recording of data
- (e) *Values* as distinguished between propositions, relating to ethical evaluation and those relating to empirical
- (f) *Systematization* of research
- (g) *Pure science* or the seeking of understanding and explanation of behaviour, before utilization of the knowledge for solution of societal problems
- (h) *Integration* of political research with that of other social sciences

Behaviouralism came to accord primacy to higher degree of reliability vis-a-vis higher degree of generality. It, therefore, focuses on question that could be answered on

the basis of the methods available. In a nutshell, behaviouralism focused on the micro-level situations rather than attempting macro-level generalizations as a whole.

The approach has come under fire from both conservatives and radicals for the purported value-neutrality. Conservatives see the distinction between values and facts as a way of undermining the possibility of political philosophy. Neal Riemer believes behaviouralism dismisses 'the task of ethical recommendation' because behaviouralists believe 'truth or falsity of values (democracy, equality, and freedom, etc.) cannot be established scientifically and are beyond the scope of legitimate inquiry'. Christian Bay believed behaviouralism was a pseudo political science and that it did not represent 'genuine' political research. Bay objected to empirical consideration taking precedence over normative and moral examination of politics. Behaviouralism initially represented a movement away from 'naive empiricism', but has been criticized as an approach for 'naive scientism'. Additionally, radical critics believe that the separation of fact from value makes the empirical study of politics impossible.

Behaviouralism, like positivism, has been criticized for its mindless empiricism. Behaviouralism proclaimed to offer a 'value free' and 'scientific' theory steering clear of ethical and political bias. They over emphasize on the fact that a theory is considered good if it was consistent with observation. David Easton himself has enumerated the shortcomings of behaviouralism which are mentioned below:

- (a) Behaviouralism pursued fundamental rather than applied knowledge. Hence, it distances itself from immediate political reality. It also neglects the special responsibilities of an intellectual.
- (b) It tends towards a subjectless, non-humane discipline, one in which human intentions and purposes played little creative part.
- (c) It is wrongly assumed that behavioural political science alone was free of ideological presuppositions.
- (d) It accepts a pristine, positivist interpretation of the nature of science uncritically.
- (e) It remains indifferent to the resulting fragmentation of knowledge.
- (f) It is not able to deal with value concerns and to describe the nature of the good society.

Decline and Revival of Political Theory

During the middle of the twentieth century, many observers talked about the decline of the political theory. Some of the observers even discussed about its death. Some of the observers declared political theory as the dog house. These discourses emerged because of the pessimistic and cynical view that the classical tradition in political theory was filled with value judgments and devoid of empiricism. The logical positivism which emerged during 1930s, criticized the normative theory for its value judgment. Later on, the behaviouralist attacked the classical tradition of which David Easton was most prominent. According to David Easton, political theory is concerned with some kind of historical form. He argued that political theory had lost its constructive roles. He outlined that political theory, as practiced by William Dunning, Charle H. Mcwain and George Holland Sabine, had decline into historicism.

There are two schools of thought about the development of political theory in the contemporary period. One school argues that there is decline of political theory and another school argues against it. In mid twentieth century, the exponents of new political

science began to question the continued relevance of the traditional political theory. David Easton, in his *Political System: An Enquiry into the State of Political Science* (1953), asserted that the traditional political theory was based on mere speculation. It was devoid of acute observation of the political reality. In order to lay scientific foundations of the study of politics, it was necessary to rescue it from the study of classics and the history of political ideas. He argued that the traditional political theory was the product of the turmoil that characterize the past ages.

According to him, it particularly flourished in Greece in pre-Plato days, Italy in the fifteenth century, England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and France in the eighteenth century which were the days of widespread social and political upheaval. It had no relevance in contemporary society. He also pointed out that there has been no outstanding political philosopher after Marx (1818-83) and J.S. Mill (1806-73). Easton argued that while economists and sociologists had produced a systematic study of human behaviour in their respective spheres of investigation, political scientists had lagged behind. They failed to develop suitable research to account for the rise of fascism or communism and their continuance. Again, during the Second World War (1939-45), economists, sociologists and psychologists had played an active role in the decision-making process but political scientists were ignored. He, therefore, appealed for building of a behavioural political science, closer to other social science, to take its due place in the decisionmaking process. He argued that the contemporary society would evolve its own value system from its own experience and insight. Political scientists would only focus on building causal theory to explain political behaviour.

However, Easton changed his view after one and a half decade. In his presidential address to the American Political Science Association in 1969, he launched his 'post-behavioural' revolution. In fact, Easton was trying to convert political science from a pure science to 'applied science'. He insisted that scientific investigation should enable the contemporary societies to tide over the prevailing crisis. This also involved a renewed concern with values which were sought to be excluded in the earlier behavioural approach.

The debate on the decline of political theory which appeared in 1950s was also joined by some other prominent writers. Thus, Alfred Cobban in his paper on 'The Decline of Political Theory', published in *Political Science Quarterly* (1953), argued that political theory had lost its significance in capitalist as well as communist systems. Capitalist systems were inspired by the idea of 'libertarian democracy', whereas there was no political theorist of democracy. It was also characterized by an overwhelming role of bureaucracy and the creation of a huge military machine. Political theory had practically no role to play in sustaining this system. While communist systems were characterized by a new form of political organization and the rule of a small oligarchy, political theory had taken a back seat under these systems. However, Cobban came to the conclusion that all was yet not lost. Political science has to answer questions which the methodology of social science may not be able to answer. It must evolve criteria of judgment which will revive the relevance of political science.

Then Seymour Martin Lipset in his *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics* (1960) argued that the values of the contemporary society had already been decided. In the United States, the age-old search for 'good society' had come to an end because they had already achieved it. The prevailing form of democracy in that country was 'the closest approximation to the good society itself in operation'. Thus, Lipset too questioned the continued relevance of political theory in those days. Another political scientist, Leo Strauss, in his famous paper 'What is Political Philosophy?', published in *Journal of*

Politics (1957) and in *An Epilogue to Essays on the Scientific Study of Politics*, argued that the new science of politics was in fact a symptom of the alleged decline of political theory by adopting positivist approach and it had ignored the challenge of normative issues.

Another political scientist, Dante Jermino, in his *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory* (1967), argued that in most of the nineteenth century and early twentieth century, there were two major causes of the decline of political theory: (i) rise of positivism which led to the craze for science; and (ii) the prevalence of political ideologies culminating in Marxism. But now it was again in ascendancy, particularly in the political thought of Michel Oakeshott, Hannah Arendt, Bertrand de Jouvenal, Leo Strauss and Eric Voegelin.

This list was expanded by Jermino in a subsequent paper so as to include John Rawls, C.B. Macpherson, Christian Bay, Robert Nozick, Herbert Marcuse, Jurgen Habermas, Alasdair MacIntyre and Michel Walzer. The works of these writers had revived the grand tradition of political philosophy. Jermino suggested that in order to understand the new role of political theory, it was imperative to identify it with political philosophy. Political philosophy is a critical study of the principles of the right order in human social existence, involving enquiry into right and wrong. Jermino argued that political philosophy deals with perennial problems confronting man in his social existence. He pointed out that detachment is not ethical neutrality. A political philosopher cannot remain indifferent to the political struggle of his times as a behaviouralist would claim. In short, behavioural political science concentrates on facts and remains neutral to values. Political philosophy cannot grow along with positivism, which abstained from a critical examination of any social situation. The gulf between traditionalist and behaviouralist components of political theory is so wide that they cannot be reunited. Any theory separated from the perennial concerns of political philosophy will prove to be irrelevant. Jermino laments that the behavioural political theory has often implicitly or uncritically endorsed the policies and practices of the established order instead of performing the Socratic function of 'speaking truth to power'. He wants that full recovery of critical political theory cannot be achieved within the positivist universe of discourse.

However, since 1970s, the dispute between political science and political philosophy has largely subsided. While David Easton had shown a renewed concern with values in his post-behavioural approach, the exponents of political philosophy did not hesitate in testing their assumptions by empirical method. Karl Popper (1902-94) proceeded to draw conclusion regarding social values. John Rawls (1921-2002) adopted empirical method for arriving at his principles of justice. C.B. Macpherson (1911-87) attacked the empirical theory of democracy propounded by Joseph Schumpeter (1883-1950), and Robert Dahl advanced his own radical theory of democracy. Herbert Marcuse and Jurgen Habermas have shown a strong empirical insight in their critical analysis of the contemporary capitalism. It is now held that political science, like other social and natural sciences, enables us to strengthen our means but we will have to resort to political philosophy to determine our ends. As means and ends are interdependent, political science and political philosophy play complementary role in our social life.

Revival

Political theory is considered as a study of the history of ideas during the third decade of the twentieth century, particularly with the purpose to define totalitarianism and defend the liberal democracy. Charles Merriam and Lasswell Kaplan tried to establish

a scientific political theory. They developed it with the eventual purpose of controlling human behaviour. Their method of enquiry was description rather than prescription. On the other hand, in the traditional sense, political theory was revived in the works of some famous political scientists like Arendt Theodore Adorno (1903-1969), Herbert Marcuse (1898-1979), Leo Strauss (1899-1973), Oakeshott, Bertrand de Jouvenal and Eric Voegelin (1901-1985). These political scientists were in opposition of the commitment to liberal democracy, faith in science and a faith in historical progress. They were also against political messianism and utopianism in politics. Hannah Arendt criticized behaviouralism and stressed on the uniqueness and responsibility of the individual human being. She argued in her book *The Human Condition* (1958) that search for uniformities in human nature by the behaviouralists would only contribute towards stereotyping the human being. She rejected the idea of hidden and anonymous forces in history. She pointed to the essential incompatibility between ideology and political theory. She illustrated the difference between responsible action and efficient automatic behaviour.

Like Hannah Arendt, Michael Oakeshott also contributed to the revival of political theory through his writings. He emphasized the philosophical analysis of experience. He understood experience to be a concrete whole on different kinds of 'modes'. According to him, the modes constituted 'arrests' in experience. In his book *Experience and its Modes* (1933), he outlined four principal modes of experience, such as history, science, practice and poetry. He pointed out that science concerned itself with measurement and quantification, history with the past, practice with an act of desiring and obtaining, and poetry with imagination and contemplation. He did not distinguish between subject and object, fact and value. He rejected the contention that philosophy could learn from method of science. He also ruled out political ideology and empiricism in an understanding of politics. Like Arendt, Oakeshott described politics as 'the activity of attending to the general arrangements of a collection of people, who, in respect of their common recognition of a manner of attending to its arrangements, compose a single community.'

Similarly, Juvenal opposed the modern trend of converting politics into administration, depriving it for the potentiality for creativity in the public sphere. He opposed ideological sloganeering and utopianism. He outlined that politics essentially involves moral choice with the purpose of building and consolidating individuals. Leo Strauss reaffirmed the importance of classical political theory to provide remedy to the crisis of modern times. He said that a political philosopher is primarily interested in truth. Strauss scrutinized the methods and purposes of the 'new' political science and concluded that it was defective when compared with classical political theory, particularly that of Aristotle. Strauss countered David Easton's charge of historicism by alleging that it was the new science that was responsible for the decline in political theory, for it pointed it to an abetted general political crisis of the West because of its overall neglect of normative issues. He equated behaviouralism's value-free approach with 'dogmatic atheism' and 'permissive egalitarianism'. Eric Voegelin pointed out the inseparableness of political science and political theory. He argued that without the latter, the former was not possible. According to him, political theory was not ideology, Utopian or scientific methodology; rather it is an experimental science of the right order for both the individual and society. He said that it dissected critically and empirically the problem of order.

The Frankfurt school also contributed towards the revival of political theory. The school represented by the political thinkers like Theodore Adorno and Herbert Marcuse emerged in Germany in the 1920s. It was directly associated with 'an anti-Bolshevik radicalism and open-ended or critical Marxism'. The school of thought was critical of both capitalism as well as socialism practiced in Soviet Union. One of the famous political

theorists of the school was Jurgen Habermas who critically examined the advanced capitalism and communicative action. He was also a critic of post modernism. He expressed his faith in the power of reason and progress. In a nutshell, it can be concluded that political theory is still relevant and alive as a result of some of the great modern political thinkers in last few decades.

POST-BEHAVIOURALISM

Behaviouralism rose to be prominent during mid 1960s as a dominant approach in the methodology of political science. However, it was not free from criticism. One of its prominent critics Leo Strauss in his article 'What is Political Philosophy?', published in *Journal of Politics* (1957), argued that the rise of behaviouralism was symptomatic of a crisis in political theory because of its failure to come to grips with normative issues. Another political scientist Sheldon Wolin in the article 'Political Theory as a Vocation', which was published in *American Political Science Review* (1969), pointed out that preoccupation of political science with method signified or abdication of true vocation of political theory. Another prominent thinker Thomas Kuhn in his celebrated work, *The Structure of Scientific Revolution* (1962), outlined that significance of scientific methods lies in its capacity for problem solving and crisis-management, and not in methodological sophistication. Gradually after 1960s, even the exponents of behaviouralism realized the drawbacks of behaviouralism. They realized that behaviouralism's strict adherence to 'pure science' was responsible for its failure to attend to the pressing social and political issues of the period.

Thus, post-behaviouralism is concerned with reality of human life. Post-behaviouralism gave two slogans: relevance and action. However, it did not completely depart from behaviouralism; rather it stood for consolidating its gain and applying them from problem-solving crisis management. Easton lamented the over-reliance of behaviouralists on methodology. He says that intellectuals have a great role to play in protecting the human value of civilization. He emphasized that behaviouralists should not ignore this role. He reminded them of their responsibility to reshape society. He argued that scientists could adopt a rational interest in value construction and application without denying the validity of their science. It placed less emphasis on the scientific method and empirical theory, and laid more stress on the public responsibilities of the discipline. In a nutshell, post-behaviouralism seeks to reintroduce a concern for values in the behavioural approach itself.

Post-behaviouralism challenged the idea that academic research had to be value neutral and argued that values should not be neglected. Post-behaviouralism claimed that behaviouralism's bias towards observable and measurable phenomena meant that too much emphasis was being placed on easily studied trivial issues at the expense of more important topics. Research should be more relevant to society and intellectuals have a positive role to play in society.

The cardinal features of the post-behaviouralism can be enumerated as following: (i) Substance preceded technique, which meant the pressing problems of society

became objects of investigation, (ii) Behaviouralism itself was seen as ideologically conservative and limited to abstraction rather than to the reality at the times in crisis, (iii) Science could be evaluatively neutral, for facts were inseparable from values, and value premises had to be related to knowledge.

(iv) Intellectuals had to shoulder the responsibilities of their society, defend human values of civilization and not become mere technicians insular to social problems. (v) The intellectual had to put knowledge to work and engage in reshaping society. (vi) The intellectual must actively participate in the politicization of the professions and academic institutions.

For the post-behaviouralists, a theory, in order to be treated as an explanatory theory, in the first place has to be evaluated, i.e., tested empirically. Easton pointed out that dissatisfaction with behaviouralism led to revisions in the method and content, favouring a revival of interpretative understanding and historical analysis, and a complete rejection of systematic methodology, while at the same time emphasizing the need to introduce formal modelling and rational actor deductivism. He announced the beginning of neo-behaviouralism in order to bring about a new unity in the theoretical focus of the discipline.

In the contemporary social science, the behavioural approach has shown increasing concern with solving the prevailing problems of society. In this way, it has largely absorbed the 'post-behavioural' orientation within its scope.

The System Theory

The systems approach of national statics and international relations is engaged in developing theories of the international system. It was introduced in the late 1950s with the basic assumptions that international relations follow an order or a system. The most prominent of the system theory approach are scholars such as Karl W. Deutsch and Raymond Aron.

The system is a set of interacting variables or a collection of functionally interdependent parts. In other words, a system is 'a set of variables in interaction which makes a unified whole affecting each other's actions'. Generally speaking, a system may be either natural, such as the solar system; or mechanical, such as a clock, computer or a car; or social in nature, such as a family.

The system theory approach conceives nations to be in contact in a complicated framework of relationships that result from the process of interaction. They emphasize the significance of the interaction of behaviour of states. Each nation is involved to some degree in participation in the international environment. Therefore, it is possible to find out that there are certain regular modes of behaviour which could be generalized within the structure of the political organization.

Characteristics of the systems approach

The systems approach, developed under the general system theory, seeks to analyse the international relations as a system of interactions, which are independent and interrelated. It views the international relations as a pattern of behaviour of the international actors. Therefore, in order to develop a scientific study of politics, it has to be treated as a system of action. The process of exchange in politics is fairly continuous, regular and patterned, and can be studied as a system of behaviour.

The system consists of a set of units in interactions and is possible to conceive relations among nation as constituting a kind of system. That is why the system consists of a known set of variables such as the political machinery, attitude, interests and political activities along with the values as a parameter to study.

The systems approach in international relations is based upon the following main assumptions:

- (i) **International system is not an international political system:** The concept of system is used in the context of international politics; it is taken to mean the international political system. International system is not international political system as it does not allocate authoritative values over them.
- (ii) **International and national actors:** The international actors are basically the national actors who act in the international environment.
- (iii) **Classification of national and supra-national actors:** The international actors can be classified into the following two types:
 - (a) The national actors who act in the international environment
 - (b) The supra-national actors, such as UN, regional organizations and other international agencies/

The supra-national actors can be further classified as bloc actors and universal actors.

From these fundamental assumptions, the system theory assumes that international system is constituted by a set of interaction among the actors or entities, such as national interests. There is a continuous process of interactions among the actors and entities, which occur at a regular interval in the international environment. These mutual exchanges occur due to the participation in the international environment, which occur in a certain identifiable pattern and describable patterns, as an interaction among nations. The concept of system can enrich the understanding of the phenomena which will help in theory building of international relations. That is why the system distinguishes the units or actors, structural processes and the context, i.e., the environment as major elements in every system.

Morton Kaplan's models of international system

Morton Kaplan is considered as one of the most influential thinkers associated with developing system theories of international relations. He presented a number of real and hypothetical models of global political organizations. His six well known models are as follows:

- (i) Balance of power system
- (ii) Loose bipolar system
- (iii) Tight bipolar system
- (iv) Universal actor system
- (v) Hierarchical system
- (vi) Unit Veto system

The first two models are historical realities, while the remaining four are hypothetical models.

1. Functional approach

Several approaches have been used for proper study of politics. One of these is the structural functional approach, which was developed by Gabriel Almond. The aim of this approach is to find out which political structures perform what basic function in the political system as a whole. The whole concept revolves

around two things, namely

'structure' and 'function'. In the words of Robert T. Halt, 'Structural functional analysis is a distinguishable approach primarily because of the selective aspects of social reality that it seeks to describe, explain and predict'. It describes social reality largely in terms of structures, processes mechanisms and functions.

2. Power approach

Recently, the idea of power has become very important in the realm of political theory. Earlier, politics was defined as the study of state and government. Today, it is defined as the study of power. The significance of power was highlighted by Machiavelli in the Medieval Age and later by Hobbes and Nietzsche. In the modern times, Max Weber, Catlin, Merriam, Lasswell, Kaplan, Treitschke and Morgenthau have brought out the importance of this concept. The 'Power Theory State' was first advocated in Germany in the nineteenth century by historians like Heinrich Von Treitschke and philosophers like Fredrich Nietzsche. Power is the primary objective of foreign policy.

Political science is the study of political institutions, constitutions and policy processes. It aims at an accurate description and explanation of these features of politics. It is an empirical (positive) science in terms that it seeks to collect data and analyses it much as a natural scientist would collect a sample and put it under the microscope. The empirical study of institutions and laws is a vital part of any study of politics. If political science asks 'what are the key building blocks of politics?', political theory may ask 'why are these the key building blocks of politics?' If political science identifies human-rights legislation as a key feature of contemporary politics, political theory might ask 'is this just?' The scholars like Arthur Benntley (*The Process of Government*), George Catlin (*The Science and Method of Politics*), David Easton (*The Political System*), Robert Dahl (*Modern Political Analysis*) and others have treated political theory as a science. However, all science is not political theory, just as all political theory is not science. Political theory is not an exact science like natural or physical science.

In political theory, unlike natural science, there are no universally recognized principles, no clear cause-effect relationships, no laboratories and no prediction can be made. It can only be termed as a science so far as it admits concepts and norms which are both observable and testable, and in so far as it responds to the requirements of reason and rationalism. In the 1950s onwards, the American political scientists in general and behaviourists in particular sought to create a science of politics and indulged in the process of reductionism. Political theory can be termed as a science so far as it can be applied to a social gathering and the definitive rules of the exact sciences are applicable within the limitations as in any social science. So far, as its methodology and its analysis are concerned it can be called a science. Colin Hay in his work *Political Analysis: A Critical Introduction* rightly points out that political theory admits objectivity in association with subjectivity, facts in relation to values, research together with theory. Political theory as science generates neutral, dispassionate and objective knowledge.

Present-day scientific method is fundamentally a product of empirical and logical approaches to knowledge. The story of its genesis is, therefore, at least until the end of the nineteenth century, identical with the general history of logic and empiricism. The empirical approach has never been entirely absent from the struggle for knowledge. But it was often grossly neglected, especially in the Middle Ages, and always had to fight for recognition against tradition, superstitions, the dogmatic influences of religion and the pseudo-authority of allegedly self-evident principles. Only after a long period of coexistence did the empirical approach begin to crowd out all others from the field for which the name 'science' was claimed.

In the political field, however, this development gained momentum under the influence of Locke and Hume, of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, and later, of the positivist and pragmatist schools.

Scientific objectivity is a standard we are all familiar with (at least in principle). The idea is that we can establish, through the application of scientific methods of data collection and analysis, the verifiable truth. Between the 1920s and 1970s, the scientific paradigm, the belief that all that counted as knowledge had to be scientific, came to be imposed upon the social sciences and humanities. The claims popular around this time were that we had left our religious and metaphysical infancy and developed science. Thus, two thousand years of philosophical and normative thought were dismissed. This quirk of intellectual history went beyond empirical study to make claims about the very nature and possibility of knowledge. These debates, called epistemological debates (from the Greek *episteme*, meaning knowledge) are key to political theory.

Positivism

The meaning of the term positivism in matters of law and justice differs from that associated with the same term in science, general philosophy and sociology. Political theory is caught between these two vocabularies. Auguste Comte (1798-1857) introduced the term in a sociological sense. He used it to distinguish the 'scientific' approach in the 'positivistic' era from 'metaphysical' and 'theological' speculations in the two preceding epochs. His ideas about what constituted a scientific approach were in many respects similar to those of present day scientific method, but not identical.

Auguste Comte absolutized progress and science. According to him, progress or progressive evolution was an ultimate law governing historic phenomena, and science a human activity able to solve all social problems, not excluding moral ones.

Positivism implies a group of epistemological perspectives and philosophies of science, based on the belief that the scientific technique is the most appropriate approach to reveal the processes by which events take place, whether physical or human. The theme of positivism has been repeatedly seen in the history of Western thought, be it thinkers of Ancient Greece or modern day thinkers. Yet, it was Auguste Comte who developed the concept in the early 1800s.

The description of the epistemological perspective of positivism first appeared in *The Course in Positive Philosophy*, a series published in the period 1830—1842. Close on the heels of this series followed *A General View of Positivism*, in 1844, published in English in 1865. The first three volumes of this course were mainly concerned with the pre-existing physical sciences, such as mathematics, astronomy, physics, chemistry and biology. The latter two volumes focused on the arrival of the social science. Comte came up with this classification of the sciences as he paid attention to the circular dependence of theory and observation in science. Thus, he was probably the first philosopher of science in the true modern sense of the term. For Comte, the physical sciences had to come first, only then could humanity focus on tackling the challenge in the form of the far from simple 'Queen Science' of human society itself. The experimental goals of sociological technique were defined in his work, *View of Positivism*.

In his explanation of social evolution, Comte mentions three stages of evolution that the society passes through in its search for truth. The idea revolving around 'law of three stages' is similar to Marx's opinion about human society moving in the direction of communism. This does not come as a surprise because both were deeply influenced by

Henri de Saint-Simon, the Utopian socialist, who also mentored Comte. Comte as well as Marx meant to cultivate secular-scientific ideologies in the wake of European secularization. The three stages stated by Comte were as follows:

1. Theological stage
2. Metaphysical stage
3. Positive stage

The first stage or the theological phase was founded on completely and absolute faith in all things with reference to God. It involves mankind's acceptance of the principles of the church as a place where people worship, instead of depending on its rational powers to discover and understand 'existence'. It pertained to the constraints imposed by the religious institutions and organizations during that period and the blind and absolute recognition and reception of any 'fact' presented to society to believe. According to Comte, the metaphysical stage of humanity was the time since the enlightenment, full of logical rationalism, to the time post the French Revolution. This second stage believed that the universal rights of humanity are of utmost importance. The core idea remains that humanity enjoys certain rights that have to be given due respect. This stage saw the rise and fall of democracies and dictators who tried to uphold or preserve the inherent rights of humanity.

The final phase or the scientific phase of Comte's universal law trilogy is also referred to as the positive stage. The core idea of this phase is that the significance of individual rights is more than that of the rule of any single individual. According to Comte, the idea of man's ability to govern himself is responsible for making this phase inherently different from the other stages. The phase is marked by the absence of a higher power governing the masses. It is possible for a single person to achieve anything of his own free will based on his own scheme. In the positive phase, the third principle is very significant. According to Comte, these three phases or stages were the universal rule with regard to society and its development. It is not possible to reach either the second or the third phase, without the completing and comprehending the previous stage. It is essential to complete each and every stage in progression.

According to Comte, the recognition of the past and the capability to build on it in the times to come, was crucial in the transition from the theological and metaphysical phases. Comte's new science', sociology, was based on the central theme of 'progress'. Sociology would result in the historical consideration of every science as 'the history of one science, including pure political history, would make no sense unless it was attached to the study of the general progress of all of humanity'. In Comte's own words, 'from science comes prediction; from prediction comes action'. The philosophy of human intellectual development that ended in science. Ironically, with regard to these phases, despite Comte trying to prove that human development cannot avoid passing through these three stages, it appears that the positivist stage is not going to be realized soon. The reason lies in the following two truths:

(i) It is necessary to have absolute understanding of not just the universe but also the surrounding world in the positivist phase, (ii) It is important that the society should not be aware of its presence in the positivist phase. According to Anthony Giddens, since humanity keeps on using science to find, explore and research new things, humanity is unable to progress beyond the second metaphysical stage. This particular view makes Comte's positivism appear quite circular.

As a system or model for the philosophy of history, positivism was made fit or suitable by historians like Hippolyte Taine. Several writing by Comte were translated into English by the Whig writer, Harriet Martineau, who was considered the first female sociologist by many. How much Comte gained or adopted from his mentor, Saint-Simon's work is still debatable. Brazilian thinkers followed Comte's ideas pertaining to the training of the scientific elite so as to prosper in the process of industrialization. Comte's idea of positivism inspired Brazil's national motto, *Ordem e Progresso* (Order and Progress), which also affected Poland.

Later on in life, Comte cultivated a 'religion of humanity' for positivist societies so as to meet the unified function, which in the past was fulfilled by traditional worship. His reform, known as the 'positivist calendar' was proposed in 1849. Despite rejection of the major part of his system coming from his English followers, such as George Eliot and Harriet Martineau, his concept of 'religion of humanity' was welcomed and his injunction to 'vivre pour autrui' ('live for others', from which comes the word 'altruism'.) was liked.

Herbet Spencer's early concepts pertaining to sociology were a response to Comte's ideas. Following his works on the developments in evolutionary biology, Spencer tried to redefine the discipline in what is today known as socially Darwinistic terms. Actually, Spencer was a proponent of Lamarckism and not Darwinism.

Comte is said to be the father of positivism. His primary contribution is in the form of the positivisation of the social sciences. He believes that positivism emphasizes the following:

- (i) Precision
- (ii) Constructive power
- (iii) Relativism

Comte expressed his views on the term 'relativity' several times. He believed that all concepts, which were considered as absolute as per the theological and metaphysical theories, were rendered 'relative' by the positivistic approach.

By the beginning of the twentieth century, French sociologists led by Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), adopted the scientific method more strictly than Comte and his followers. However, they did not conduct inquiries or investigate the philosophical and methodological issue of whether moral judgements could be established using scientific means. They were mainly interested in investigating sociological. Their secondary interest lay in explaining these facts by getting down to their scientifically determinable sociological and psychological causes. As a result of these inquiries, there was a relativistic focus on local and temporal differences in ethical approaches. Positivism emphasized on the society, in general, hoping to get rid of the existing problems and lay the foundation for a better future. The analytical tools it used to achieve this were: (i) Empiricism (ii) Unity of science (iii) Control

Positivism proclaimed that the only dependable knowledge is the one that has experience, positive verification and sense as its bases. Emile Durkheim later declared through reformulation that sociological positivism was the foundation to social research. At the beginning of the twentieth century, German sociologists, such as Max Weber and Georg Simmel, denounced the principal, and went on to found the anti-positivist movement

in sociology. Much later, anti-positivists and critical theorists came to link positivism with 'scientism'.

In the 1950s, the primary features of positivism were defined ('received view') as follows:

1. Emphasis on science as a product, a linguistic or numerical set of statements
2. Demonstration of the logical structure and coherence of statements (axiomatization)
3. Belief in the cumulateness of science
4. Belief in the trans-cultural quality of science
5. Belief in the fact that science is based on specific results, which are not linked to the personality and social position of the investigator
6. Belief that science comprises commensurable theories or research traditions
7. Belief that science often integrates new ideas that are disjointed from those of the past
8. Belief that science covers the concept of the unity of science, that there is just one science pertaining to one real world, which underlies the various scientific disciplines

Elsewhere, you come across a definition of 'positivism', which says that it is 'the view that all true knowledge is scientific,' and that all things are ultimately measurable. Positivism is closely related to reductionism, in that both involve the view that 'entities of one kind... are reducible to entities of another,' such as societies to configurations of individuals, or mental events to neural phenomena. It also involves the contention that 'processes are reducible to physiological, physical or chemical events', and even that 'social processes are reducible to relationships between and actions of individuals', or that 'biological organisms are reducible to physical systems'.

The supporters of positivism divide the analytical statements about the physical or social world into three categories:

- (a) Such statements can be useful tautologies, meaning repeating the same things through different words and purely definitional statements that give specific meaning to a particular concept or phenomena
- (b) Statements are to be empirically tested by observation to access their truth or falsity
- (c) Statements that did not fall into the afforest categories and lacked analytic content had to be dropped

In a nutshell, the positivist argues that meaningful analysis is possible only through useful tautologies and empirical statements. This rules out metaphysics, theology, aesthetics and ethics because they merely introduced obscurity into the process of enquiry. The principal aim of positivism is to be 'value free' or 'ethically neutral'. In this regard, it patterns itself on the natural sciences in deciding about the right and wrong of issues. Positivism gives emphasis on empiricism which believed that observation and experience as sources of knowledge.

Positivism relies on scientific method as the only source of true knowledge. It rejects superstition, religion and metaphysics as pre-scientific forms of thought. It holds that all knowledge is ultimately based on sense-experience. Hence, empirical method must be adopted for any genuine inquiry in the field of social sciences as well as physical sciences.

Positivism is not really favoured much in contemporary social science. Those who practice positivism in the modern age, recognize and accept observer bias and

structural constraints. Modern positivists try to avoid metaphysical concerns and go for methodological debates instead, which deal with the following:

- Clarity
- Replicability
- Reliability
- Validity

This positivism is said to be equivalent to 'quantitative research'. Therefore, it does not carry any clear theoretical or philosophical promises.

Historically speaking, positivism been criticized for its universalism. The fact that it believed that all processes can be reduced to physiological, physical or chemical events, has received criticism. It contended that social processes can be reduced to relationships between individuals and actions of individuals. It has been criticized for believing biological organisms can be reduced to physical systems.

Critics, including Max Horkheimer denounced the classic formulation of positivism on the basis of the following two reasons:

(i) It falsely represented human social action: Their argument was that positivism systematically did not show any appreciation for the level to which the social facts it yielded were nonexistent in the objective world but were themselves a result of socially and historically mediated human consciousness. The observer's contribution was overlooked by Positivism in the constitution of social reality. Therefore, it did not succeed in considering the historical and social conditions that impacted the representation of social ideas. According to Positivism, social reality existed objectively and independently and that these conditions were produced by labour, (ii) Representation of social reality resulting from positivism was innately and artificially conservative. This was failed to challenge the situation. This was also probably why positivism was popular some political circles.

Horkheimer, on the other hand, believed that critical theory was in possession of a reflexive element, which lacked the positivistic traditional theory.

Very few scholars today support Horkheimer's views, which received criticism. Ever since his works, many critiques of positivism, especially from philosophy of science, have resulted in the development of post-positivism. This philosophy relaxes the epistemological commitments of logical positivism, without asserting the separation of the knower and the known. Instead of outrightly denouncing the scientific project, post-positivists aim to change and rectify it. However, the exact level of their attraction for science differs vastly. For instance, some post-positivists believe the critique that observation never fails to be laden with value. However, they also argue that the best values to follow for sociological observation are the values of science: skepticism, rigour and modesty. Just like certain critical theorists feel they are morally committed to free, classless and democratic values, these post-positivists consider their methods as driven by a moral commitment to these scientific values. Such scholars could consider themselves to be either positivists or anti-positivists.

Positivism has been criticized by religious factions and philosophers who were of the opinion that truth lies in sense experience but this does not end there. Positivism is unable to prove that there are any abstract ideas, laws, and principles beyond specific observable facts, relationships and essential doctrines or that it is not possible for us to be aware of them. It is unable to prove that material and corporeal things comprise the

whole order of existing beings and that our knowledge is limited to them. Positivism advocates that all abstract or general concepts and ideas are simply collective representations of the experimental order—for instance, the idea of 'man' itself is a type of unified vision of all the men who are noticed or encountered in our experience. This is in contradiction to a Platonic or Christian ideal, wherein it is possible to abstract an idea from any solid determination, and apply the same in an identical manner to an infinite number of objects belonging to the same class. From the perspective of the idea, there is more precision in the latter because collective images are generally chaotic, and become even more confused more with an increase in the collection. By definition, there is always clarity in an idea.

The debate between the positivists and anti-positivists continues even to this day, although in an indefinable fashion. Authors who write in various epistemological viewpoints, do not express their disapproval or conflicts in identical terms. They hardly ever interact with each other directly. The issues are further complicated, with scholars rarely stating their epistemological promises. Other sources have to be used to find out what their epistemological positions are, for example, their selection of methodology or theory. But, there is no absolutely appropriate correspondence between these categories. Many scholars who critique as positivists are actually followers of post-positivism. This conflict or debate has been presented by a scholar in terms of the social construction of the 'other'. Each side defines the 'other' on the basis of what it is *not* instead of what it is, and then goes on to attribute greater uniformity to their opponents than what exists in reality. Thus, it is more appropriate to comprehend this as two separate arguments instead of as a debate. The two arguments would be:

(i) The anti-positivist enunciation of a social meta-theory covering a philosophical critique of scientism (ii) Positivist development of a scientific research methodology for sociology with accompanying critiques of the reliability and validity of work, which they perceive as disturbing such standards.

Anti-positivism, or non-positivist sociology, also known as interpretive sociology is the perspective of social science that academics should denounce empiricism as well as the scientific method while conducting social theory and research. Anti-positivism pertains to different historical conflicts in the philosophy and sociology of science. In the modern age, on the other hand, non-positivism is equivalent to qualitative research methods, whereas positivist research is more quantitative. Positivists rely on research methods like experiments and statistical surveys, whereas anti-positivists prefer research methods that depend on unstructured interviews or participant observation. Presently, positivist and non-positivist techniques are often mixed.

In early 1800s, many intellectuals, especially the Hegelians, started questioning the viewpoint of experiential social analysis. Karl Marx passed away even before social science was formally established but he was strongly against Comtean sociological positivism, even though he himself tried to establish a historical materialist 'science of society'. The developed and augmented positivism from Durkheim founded the modern academic sociology and social research, which held on to several mechanical aspects of its predecessor. In the meantime, Edmund Husserl, refuted positivism using phenomenology. At the turn of the twentieth century, German sociologists introduced sociological anti-positivism or *verstehende* in a formal way. Their proposal was that research should focus on human cultural norms, values, symbols and social processes

observed from a subjective angle. Max Weber's argument was that sociology was in a slack manner, a 'science' because it possesses the ability to methodologically identify the causal relationships of human 'social action', especially among ideal types, or hypothetical simplifications of complex social phenomena. But the non-positivists, look for relationships that are neither historical nor can be generalized as those sought after by natural scientists.

Thinker, Sir Karl Popper, was amongst the first to assess positivism. He broached falsification as a critique to the logic behind the positivist idea of verifiability. According to Falsificationism, it is not possible to authenticate the truthfulness of a belief but is definitely possible to discard false beliefs in case they are phrased in a manner agreeable to falsification. Thomas Kuhn's concept of paradigm shifts provides a more powerful evaluation of positivism. His argument is that it is not merely individual theories but whole worldviews that should occasionally shift as a reaction to evidence. Post-positivism is an alteration of positivism wherein the critiques against logical positivism are recognized. It does not discard the scientific method. Instead, it reforms to fulfil these critiques. It holds on to the basic assumptions of positivism, that is, ontological realism, the possibility and desirability of objective truth, and the use of experimental methodology. Post-positivism of this kind is not uncommon in the social sciences, sociology in particular, for reasons both practical and conceptual.

Logical Positivism or Neo-positivism

Logical positivism is a school of philosophy, which is a mix of the following:

- [Empiricis.il](#)
- The idea that observational evidence cannot be separated from knowledge of the world with a version of rationalism
- The idea that our knowledge is inclusive of a component that is not developed from observation.

Logical positivism or logical empiricism, also known as logical neo-positivism was a philosophical movement that started in Austria and Germany in the 1920s, and was mainly related to the logical analysis of scientific knowledge, which confirmed that statements regarding metaphysics, religion and ethics are bereft of cognitive meaning, and are, therefore, nothing but an expression of feelings or desires. Only statements pertaining to mathematics, logic and natural sciences carry a definite meaning. Its followers included Rudolf Carnap (1891-1970), who is considered the leading figure of logical positivism, Herbert Feigl (1902-88), Philipp Frank (1884-1966), Kurt Grelling (1886-1942), Hans Hahn (1879-1934), Carl Gustav Hempel (1905-97), Victor Kraft (1880-1975), Otto Neurath (1882-1945), Hans Reichenbach (1891-1953), Moritz Schlick (1882-1936) and Friedrich Waismann (1896-1959).

The origin of logical positivism was greatly impacted by Einstein's theory of relativity. Logical positivists were keen to clarify the philosophical importance of the theory of relativity. Another influence over logical positivism came from the development of formal logic. Logical positivism was extensively in touch with Polish logicians including Jan Lukasiewicz, Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz and Alfred Tarski, who developed many branches of contemporary logic, such as:

- The algebra of logic
- Many-valued propositional calculus
- The semantics for logic

In the 1930s, logical positivism was a philosophical movement, which was prominent in America and Europe. It actively advertised its new philosophical ideas. Logical positivists were known for their progressive, democratic and at times, even socialist political attitudes. The followers of Nazism were hostile towards logical positivists.

Logical positivism developed from the discussions of the 'First Vienna Circle', a group which gathered at the Cafe Central prior to World War I. The notable proponents of logical positivism moved to England and America where they strongly influenced the philosophy of the Americans. Until the 1950s, logical positivism continued to lead amongst the schools of the philosophy of science. After emigrating to the US, Carnap came up with a proposal to replace the earlier principles in his *Logical Syntax of Language*. This modification in direction and the slightly varying views of Reichenbach and others resulted in a consensus that 'logical empiricism' would be the English name for the shared principles, in exile in America, since the late 1930s.

In the early twentieth century, logical positivism—which descended from Comte's basic thesis, yet, remained an independent movement promoting analytic tradition—emerged in Vienna and progressed to be one amongst many dominant schools of Anglo-American philosophy. Logical positivists who were also called neo-positivists, denounce metaphysical speculation and try to simplify and condense statements and propositions to pure logic. Critiques of this approach by philosophers like Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn, have had strong influence on post positivism development. In psychology, the positivist movement remained a strong influence on the development of behaviourism and operationalism. In economics, researchers tried to outdo the methodological assumptions of classical positivism albeit in a de-facto manner. Most of the economists refrain from plainly being concerned with matters of epistemology. In jurisprudence, 'legal positivism' mainly implies the condemnation of natural law. Therefore, its common meaning with philosophical positivism is somewhat lessened. Of late, the new generations have mainly focussed on the authority of human political structures in contrast to a 'scientific' view of law.

Logical positivism, believes that all meaningful statements can be categorized into two categories comprising:

- (i) True or false statements in virtue of their logical forms and in virtue of their meaning, that is, analytic a priori, (ii) Comprising statements whose truth or falsity can be determined only by means of the experience, that is, synthetic a posteriori

Logical positivism, in its earliest form, subscribed to the belief that all theoretical terms could be defined with the help of observational terms. Further researches, by Carnap and Hempel, clearly showed that it is not possible to define theoretical terms by observational terms. Therefore, theoretical terms cannot be dispensed with in a scientific theory. The practical aspects of scientific research were not taken into account by logical positivism, which had no interest in the actual process of discovery but was rather concerned with rationally reconstructing scientific knowledge, that is, the study of the logical (formal) links between statements, hypotheses and proof based on experiments.

The advocates of logical positivism reject traditional metaphysics' cognitive status. They point out that scientific propositions are of two kinds, namely analytic and synthetic. They argue that an analytical statement is logical or mathematical in nature whereas it is synthetic when 'propositions add something to the meaning of a given term'. Therefore,

logical positivists rejected the traditional political theory as meaningless and unverifiable. They also dwell upon a more radical form of empiricism, namely phenomenism. Phenomenism argues that the basis of science is the restricting experience of sensations. Logical positivists give wider emphasis on logical analysis and their aim is to unify the sciences. They point out that experience supplies the subject of all science and helps in formulating laws and theories.

The radical wing of the neo-positivists or logical positivists recognizes only sense experiences in the process of scientific verification. Beginning with the second half of the 1930s, some neo-positivists have abandoned one or another of their original positions. Thus, Moritz Schlick in one of his last papers 'Meaning and Verification' modified the requirement of verifiability for meaningful sentences by interpreting it as requiring only a 'logical' not an empirical possibility of verification. The empirical circumstances, he wrote, are all-important when you want to know if a proposition is true, but they can have no influence on the meaning of the proposition. The only thing necessary for a process of verification to be 'logically' possible, Schlick argued, is that it 'can be described'. Logical possibility or impossibility of verification, therefore, is 'always self-imposed'.

Neo-positivism or logical positivism got a thrust in the wake of efforts made by Ernst Mach (1838-1916) to establish the unity of all sciences through the radical elimination of metaphysics in every scientific work and through common recognition that all scientific authority must be ultimately based on perception.

Logical positivism holds that reliable and valid knowledge in any field of inquiry that can be obtained only by empirical method (i.e., observation based on sense-experience). The questions concerning values are beyond the scope of scientific knowledge; hence, it is not possible to obtain reliable knowledge about them. Between the 1920s and the 1970s, the belief that scientific knowledge was the only true form of knowledge gained huge support. Empiricism became the main stay of logical positivism through the work of the Vienna circle in the 1920s and 1930s as earlier stated. Positivism became further refined in the behaviourist movements of the 1950s. These hyper-empirical schools of thought argued that scientific verifiability was the sole criterion of knowledge. Finally, there were normative utterances which were dismissed as 'ejaculations' or as 'nonsense'. They were treated derisively as they could not be subjected to empirical verification or falsification.

The logical positivism has impacted political science in a significant way. The first and foremost impact is by its principle of verification. It views politics as metaphysical beyond science, essentially non-rational and arbitrary. They say it is concerned with what would happen rather than what should happen. This distinguished them from the positivist who attempted to make politics scientific. Another impact of logical positivism is that adopting the various aspects of science. Logical positivists argue that to be scientific means adopting those aspects ethics are devoid of science that logical positivism identified as science.

ACTIVITY

Research how Frankfurt school contributed towards the revival of political theory.

DID YOU KNOW

- Auguste Comte introduced the term positivism into the social sciences. Positivism refers to a set of epistemological perspectives and philosophies of science, which believes that the scientific method is the best approach to uncover the processes by which both physical and human events take place.
- Anti-positivism (also known as non-positivist or interpretive sociology) is the view in social science that academics must necessarily reject empiricism and the scientific method in the conduct of social theory and research.
- Neo-positivism or logical positivism got a thrust in the wake of efforts made by Ernst Mach to establish the unity of all sciences through the radical elimination of metaphysics in every scientific work and through common recognition that all scientific authority must be ultimately based on perception.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Political theory was considered as a study of the history of ideas during the third decade of the twentieth century, particularly with the purpose to define the totalitarian communism and defend the liberal democracy.
- Behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism are the two contemporary approaches to the study of politics. In the 1950s, the discipline of political science was transformed by the behavioural revolution led by the advocates of a more social scientific empirical approach.
- In the early 1940s, behaviourism itself was referred to as a behavioural science and later referred to as behaviourism. David Easton was the first to differentiate between behaviouralism and behaviourism in the 1950s.
- Post-behaviouralism seeks to introduce a concern for values in the behavioural approach itself. It challenged that academic research had to be value neutral and argued that values should not be neglected.
- The system theory approach of international relations was introduced in the late 1950s. The approach is engaged in developing theories of the international system. It was introduced with the basic assumptions that international relations follow an order or a system.
- The structural functional approach, developed by Gabriel Almond, aims to find out which political structures perform what basic function in the political system as a whole.
- Auguste Comte introduced the term positivism into the social sciences. Positivism refers to a set of epistemological perspectives and philosophies of science, which believes that the scientific method is the best approach to uncover the processes by which both physical and human events take place.
- Anti-positivism (also known as non-positivist or interpretive sociology) is the view in social science that academics must necessarily reject empiricism and the scientific method in the conduct of social theory and research.

- Neo-positivism or logical positivism got a thrust in the wake of efforts made by Ernst Mach to establish the unity of all sciences through the radical elimination of metaphysics in every scientific work and through common recognition that all scientific authority must be ultimately based on perception.
- Currently, it is believed that political science, like other social and natural sciences, enables us to strengthen our means but we will have to resort to political philosophy to determine our ends.

KEYTERMS

- **Formalism:** It is a school of literary criticism and literary theory having mainly to do with structural purposes of a particular text.
- **Foreign policy:** The diplomatic policy of a nation in its interactions with other nations is called as foreign policy.
- **Physical science:** It is an encompassing term for the branches of natural science and science that study non-living systems, in contrast to the life sciences.
- **Scientism:** It is a belief in the universal applicability of the systematic methods and approach of science, especially the view that empirical science constitutes the most authoritative worldview or most valuable part of human learning to the exclusion of other viewpoints.
- **Postmodernism:** A philosophical movement evolved in reaction to modernism, which is the tendency in contemporary culture to accept only objective truth and to be inherently suspicious towards a global cultural narrative or meta-narrative.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. (a) Positivism (b) Leo Strauss
2. (a) True (b) True
3. (a) David Easton (b) 1950s
4. (a) True (b) False
5. (a) Auguste Comte (b) Phenomenology
6. (a) False (b) False

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES Short-

Answer Questions

1. How does the development of the contemporary approaches signify a departure from traditional approaches?
2. What is behaviouralism?
3. What do you understand by political theory?
4. There are two schools of thought about the development of political theory in the contemporary period—what are they?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Explain the role of behaviouralism and post-behaviouralism in the study of politics.
2. What are the characteristics of system approach in terms of international relations?
3. Explain the impact of the structural functional approach for the study of politics.
4. Analyse the contributions of great political thinkers towards the revival of political theory.

FURTHER READING

Pruthi, R. K.; *The Political Theory*, Sarup & Sons, India, 2005.

Freeden, M.; *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*, Clarendon Press, Gloucestershire, 1996.

Lively, J. *Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx: Key Debates*, Routledge, UK, 1989.

Arora, N. D. and Awasthy S. S.; *Political Theory and Political Thought*, Har-Anand Publications, India, 2007.

UNIT 3 SYSTEMS THEORY AND APPROACH

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

David Easton's Model

Gabriel A. Almond's Structural Functional Model

Karl W Deutsch's Communication Model

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will study the systems theory and approach. Contemporary concepts derived from the systems theory have been popularized in varying areas, such as ecological systems, organizational theory and management, human resource development and education, based on the promotional efforts of Bela H. Banathy, Howard T. Odum, Eugene Odum, Fritjof Capra, Peter Senge, Richard A. Swanson, Debora Hammond and Alfonso Montuori.

This trans-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary sphere with multiple perspectives, brings together doctrines and ideas related to ontology, philosophy of science, physics, computer science, biology, engineering, geography, sociology, political science, psychotherapy, economics and many other subjects.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss the genesis of the systems theory - the David Easton's Model
- Describe structural functional analysis
- Explain Karl W Deutsch's communication model

DAVID EASTON'S MODEL

The systems theory or approach refers to the trans-disciplinary study of systems, in general, with the objective of explaining beliefs and standards that are applicable to all system types in all research fields. The term does not possess a properly established, accurate meaning. However, the systems approach can be considered a specialization of systems thinking and a generalization of systems science'. The term is born from Bertalanffy's General System Theory (GST) and is employed later, in other fields, like the action theory of Talcott Parsons and the system theory of Niklas Luhmann. In this

regard, the term 'systems' refers in particular to self-regulating systems capable of correcting themselves based on feedback. In nature too, there are several examples of self-regulating systems, such as those found in the physiological systems of our body, local and global ecosystems, and even in climate.

The systems theory, therefore, facilitates interaction among disciplines not merely within autonomous areas of study but also within the field of systems science itself. In this regard, as misinterpretations were more likely, von Bertalanffy was of the opinion that a general theory of systems could act as an agent of regulation in science protecting against artificial comparisons that are hardly of an use in science. In fact, practically speaking, their results can be more harmful. Others favour the direct systems concepts cultivated by the original propagators of the theory. For instance, Dya Prigogine, from the Center for Complex Quantum Systems at University of Texas, Austin, who analysed emergent properties, suggested that they offer analogues for living systems. Francisco Varela and Humberto Maturana's theories of autopoiesis are built up on this very field. Notable names in modern systems science include Russell Ackoff, Bela H. Banathy, Anthony Stafford Beer, Peter Checkland, Robert L. Flood, Fritjof Capra, Michael C. Jackson, Edgar Morin and Werner Ulrich among others.

With the modern bases for a general theory of systems post-World Wars, Ervin Laszlo, mentions in the preface to *Perspectives on General System Theory*, authored by Bertalanffy that by translating the 'general system theory' from German to English, much harm has been done to the theory. He goes on to explain that originally a general system theory was *Allgemeine System theorie* (or *Lehre*), drawing attention to the fact that 'Theorie' (or *Lehre*) similar to 'Wissenschaft' (or Scholarship), has quite a broad meaning in German than the English terms 'theory' and 'science', which have the closes meanings. These ideas referred to a systematic body of knowledge and an organized group of concepts, either experiential, axiomatic or philosophical. '*Lehre*', therefore, is linked with theory and science in the etymology of general systems but its translation from German has not been successful. The term that gets closest to it is 'teaching' but that is not quite accurate and appears rather inflexible too. Many of the root meanings for 'general systems theory' may have vanished in the process of translation, 'systems theory' came to be commonly used by early investigators to explain the manner in which relationships in an organization were interdependent. They explained this by coming up with a definition of a novel thought about science and scientific paradigms.

From this reference structure, a system comprises interrelated sets of activities that indulge in regular interactions. For example, while trying to note the impact on organizational psychology as it developed and grew from being an industrial psychology revolving around individuals to an organizational psychology revolving around systems and development. It was realized that organizations are very complex social systems, which reduce the parts from the whole, and decrease the general and overall effectiveness of organizations. This is dissimilar to conventional approaches which are centred around individuals, structures, departments and units, all considered partly separate from the whole. The fact that these parts are interdependent and that the groups of individuals, structures, units and processes are interdependent are overlooked or not recognized even though they facilitate the smooth functioning of the organization.

According to Laszlo, the new systems perspective of organized complexity goes beyond the Newton's perspective of organized simplicity' which reduces the parts from the whole, or comprehends the whole or 'totality' without any link to the parts. The link

between organizations and their surroundings received recognition or acceptance as the most significant source of complexity and interdependence. Usually, the whole possesses properties that are unrecognizable or cannot be distinguished by analyzing, in isolation, the elements that constitute the whole. Bela H. Banathy as well as the promoters of the systems society, present the argument that 'the benefit of humankind' is the objective of science. This purpose has led to important and significant contributions to the field of systems theory. Banathy's definition reinforces this viewpoint.

The systems perspective is a world-view formed on the basis of system inquiry. The core of the systems inquiry is the idea of system. Generally speaking, the word 'system' implies a configuration of parts interlinked by a network of relationships. According to the Primer group, system can be defined as a group of relationships among group members who pose as a unified whole. Von Bertalanffy referred to 'system' as 'elements in standing relationship'.

Related or comparable concepts exist in the learning theories that were cultivated from similar basic concepts, focusing on the comprehension or interpretation of results that come from the knowledge of concepts, in part as well as a whole. Actually, Bertalanffy's organismic psychology was a corresponded to the learning theory of Jean Piaget. Interdisciplinary views are crucial in finding a new path away from the approaches of the industrial age, where history and math were separate and the arts and sciences were specialized and separate; where teaching was considered to be behaviorist conditioning. The modern work that was most impactful was of Peter Senge who assessed in detail the educational systems based on traditional assumptions about learning, including the issues related to fragmented knowledge and lack of holistic learning from the 'machine-age thinking' that became a 'model of school separated from daily life'. In this manner, the supporters of the systems theory tried to come up with options and an evolved ideation from orthodox theories with individuals, such as Max Weber, Emile Durkheim in sociology and Frederick Winslow Taylor in scientific management were strongly rooted in classical/traditional assumptions. The theorists turned to holistic techniques by developing systems concepts that whose integration was possible with various fields.

The way in which reductionism contradicts conventional or traditional theory, wherein a single part is the subject, is merely an example of altering assumptions. With the systems theory, the focus shifts from the parts to the manner in which the parts are organized. In other words, it recognizes the manner in which the parts interact and their characteristic of not being constant or static. It accepts the dynamism of the interactions/processes. Conventional systems, which were 'closed', were challenged when the perspective of open systems came to be developed. There was a marked shift in focus from knowledge which was characteristically absolute and comprised universal authoritative principles to knowledge, which was relative, general, conceptual and perceptual.

Yet, they were traditional in that they attempted to offer means by which human life could be organized. Simply put, the ideas that came before were pondered and thought over instead of being discarded altogether. There was thorough assessment and evaluation of mechanistic thought—the industrial age mechanistic metaphor of the mind derived from the way in which Newtonian mechanics were interpreted, by philosophers and psychologists. These interpretations form the bases of modern organization theory and management by the end of the nineteenth century. Classical or traditional science had not vanished. In fact, the main assumptions were questioned, impacting the organized systems that existed in the social and technical sciences.

Systems thinking started in ancient times as is clear from the first systems of written communication with Sumerian cuneiform or the Mayan numerals or the engineering marvels in the form of the Egyptian pyramids.

C. West Churchman, who distinguished between Western rationalist traditions of philosophy, was in favour of the I Ching as a systems approach, which made him appear to share a philosophy similar to that of the philosophy before Socrates and Heraclitus. According to Von Bertalanffy, the roots of the systems concepts were embedded in the philosophy of G.W. von Leibniz and Nicholas of Cusa's *coincidentia oppositorum*.

Clearly, modern systems are a lot more complicated but they have their roots firmly in history. A significant step to introduce the *systems approach*, into the hard sciences, that is the rational sciences of the 19th century, was the transformation of energy by notable figures, such as James Joule and Sadi Carnot. Also, this century's thermodynamics with Rudolf Clausius, Josiah Gibbs and others built, as a formal scientific object, the *system* reference model.

The systems theory is a field of study, which was particularly developed after the World Wars, on the basis of the works of Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Anatol Rapoport, Kenneth E. Boulding, William Ross Ashby, Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, C. West Churchman and others in the 1950s. Their efforts received impetus from the Society for General Systems Research. Bertalanffy recognized scientific advancement, which challenged the classical assumptions made in the organizational sciences, in the interwar period itself. His efforts to come up with a theory of systems began that early, with the publication of his work, 'An Outline for General Systems Theory' in *the British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, Vol 1, No. 2, 1950. While the assumptions in Western science, from Plato and Aristotle of Greece to Newton's *Principia* have been a strong historical influence in all fields, that is, the hard and social sciences, the traditional theorists attempted to find out the implications of the advancements made in the 20th century, in terms of systems. Several subjects were studied in the 1940s and 1950s, including the following:

- Complexity
- Self-organization
- Connectionism
- Adaptive systems

In areas such as cybernetics, researchers like Norbert Wiener, William Ross Ashby, John von Neumann and Heinz von Foerster studied complex systems through mathematics. The discovery of cellular automata and self-producing systems was made by John von Neumann, using merely pencil and paper. The basics of the chaos theory were constructed by Aleksandr Lyapunov and Jules Henri Poincaré without any assistance from computers. Also, the radiation ecologist, Howard T. Odum, accepted the need for a language capable of depicting energetics, thermodynamics and kinetics, in order to study general systems, at any system scale. Odum cultivated a general systems, or universal language, which had its basis in the circuit language of electronics to meet this requirement. It was called the Energy Systems Language. Between 1929 and 1951, Robert Maynard Hutchins of the University of Chicago had tried to support not just innovation but also interdisciplinary research in the social sciences, with the help of Ford Foundation, which set up the interdisciplinary division of the Social Sciences in 1931.

Many scholars were actively involved in concepts before (for example, *Tectology* by Alexander Bogdanov, in 1912-1917). However, in 1937, von Bertalanffy came up

with the general theory of systems at a conference at the University of Chicago. This systems view was founded on several fundamental concepts:

(i) It is possible to view all phenomena as a network of relationships among elements, or a system, (ii) Any system, irrespective of being electrical, biological, or social, will have a common pattern, behavior as well as properties. These can all be comprehended and used to better understand the behaviour of complex phenomena and get nearer to a unity of science. System philosophy, methodology and application complement this science.

By 1956, the 'Society for General Systems Research' was set up. In 1988, it was renamed the 'International Society for Systems Science'. The Cold War impacted the research project for systems theory in manners that were disappointing to most of the original theorists. Many started believing that theories defined in association with the systems theory had moved away from the initial General Systems Theory (GST) perspective. The economist, Kenneth Boulding, who was an early researcher in the systems theory, was concerned about the way systems concepts were manipulated. From the impact of the Cold War, he came to the conclusion that power abuse definitely was consequential and that systems theory could offer solutions to such issues. Following the conclusion of the Cold War, interest in the systems theory was renewed and efforts were made to make a stronger ethical perspective.

Several of the early systems theorists tried to find a general systems theory capable of explaining all systems in all fields of science. The term probably originated in Bertalanffy's book, *General System theory: Foundations, Development, Applications* (1968). Von Bertalanffy's 'allgemeine Systemlehre' (general systems teachings) was first developed through lectures which began in 1937 and later through published works in 1946. Von Bertalanffy aimed to unite organismic science, which he had studied as a biologist, under a single heading. He wished to use the term 'system' to refer to all the principles common to systems, in general. In his book he states that there are models, laws and principles applicable to generalized systems or subsystems, whatever be their type, or the elements that comprise them or the relationships that exist among them. Therefore, it is appropriate to demand a theory of universal principles applicable to all systems in general instead of a theory of systems of a specialized type.

'Cybernetics' is a term that originates from a Greek word meaning 'steersman'. This Greek word is also the parent of the English word 'govern'. Cybernetics refers to the study of feedback and derived concepts, like communication and control in living organisms, machines and organizations. The emphasis is on how information is processed (digitally, mechanically or biologically); how things react to information and alterations or how things can be altered to process information and react to it in a better way.' Systems theory' as well as 'cybernetics' are terms that are considered synonymous. There are authors who use the term *cybernetic systems* to refer to a subclass of general systems, comprising which include feedback loops.

Gordon Pask, however, pointed out differences of eternal interacting actor loops (loops producing limited products) making general systems a proper subset of cybernetics. As per Jackson, Von Bertalanffy advocated a very young form of general system theory (GST) in the 1920s and 1930s, which was probably just born. However, in the early 1950s this theory became quite popular in scientific circles. Talk of cybernetics spread in the late 1800s leading to various researched and influential publications, such as *Cybernetics* by Wiener, in 1948 and *General Systems Theory* by Von Bertalanffy in

1968. Cybernetics had its roots in engineering fields while GST was born from biology. Von Bertalanffy particularly points out the difference between the areas while mentioning the effect of cybernetics. He felt it was wrong to identify the 'systems theory' with cybernetics and control theory. Cybernetics is the theory of control mechanisms in technology and nature, which has its basis in the concepts of information and feedback.

However, as part of a general theory of systems, this approach is widely applicable but cannot be identified with a generalized "systems theory". He feels that a warning is essential to check unbridled expansion into the fields where its concepts are irrelevant. Jackson (2000) also felt that von Bertalanffy received information from Alexander Bogdanov *Tectology*, a three volume series published in Russia in the period 1912 to 1917. The German translation of this work was published in 1928. He clearly states to Gorelik (1975) that the 'conceptual part' of the general system theory (GST) had at first been established by Bogdanov. Mattessich (1978) and Capra (1996) also hold similar positions.

Much to the surprise of Capra (1996), Ludwig von Bertalanffy failed to mention Bogdanov in his titles. The goal of explaining complex systems comprising innumerable mutually interacting and interrelated components is common to the following:

- Cybernetics
- Catastrophe theory
- Chaos theory
- Complexity theory

Cellular automata (CA), neural networks (NN), artificial intelligence (AI), and artificial life (ALife) are interrelated fields. However, they do not attempt to explain general (universal) complex (singular) systems. The best method of comparing various 'C'-Theories related to complex systems is historical, as it focusses on various tools and techniques, including pure mathematics and even pure computer science in the modern age. Since the start of the chaos theory when Edward Lorenz serendipitously chanced upon an unusual attractor with his computer, computers have come to be a source of information that cannot be dispensed with. Today, it is impossible to even think of studying complex systems in the absence of computers.

American writers, David Easton, G. A. Almond and Morton A. Kaplan did not favour the traditional way of making compartments in disciplines, such as economics, politics, psychology, sociology or other social sciences. They reacted by stating that this compartmentalization only caused a reduction of the cross-flows between various related fields of study. Therefore, the idea of systems analysis germinates from the views of these writers.

The new crop of social scientists was inspired by the contributions of natural scientists, such as Ludwig Von Bertalanffy, who led the movement aimed at unifying all natural sciences. Many significant conferences took place, which drove American educational institutions to find out whether scientific research could be conducted to try and establish a unified theory of human behaviour. Establishment of the Society for the Advancement of the General System Research in 1956, was a notable event following which annual year books started paying special attention to the fields of general system theory. Therefore, it became fashionable to study the general system theory. As per O. R. Young, the core or guiding principle which was developed in this search was the idea of 'system', which has ever since become the fundamental conceptual asset of the general system theory.

Various writers have employed and defined the term 'system' in various ways. Ludwig Von Bertalanffy, described a 'system' as a group of interacting elements. Hall

and Fagen called 'system' a set of objects, their relations and also the relation between their attitudes. According to Collin Cherry, a system is a whole comprising several component parts; a collection of attitudes. Kaplan wrote: 'A brief and non-technical description of the object of systems analysis would include; the study of a set of interrelated variables, as distinguished from the environment of the set, and of the ways in which this set is maintained under the impact of environmental disturbances'.

The characteristic features of systems, as listed by David Apter are as follows:

- Systems comprise boundaries containing functional interrelationships, which are primarily based on some of the communications.
- Systems also contain subclasses or subsystems, which have exchanges between the sub-systems.
- Systems are capable of coding. They accept inputs in the form of information and are able to learn from these inputs. They then end up translating these inputs into some sort of output.

To summarize, a system is based on a relationship between information and the use of energy. The link between coding and the use of energy outputs is transformational. This results in general systems paradigm which is applicable to various system levels, each having its individual boundary: cells, organs, individuals, groups, and societies. The general system approach, employs energy, information input control mechanism, memory banks, checking instruments, and outputs to generate new energy and information.

A 'system' is not merely a mere random collection of elements. It comprises interdependent elements, which can be precisely identified in time as well as space. A system may contain two constructs as follows: (i) Homological construct (ii) Interlocking construct

The homological construct or isomorphism, consists of 'one to one correspondence' between objects, in various systems, preserving the relationship existing between two objects.

The interlocking construct directly refers to scale effects and to the vertical or hierarchical association of systems.

An examination or assessment of 'system analysis' is an important part of interdisciplinary approach. Systems theory has a basic difference that sets it apart from the general theory of all systems: it is related to the natural sciences, such as physics and biology. The general systems try to outline a framework, which has its basis in specific hypotheses and concepts, which can be applied to different branches of social sciences. Those who promote system analysis follow the belief that there exist many theories common to different disciplines. Considering the fact that they can be placed only in an abstract way, a general theory can be derived which could be useful in each discipline as a broad concept, in a general perspective, before embarking into detailed analysis or research.

The fundamental concept for elaborating the general system theory may classified as follows:

Category 1: Descriptive concepts, -which can be employed as devices of classificatory variables

Category 2: Concepts related to the regulation and maintenance of a system

Category 3: Concepts that enunciate the forces responsible for changing the system.

The first category consists of concepts that differentiate between different types of systems, such as democratic (open) and non-democratic (closed system), or organismic and non-organismic system. The second category comprises the crucial ingredient of the general system theory. The main focus of this theory is on the regulation and maintenance of the system. Here, many significant concepts are found having their relationship with the forces playing their role in the regulation or maintenance of a system. The third category stresses on the fact that change is the law of nature. However, this change is disruptive as well as non-disruptive.

David Easton is probably the most notable among the names of those who subscribe to systems analysis. Easton's monumental work *A Systems Analysis of Political Life*, which was published in 1965 received praise from famous writers on contemporary empirical political theory for providing an original set of concepts that could help arrange and organize at the level of theory. It also interpreted political phenomena in a novel fashion. Easton's attempts to construct an empirically-oriented political theory were spread over three phases, with each phase being represented by a major published work:

(i) *The Political System* (1953) -promoted general theory in political science (ii) *A Frame Work for Political Analysis* (1965)—set for the major concepts

for the development of such a general theory, (iii) *A System Analysis of Political Life* (1965)—tried to explain the concepts hoping that they would be applied in an empirical way.

In fact, Easton later tried to shift his theory to an empirical situation. Simply put, Easton's behavioural model of politics, suggested that a political system could be considered a delimited (with all political systems having specific boundaries) and fluid (changing) system of decision-making steps. His approach can be simplified in the following manner:

- **The first step is to change the** social or physical environment surrounding a political system producing 'demands' and 'supports' for action or the status quo directed as 'inputs' towards the political system, through political behaviour.
- **The second step is stimulating competition in a political system through** these demands and supporting groups, resulting in decisions or 'outputs' aimed at some aspect of the surrounding social or physical environment.
- **The third step is that** after a decision or output is made (e.g., a specific policy), it interacts with its environment, and in case any change is produced in the environment, there are 'results'.
- **The fourth step** is that a new policy interacts with its environment, generating new demands or supports and groups in support or against the policy ('feedback') or a new policy on some related matter.
- **The fifth step** is that of 'feedback', which leads back to Step 1.

This goes on endlessly. If the system functions as stated, then it will be a 'stable political system' but if it breaks down, we encounter a 'dysfunctional political system'.

Political Analysis

Easton's aspiration was to make a science out of politics. He worked with abstract approaches describing the regular patterns and processes in politics, in general. According to his viewpoint, the greatest degree of abstraction could lead to scientific generalizations about politics. In a nutshell, politics should be considered as a whole, and not as an aggregation of various issues that need solutions.

His primary model was based on an organic perspective of politics, considering it an object breathing life. His theory describes the elements that make political systems adapt and survive.

According to him, politics is in a constant flux, and therefore, he denounces the idea of 'equilibrium', which widely exists in other political theories. Also, he does not approve the concept that politics could be studied by simply observing different levels of analysis. His abstractions could account for any group and demand at any point of time. That is, interest group theory and elite theory can be incorporated in the analysis of political systems. His theory was and is highly influential in the pluralist tradition in political science.

Initially Easton argued that scientific knowledge is theoretical and based on facts but facts alone do not explain events and must be ordered in some way. Further, the study of political life involves the political system as a whole rather than solution for particular problems. Theory must be combined with reliable knowledge and empirical data; psychological data on personalities and motivation of participants and situational data saved by environmental influences. Easton's quest for theory involved the formulation of a general framework, a focus on the whole system rather than merely on its part, an awareness of environmental influences upon the system, and recognitions of the differences between political life in equilibrium and in disequilibrium. Easton rejected the concept of the state by referring to the confusion and variety of meanings; system for him permits clear conceptualization.

Likewise, power is understood as only one of many significant concepts useful in the study of political life. Power, however, relates to the shaping and carrying out of authoritative politics in society.

Easton identified some attributes of political system in an attempt to move in the direction of a general political theory. These attributes were: (i) properties of identification in the form of units and boundaries (ii) inputs and outputs (iii) differentiation within a system and (iv) integration within a system. Each attribute was described and illustrated through a 'primitive' diagram which is produced in the Figure 3.1. This diagram shows that the 'political system' receives 'inputs' from the 'environment' in the form of 'demands' and 'supports'; it produces 'output' in the form of 'policies and decisions'. The 'output' flows back into the environment through a feedback mechanism. According to Easton, demands are the raw materials out of which finished products called decisions are manufactured. He has characterized supports as the energy in the form of actions for orientations enabling the political system to convert the demand into authoritative decisions and policies. Demand may arise from any source the people, politicians, administrators, opinion leaders and so on depending on the nature of the regime. The extent of support is bound to vary depending on the expectation of the people from their political system.

Variability of support is bound to affect the destinies of the political authorities (upon called governments), the regime (democratic, authoritarian, and the like), and the political community. Outputs are produced by the political system through special processes that ensure their acceptance as binding by members of the society most of the time.

Criticism

Easton is concerned with clarifying and simplifying concepts related to an excessive pre-occupation with stability, maintenance, persistence, and equilibrium, a tendency derived from biology. For example, Easton refers to 'authoritative allocation of values' as the 'life processes' of the political system. Yet this idea can lead to some 'misleading assumption on which to construct adequate theory of politics'.

According to Thorson, Easton was unable to deal with particular changes. In his words 'We can in no sense then regard Easton's theory as a theory of political science; as a theory which answers questions concerning why any particular political change occurred'.

Another criticism against Easton's framework is that he posted some generalizations, but his framework yielded few, any, testable hypotheses. According to Eugene Miller, the ideological underpinnings of the framework pose a problem.. He noted that early in his writings Easton was concerned with an intellectual crisis and the imminent waning of democratic liberalism. In his assessment, Miller concluded that Easton failed to identify 'the object of political inquiry', and he questioned 'if system analysis, as a kind of political biology, is concerned with questions that are, properly speaking, political in nature'.

Theodore J. Lowi noted that when Easton and Eastonised turned empirical within the system context, they literally stepped outside the political system and studied political socialization. It is also criticised that Easton's definition of terms like 'politics' and 'political system' based on the ingredient of 'essay top interactions' are so broad that one fails to apply the line of distinction between an abstract and a concrete political system.

According to S. P. Verma, 'Easton in his serious effort to move away from the institutional to the behavioural approach found himself hanging somewhere in the middle'.

Systems analysis deals with the life processes of all political systems instead of with particular structures or processes that play a role in making a specific type of command viable. We should find out whether systems analysis as a type of political biology deals with political questions.

Human beings tend to differentiate between biological issues related to the manner in which life is sustained and the ethical issues related to the lifestyle men should opt for. Ethically speaking, the primary phenomenon does not deal with the life processes of a man but his character. It is insignificant that men have common life processes. What is significant is that they all have different characters. A man has to stay alive to be able to possess identity. However, what determines his identity is his character and lifestyle and not his vital processes. Political things need to be comprehended by comparing with ethics and not biology. It is essential for a political society to exist in order for its members to select a rule/system and accordingly a lifestyle. The identity of the society comes from the type of system/regime and way of life selected and not from the processes that are responsible for the sustenance of any type of system. Studying the identity and change in political life is based on alterations in systems and not on the loss of authoritative decision-making. If political change is studied in order to intelligently distinguish between changes that are beneficial and those that are harmful, the study will have to be guided

by an understanding of the good and just regime. In the past, there was always reason to doubt the fact that Easton's concept of knowledge allows an answer that can be relied on, in response to the question of appropriate political order.

What we now realize is that the question does not arise in his conceptual framework as he moves away from the regime as the core of political inquiry. This is not just by accident that Easton has not succeeded in developing the 'value theory', which he has been promoting for a long time. His theory does not support the revival of serious inquiry related to the ends of political life. In spite of these points of criticism, there is no denying the fact that the proper general system theory has been used very little in the social sciences. Therefore, it is not easy to judge how useful it is in a precise way at this point. This theory may be upheld as a model or system of political analysis but it is still too early to make a clear and definite judgment on this question. But it can be surely admitted that the outline of system analysis has been discovered to be quite useful for comparatively analyzing the various political units, like, modernized and developing polities.

It is widely utilized to analyse the international political system. The model of political system has also offered a solution as a foundation for Gabriel Almond's approach of structural-functional analysis, just like for Karl Deutsch's communication theory approach.

GABRIEL A. ALMOND'S STRUCTURAL FUNCTIONAL MODEL

Structural-functionalism is a broad perspective in sociology and anthropology, established in order to understand society as a structure comprising interrelated parts. Functionalism looks at society as a whole, based on the functions of the customs, norms, institutions and traditions that comprise it. According to Herber Spencer, these components of the society are like 'organs' working to facilitate the smooth functioning of the body as a whole. Basically, the emphasis is on the effort to attribute to every element (custom, practice, feature etc.), its impact or influence on the functioning of a system that is supposed to be stable and cohesive.

Talcott Parsons, described 'structural-functionalism' as a specific stage in the systematic development of social science, rather than a particular school of thought. Parsons named his own theory, the action theory' arguing repeatedly that the 'structural-functionalism' is a name that tends to mislead.

The tendency to make biological comparisons and the notions of social evolutionism are the characteristic features of classical functionalist theories. You may consider functionalism as a logical extension of the organic analogies for society by political philosophers like Rousseau. However, sociology tends to attract more focussed attention towards the institutions that are unique to industrialized capitalist society (or *modernity*). The foundation of functionalism is also anthropological, in that, it is based on the works of Marcel Mauss, Bronisaw Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown and other theorists. Radcliffe-Brown was the first to specifically use the prefix 'structural'. Durkheim suggested that most stateless and 'primitive' societies, where powerful centralized institutions are missing, have their basis in an association of corporate-descent groups. In addition, structural functionalism built on Malinowski's argument saying that the nuclear family is the basic building block of society, of which the clan is an outgrowth, and not the other way around. Durkheim wished to know how some societies managed to remain internally stable and survived over time. He suggested that such societies show a tendency for

segmentation, where equivalent parts are linked by shared values and common symbols or as according to his nephew Marcel Mauss, systems of exchanges. In contemporary societies, which are riddled with complexities, members are busy doing different types of work, and end up being interdependent. On the basis of the metaphor of an organism' used earlier, where several components worked together as a unified whole, it was Durkheim's argument that organic solidarity binds together complex societies.

Radcliffe-Brown not only supported but upheld these views. Like Comte, his belief was that society comprises a different degree of reality, as distinguished from both biological and inorganic matter. Therefore, social phenomena had to be built within this level, with individuals being merely transient occupants of stable social roles. The key issue concerning structural functionalism is a continuation of the Durkheimian job of enunciating the fact that societies need to be internally stable and cohesive so as to survive over time. Societies are considered coherent, linked together by constructs that are related, just like organisms, with their various components or social institutions, unconsciously working together in quasi-automatic manner in order to attain social equilibrium on the whole. Thus, all social and cultural phenomena are seen as functional in the sense of working together, and are considered to possess 'lives' of their own. They are mainly analysed on the basis of this function. The significance of the individual comes from his status, the way he is placed in terms of social relations, and his behaviour with regard to his status. The social structure, then, is the web of statuses linked by associated roles. It is simple to equate the view point directly with political conservatism. Emphasis on 'cohesive systems' results in functionalist theories that need to be contrasted with 'conflict theories', which, in turn, focus on social issues and inequalities.

Political scientists, Gabriel Almond and Bingham Powell, came up with a new structural-functionalist model in the 1970s that compared political systems. Their argument was that a political system can be understood only if its institutions (structures) and the functions of each institution are understood. They believed that these institutions were not understood well enough and that they should be put in historical context, dynamic and full of meaning. The concept was in sharp contrast to the prevailing models in the area of comparative politics, that is, the state-society theory and the dependency theory. These theories had descended from David Easton's system theory in international relations, and upheld a mechanistic viewpoint considering all political systems as being similar, following identical laws of 'stimulus and response'—or inputs and outputs—and at the same time, giving very little attention to special or unique characteristics. The structural-functional model has its basis on the perspective that a political system comprises several essential parts, such as interest groups, political parties and branches of government.

Along with structures, Almond and Powell proved that a political system was composed of different functions, the main ones being political socialization, recruitment and communication: socialization implies the manner in which societies convey their values and beliefs to the generations that succeed, and in terms of politics, they describe the process used by society to instill civic virtues, or the traditions of effective citizenship; recruitment indicates the process used by a political system to cultivate interest, willingness to engage and participate in the citizens.

'Communication implies the manner in which a system propagates its values and information. Like system analysis, structural functional analysis is also based on the concept of political system. This model of political analysis has been more widely used in the sphere of comparative politics because it provides for standard categories for different types of political systems. The concept of structural functional analysis originated in the

sphere of social anthropology in the writings of Redcliff-Brown and B. Malinowski. Then it was developed in the field of sociology by Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton and Marion Levy. Gabriel Almond and his associates developed it into a tool of political analysis. In the introduction to a collective work co edited with James S. Coleman, *The Politics of the Developing Areas* (1960) Almond renovated the concept of comparative politics. Political system replaced the state and the legal and institutional apparatus employed by traditional political scientists. Function substituted for power, role for office, and structure for institution. They identified four characteristics of the political system: (i) All political systems have political structures (ii) The same functions are performed in all political systems with different frequencies and by different kinds of structures; (iii) All political structures are multifunctional (iv) All political systems are 'mish-mash' systems in the cultural sense, i.e. they are based on a culture which is always the mixture of the modern and the traditional.

Instead of focusing on such concepts as institutions, organization or group, Almond turned to role and structures. Roles being the interacting units of the political system and structures representing the patterns of interaction. He also introduced the concept of political culture, which he conceived of as embedded in a particular pattern of orientations to political action with these patterns usually extending beyond the boundaries of the political system.

Gabriel Almond and G. B. Powell in their book *Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach* (1966), further developed this approach. They argued that all political systems regardless of their type must perform a specific set of tasks if they are to remain in existence as systems in working order or in equilibrium, i.e. as 'ongoing systems'. These are the functional requirements of the system. With this assumption they sought to modify David Easton's model of the political system, suggesting that 'inputs' and 'outputs' recognized by Easton can be understood as 'functions' or 'functional requisites' of political system. They sought to redefine these inputs and outputs with a deeper understanding of political process and proceeded to identify various structures corresponding to these functions, in order to evolve a 'structural-functional' framework.

According to them, in various political systems these functions may be performed by different kinds of political structures and, sometimes, even by structures which are not overtly recognized as being, primarily, 'political'. Almond presents a seven-fold classification of the functional variables in his input-output model. He mentions four input functions and three output functions. Input functions are: (i) Political socialization and recruitment (ii) Interest articulation (iii) Interest aggregation (iv) Political communication. He also mentions three variables in his category of output functions. They are:

(i) Rulemaking (ii) Rule application (iii) Rule adjudication

Output functions are correspondent to conventional governmental functions, which are performed by formal governmental organs like legislature (rule making), executive (rule application) and judiciary (rule adjudication). According to Almond, input functions are performed by non-governmental structures or institutions. He further said that all structures are multi-functional, yet some structures are especially suited for specific purposes.

Almond elaborates his input functions further. The first function political socialization is the process whereby an individual acquires attitudes and orientations towards political phenomena. It also implies the process whereby society transmits political norms and beliefs from one generation to the next.

Recruitment stands for the process whereby political groups obtained members for various important roles in the political process, either in addition to the existing members or as replacement for other members. Since political socialization prepares the individual to assume various important role in the social structure it is instrumental to recruitment also. The main institutions which perform these functions are family, school and other primary groups. The second input function, interest articulation, implies the processes where by opinions, attitudes, beliefs, preferences are converted into coherent demands on the political system. This function may be performed by various structures, but interest groups are most suited to perform this function. The third input function the interest aggregation is the process whereby various divergent interests are collated and translated into concrete demands of a very large section of a society, policy proposals and programmes of action etc. This function can be performed best by political parties. The last input function political communication is the process whereby components of a political system, such as, individuals, groups and institutions, transmit and receive information regarding the functioning of the political system. This function can be best performed by mass media or the organizations controlling the media of mass communication. Further, Almond and Powell have identified three chief characteristics of development of political system that is 'political development'. These are (i) Structural differentiation (ii) Secularization of culture and (iii) Expansion of capabilities.

According to Almond, a principal aspect of the development or transformation of the political system is role differentiation or structural differentiation. By differentiation they refer to the process whereby roles change and become more specialized or more autonomous or where by new types of roles are established or are created. The underlying propensities of a political system, representing its psychological dimension, have been described as political culture. Secularization of culture concerns with this aspect of political system. The secularization of culture, to Almond and Powell is the process whereby traditional orientations and attitudes give way to more dynamic decision making processes involving the gathering of information, the evaluation of information, the laying out of alternative course of action, the selection of a course of action from among these possible courses, and the means where by one tests whether or not a given course of action is producing the consequences which were intended.

Expansion of capabilities implies an increase in four types of capabilities of political system:

- (i) Regulative capability (the capability of legitimate coercion to control the behaviour of individuals and groups)
- (ii) Extractive capability (the capability to appropriate the natural and human resources of society and international environment)

(iii) Distributive capability (the capability to distribute various benefits to individuals and groups) (iv) Responsive capability (the capability to respond to the demands coming from society and international environment).

A balanced development required that regulative and extractive capabilities of political system are suitably matched with its distributive and responsive capabilities.

Despite the fact that structural-functional approach has occupied a very important place in the realm of comparative politics, it cannot be denied that it has some serious shortcomings. It has been criticized on various grounds. First, the structural-functional analysis tends to focus primarily static relationships rather than dynamics. The approach is concerned, above all, with the problems of systemic survival, the requirements of the stable adaptation, and the operation of various functions and structures oriented towards system maintenance. Therefore, this approach is accused of being anti change. This approach has the serious flaw of being concerned with the present and having no perspective of the future.

The functionalists defeat the very purpose of their approach by wrongly applying their tools of empirical investigation while studying the political systems of the third world. It failed to provide empirically validated answers to what is happening in the third world. According to Marion Levy, this approach suffers from the 'fallacy of functional teleology'. It means it suffers from the tendency to explain the origins of a condition or pattern of action in terms of its being a functional necessity for the survival of the system. It is also alleged that the structural functional approach is nothing else than an exercise to defend and justify the status quo.

The real pursuit of the functionalist is to save a political system from changing towards socialism. The functionalists are accused of being the defenders of the bourgeoisie at home and of imperialism abroad. It is also further criticized that while Easton and Parsons present and elaborate scheme of their 'system' Almond talks of functions without referring to a system in which functions have a meaning that is, he is more concerned with his own sub-sets without first explaining and clarifying the premises of his main set. Moreover, whatever he says about his political system and its structural functional mechanism is applicable to a western country.

According to Meehan 'It seems clear that the search for a general theory, functionalist or not, or for an all-encompassing model of politics is a false and misleading trail that leads to conceptual difficulties that are virtually insoluble.' It is also alleged that the structural functional approach is not suited to analysis of power relations in society. However, structural functional analysis signifies a significant advance in the sphere of political analysis. It has its advantages limited to the study of selected affluent western democratic countries where alone it may look quite attractive for a comparative analysis of political systems. It may also be added in its favour that it deals for the most part with a manageable collection of variables; and it provides a set of standardized categories that can be applied successfully over widely disparate political systems.

KARL W DEUTSCH'S COMMUNICATION MODEL

The political communication approach is a relatively recent and fast-moving development in the field of scientific analysis. It leans heavily on the fundamental orientations of cybernetics-the science of control and communication system. It has received great

impetus from the revolutionary developments that occurred after the Second World War in the spheres of engineering and technology. Some scholars, chief among them Karl W. Deutsch, have developed a new approach in the sphere of comparative politics whereby the analysis of political phenomena is made on the basis of communication and control system.

The main purpose of social theorists subscribing to this approach is that the developments in the new science of communications have led to a diminution in importance of the differences of analytical purposes, between the behaviour of living things and that of social organizations. Karl Deutsch sees that the new sciences can now, without fear of being misleading, be used with regard to the state as well as other types of political systems. The term 'communication' refers to a body of basic concepts underlying several contemporary approaches to human behaviour, including the interactions of nation states. Used in a wider sense, the term 'communication' involves not only oral speech but all human behaviour. In an even broader sense, it may be used with reference to the ways in which the physical environment excites signals in the central nervous system-together with the ways in which the human being operates upon the physical environment. In this term the organism and the environment form a single system: the organism affects the environment and the environment affects the organism. It is for this reason that the approach of political communications as also known as political cybernetics.

According to this approach, politics and government 'appear in essence as processes of steering and coordinating human efforts towards the attainment of some set of goals'. In this framework, this approach refers to the basic mechanism through which these processes manifest themselves in the decision. The study of the political communication approach is integrally related to the study of political systems. It is the communication that gives dynamics to the political system. The communication approach adopted by Karl Deutsch may be set to have three main characteristics:

(i) It no longer has six powers as the key variable in the key explanation of the political phenomena. Power is neither the centre nor the essence of politics. Instead, the essence of politics becomes the dependable coordination of human efforts and expectation for the attainment of the goals of the society, (ii) There is a strong emphasis on the empirical nature of the concepts. The attempt is to 'operationalize' the concept through measurement and mapping. Quantitative data are not seen as a substitute for other type of analysis but as complementary in that they could do much to check, strengthen or confirm the judgement of the historian or political analyst, (iii) It is not restricted to any one level of analysis. It is equally relevant to groups, people, organizations of any size, including the state, and relationship between the units.

The political communication approach lays stress on the point that all functions of a political system' are performed by the means of communications'. It is communication that sustains and nourishes the body of a system. Hence, one may liken the communication to the circulation of the blood. It is not the blood but what it contains that nourishes the system. The blood is the neutral medium carrying claims, protests and demands through the veins of the heart; and from the heart through the arteries flow the outputs of rules, regulations and adjudications in response to the claims and demands. Though this approach seeks to study the elements of change, it is more concerned with a change that may not bring about the destruction of the system. As such, it is concerned with ways in which certain kinds of apparatus are maintained through 'feedbacks', that is to say, devices by which the entropy of a system is counteracted by returning some of its output into input.

Karl Deutsch, the chief exponent of the communication approach describes the main theme of his model in his famous book *The Nerves of Government: Modes of Political Communication and Control* (1963). He sought to apply the concepts and methods of modern information technology as well as psychology of the nervous system to an analysis of political system. As stated earlier he particularly introduced the techniques of cybernetics to the sphere of political analysis. Cybernetics is the study of the operation of control and communication systems; it deals both with biological systems and man-made machinery.

Deutsch declared that his work was concerned less with the bones or muscles of the body-politic than with its nerves-its channels of communication and decisions. Communication theory regards the function of communication as the centre of all political activity. An analysis of communication flowing from and flowing into the political system would, therefore, be very helpful in the description, classification analysis and explanation of the important aspects of political life. Deutsch argued that it might be profitable to look upon government somewhat less as a problem of power and somewhat more as a problem of steering i.e. directing the course of its activity which is the main function of communication. He, therefore, regards political system as a 'network of communication channels'. According to him, it is largely a 'self-regulating' or self-controlling' system which involves its own process and mechanism for acquisition, collection, transmission, selection and storage of information.

The aim of Deutsch is to use the concepts and methods of the science of cybernetics to provide explanations for not simply the survival but the growth of political systems and to predict the consequences of changes that affect the structure of systems. The main features of Deutsch communication model may be summed up as follows:

(i) *Society as a machine*: According to Deutsch, the social system and political system as its part survive and develop because they contain mechanisms which allowed or encourage habit forming and other activities that go with this: the acquiring of information; the selection and storage of this information; the selection and the development of norms relating to the use of information gain, (ii) *New definition of politics*: One of the important concerns of Deutsch is to reduce the importance of the notion of powers as a component of continuing political activity. To him, politics is concerned with the attainment of social goals. It is the sphere in which decisions are made with respect to the whole society-decisions which are enforceable, (iii) *New notion of government*: According to Deutsch, the function of the government is to control the direction of information into or away from particular channels of communication. Thus, its main task is to steer information rather than exercising power over the individuals. (iv) *Miniature communications system*: The infrastructure of a political system is constituted by political parties and interest groups. They are interconnected and open but they are also capable of steering themselves and with mechanism (human and institutional) that allowed them to adopt and modify their structures and behaviours. (v) *Homeostatis instead of equilibrium*: Deutsch desires to furnish a model that is not static but dynamic. That is, he is not for equilibrium that indicates a statutory model of a political system. He calls the whole idea of equilibrium as being both mechanistic and excessively detached from the impact of

environmental factors. Politics is a changing phenomenon and, thus he stands for a dynamic situation which he terms as homeostatis.

(vi) *Concept of feedback or servomechanism:* Feedback is the key concept of the model of Deutsch. It means a network of communications that produces actions in response to an input of information and includes the results of its own action in the information but it modifies its subsequent behaviour. However, feedback may be negative or positive.

A negative feedback system is one which transmits back to itself information that is the result of decisions and actions taken by the system, and which leads the system to change its behaviour in pursuit of the goals which it has set itself. 'Load' indicates the total amount of information which a system may possess at a particular time. 'Lag' indicates the amount of delay that the system experiences between reporting the consequences of decisions and acting on the information that it has received. 'Gain' is an indication of the manner in which the system responds to the information that it has received. 'Lead' illustrates the extent to which a system has the capacity to react to predictions about the future consequences of decisions and actions.

There are some problems of communication that may be studied in three contexts: (i) Communication within the political system; (ii) Communication between the political system and its environment; and (iii) Communication between two or more political systems.

Its analysis involves the study of several components, including: (i) the structures meant for sending and receiving messages; (ii) the channels used for the purpose of communication; (iii) process of storage of information; (iv) feedback mechanisms; (v) the code and languages applied for the purpose of communication; and (vi) the contents of message transmitted. Communication by no means a smooth process. One has to be very careful in detecting distortions.

If the distortion could be corrected appropriately, lots of problem can be prevented or minimized.

Criticism

The political communication approach also is not free from criticism, which can be enumerated as follows:

(i) Political communication approach, though different from such an approach in other disciplines like neurophysiology, mathematics and electrical engineering, has been criticized for elaborating and essentially engineering and mechanistic orientation towards human behaviour.

One may ask as to how the law of a natural and fixed science like that of electrical engineering can be applied to the study of human behaviour that is never fixed and definite. Man is not a machine and thus society cannot be regarded as a mechanistic arrangement.

(ii) The entire approach of political communication depends upon the extension of an analogy between a natural and a social system. A shift from the language of natural sciences to that of a social science is bound to involve significant discontinuities and incongruities. Naturally, the model of Deutsch ultimately becomes so complex that it tends to move away from being a working model and towards becoming a scheme.

(iii) There is not only the difficulty of applying models picked up from a natural to a social science it is all the more difficult to make it useful for the purpose of social sciences. Some terms of electrical engineering may either remain unapplied or they may be misapplied and for this reason it is likely that we get a confused picture of a political model. The theory thus suffers from serious drawbacks both at the structural level and in substantive matters.

(iv) A cybernetic model is a very general, abstract one, and its principal concepts may acquire different meanings according to the particular system to which they are applied, be it a computer, an irrigation system, the human brain and society. It is also remarked that, despite Deutsch's attempt to eventually develop a theory of politics, national and international, his own formulations were explicitly not theory but parts of an ongoing enterprise to be developed into theory at some unspecified later stage.

Though it is true that the cybernetics model loosely adopted by Karl Deutsch and others for analysing the stability and instability of political systems in the light of communication systems is not rich enough to do all that they intended to do with it, we cannot ignore the fact that the work of an innovator is always subject to criticism. Despite all points of weakness, as enumerated above it may be admitted that the approach looks promising too. In political science this approach is particularly useful for an analysis of the processes of bargaining, conflict resolution, decision making, evolution of policies, estimating the impact of publicity of propaganda as well as for understanding the dynamics of international relations.

ACTIVITY

Give two examples of flaw in the political communication approach in the Indian political system.

DID YOU KNOW

Systems thinking has been compared to Buddhism, and evolutionary systems thinking can be appreciated as the integration of the sciences with the works of mystical and transpersonal thinkers such as Sri Aurobindo (1872-1950) in the East and Carl G Jung (1875-1961) and Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (1881-1955) in the West. This convergence of science, philosophy, and religion is manifested in the systemic inquiry on conscious evolution and its underlying ethic.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- The systems theory or approach refers to the trans-disciplinary study of systems, in general, with the objective of explaining beliefs and standards that are applicable to all system types in all research fields.

- The systems theory, therefore, facilitates interaction among disciplines not merely within autonomous areas of study but also within the field of systems science itself.
- According to Laszlo, the new systems perspective of organized complexity goes beyond the Newton's perspective of organized simplicity' which reduces the parts from the whole, or comprehends the whole or 'totality' without any link to the parts.
- The systems perspective is a world-view formed on the basis of system inquiry. The core of the systems inquiry is the idea of 'system'.
- Conventional systems, which were 'closed', were challenged when the perspective of open systems came to be developed. There was a marked shift in focus from knowledge which was characteristically absolute and comprised universal authoritative principles to knowledge, which was relative, general, conceptual and perceptual.
- Systems thinking started in ancient times as is clear from the first systems of written communication with Sumerian cuneiform or the Mayan numerals or the engineering marvels in the form of the Egyptian pyramids.
- The systems theory is a field of study, which was particularly developed after the World Wars, on the basis of the works of Ludwig von Bertalanffy, Anatol Rapoport, Kenneth E. Boulding, William Ross Ashby, Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, C. West Churchman and others in the 1950s.
- Many scholars were actively involved in concepts before (for example, Tectology by Alexander Bogdanov, in 1912-1917). However, in 1937, von Bertalanffy came up with the general theory of systems at a conference at the University of Chicago.
- 'Cybernetics' is a term that originates from a Greek word meaning 'steersman'. This Greek word is also the parent of the English word 'govern'.
- Cybernetics refers to the study of feedback and derived concepts, like communication and control in living organisms, machines and organizations.
- Cybernetics had its roots in engineering fields while GST was born from biology.
- A system is based on a relationship between information and the use of energy.
- David Easton is probably the most notable among the names of those who subscribe to systems analysis.
- Initially Easton argued that scientific knowledge is theoretical and based on facts but facts alone do not explain events and must be ordered in some way.
- According to Thorson, Easton was unable to deal with particular changes.
- Theodore J. Lowi noted that when Easton and Eastonised turned empirical within the system context, they literally stepped outside the political system and studied political socialization.
- Structural-functionalism is a broad perspective in sociology and anthropology, established in order to understand society as a structure compelling interrelated parts.
- Political scientists, Gabriel Almond and Bingham Powell, came up with a new structural-functionalist model in the 1970s, that compared political systems.

Almond presents a seven-fold classification of the functional variables in his input-output model. He mentions four input functions and three output functions.

- Recruitment stands for the process whereby political groups obtained members for various important roles in the political process, either in addition to the existing members or as replacement for other members.
- Despite the fact that structural-functional approach has occupied a very important place in the realm of comparative politics, it cannot be denied that it has some serious shortcomings.
- The political communication approach is a relatively recent and fast-moving development in the field of scientific analysis.
- The political communication approach lays stress on the point that all functions of a political system 'are performed by the means of communications'.
- A negative feedback system is one which transmits back to itself information that is the result of decisions and actions taken by the system, and which leads the system to change its behaviour in pursuit of the goals which it has set itself.

KEY TERMS

- **Cybernetics:** It is the study of feedback and derived concepts such as communication and control in living organisms, machines and organizations.
- **Functionalism:** It is belief in or stress on the practical application of a thing, in particular.
- **System:** System means a configuration of parts connected and joined together by a web of relationships.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. True
2. In the most general sense, system means a configuration of parts interlinked by a network of relationships.
3. Cybernetics is the study of the operation of control and communication systems.
4. David Easton
5. Social evolutionism
6. True
7. Communication
8. Political communication approach, though different from such approach in other disciplines like neurophysiology, mathematics and electrical engineering has been criticized for elaborating an essentially engineering and mechanistic orientation towards human behaviour.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is systems theory?
2. The basic concept used in the elaboration of the general system theory may be put into three categories—what are they?

3. What attributes of a political system did David Easton identify in the direction of a general political theory?
4. What are the three chief characteristics of political development identified by Almond and Powell?
5. What are the three main characteristics of the communication approach adopted by Karl Deutsch?

Long-Answer Questions

1. David Easton's model of political system was a path-breaking model in comparative political analysis. Discuss.
2. Give a comparative analysis of structural functionalism of Almond vis-a-vis the system model of David Easton.
3. Give a summary of communication model as advocated by Karl Deutsch.
4. Describe Almond's structural-functionalist approach to compare political systems?

FURTHER READING

Pruthi, R. K.; *The Political Theory*, Sarup & Sons, India, 2005.

Freedon, M.; *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*, Clarendon Press, Gloucestershire, 1996.

Lively, J. *Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx: Key Debates*, Routledge, UK, 1989.

Arora, N. D. and Awasthy S. S.; *Political Theory and Political Thought*, Har-Anand Publications, India, 2007.

UNIT 4 DECISION-MAKING APPROACH

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Fundamentals of Decision-Making Theory

Decision-Making Approach of Richard Snyder

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Richard Snyder, H. W. Bruck and Burton Sapin had focused on the decision-making theory in the study of international politics during the 1950s. They had undertaken a theoretical exploration of the behaviour of actors in international relations. In the 1960s, writers such as William Riker, James Robinson, Herbert Simon and J. W. Burton significantly contributed to the decision-making theory. In this unit, you will learn about the decision-making approach of Richard Snyder.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Explain the significant elements of decision-making theory
- Discuss the elite theories propounded by different writers
- Explain the important aspects and criticism of group theory

FUNDAMENTALS OF DECISION-MAKING

THEORY

The decision-making approach seeks to study the functioning of states in general and the actual decision makers of the state in particular. It is done through the following processes:

1. Identification of the decision makers
2. Analysis of the decision-making process
3. Search of appropriate and precise methods for comprehending the process as well as international politics

The decision-making approach advocates the use of models for appropriately analysing decisions. Graham T. Allison describes these models as follows:

(i) The rational actor model seeks to assess the policy process on the basis of the ex-post factor reviews of the credibility of the policies pursued.

(ii) The organizational process model is concerned with tapping the administrative and organizational behaviours with the specific aim of comprehending and analysing government decisions, (iii) The government politics model stresses the problems and significance of securing international bureaucratic consensus as an instrument of evolving policy.

The basic inquiry in the decision-making analysis is how and why the national actors behave in the way they do. They focus on the study of the processes' foreign policy formulation. The decision-making approaches used by the decision makers and the state are defined as decisional units. The action of the state is seen through the actions of the decision makers and proceeds with the assumption that the key to political action lies in the way in which decision makers define their situation.

DECISION-MAKING APPROACH OF RICHARD SNYDER

According to Snyder, the state is the prime actor in international politics and its behaviour should always be understood in terms of the objective realities of its position in the world. Its goals and sources of behaviour can be traced to geographical, historical, political and technological circumstances. The goal of the state and its national interests are largely conditioned by the objective circumstances in which the state is situated at a particular time in history.

Snyder's conceptual scheme

Snyder began by presenting the conceptual scheme through the outline of categories based on which the data to study foreign policy decisions should be gathered. Since Snyder's approach comprised mainly of the conceptual scheme, which identified a number of variables to study without relying on theory about their interrelations, propositions for empirical study could not be logically derived from the formulation. This is because they had more formal models, such as those of mathematician-physicist John von Neumann and economist Oskar Morgenstern. Yet, Snyder and his associates put forth a number of hypotheses for empirical work which was based on the conceptual scheme and were easy to study in different contexts by different researchers.

The fact that it brought together the psychological and sociological levels of explanation was one of the greatest merits of the conceptual scheme originated by Snyder. His work sought to bring together the data and theory about individual decision makers as well as groups and organizations in the context within which they operate. Thus, means of explaining the group behaviour in different terms rather than those focussed only on personality are offered. The aim of this work was to bring together the social and psychological levels of analysis so as to augment the ability to predict variance. Yet, a branch of researchers have argued that neither the state of psychology nor that of sociology permits these hypothetical combinations. There was merit in these points of contention due to the fact that only a few political scientists could pursue Lasswell's initiatives to study political personalities and to the continuing separation of experimental social psychologists from field-oriented political scientists. It can be expected that among the most active areas for future research on decision making will be those on interrelation of individual and organizational factors in producing decision outcomes.

Snyder's theory of democratization

The following chain of events has been identified by Snyder, which he says, might happen during the process of democratization:

- (i) Conditions that structure elites' decision of whether to promote nationalism
- (ii) Conditions that structure what type of nationalism will emerge
- (iii) Conditions that structure whether the masses are persuaded by these appeals

Each one of these are discussed in details below:

- (i) Conditions that structure elites' decision of whether to promote nationalism

Two factors are important here: opportunity and motivation.

- **Motivation:** (a) The arrival of full democracy threatens the elites or (b) the institutions of governance are so weak that elites look for a way to mobilize mass support. Nationalism is seen as an effective solution to this because it is seen as the only solution which can save the elites from the dual problems from which they suffer, which are, (1) mobilize mass support and (2) not allowing the government to take over the reign. Thus, the elites can claim to rule "in the name of" the people without allowing rule "by" the people.
- **Opportunity:** Will it be easy to persuade (in other words, elite perceptions steps (2) and (3 —the strength of institutions part)? This is what determines whether nationalism will work or not.

- (ii) Conditions that structure what type of nationalism will emerge

There are three main variables that come into play here. These are the level/ timing of social and economic development (this is drawn heavily from Przeworski et. al.), the adaptability of elite interests to democracy, and the strength of institutions.

- **Development:** In the hindsight, countries that are developed are perhaps doing better because it is these countries that are most likely to make their democratic transitions in a short time. It is installed or slow transitions that nationalism is most likely.
- While poor countries can have nationalist appeals, yet collective action is difficult to sustain. This brings down the risk of sustained nationalist movements.
- There are two worst types of dangers that intermediate levels are in danger of the most: revolutionary or counter-revolutionary nationalism. The reason for this is the fact that a democratic opposition movement can be successful in throwing out the old elite, but the support of both the middle classes and the working classes is not enough to sustain it. Therefore, the revolutionary or counter-revolutionary nationalism come into the play.
- **Adaptability of elite interests:** This is of interest because it affects the first step which is elite motivation. It can be asked if the elites would continue to get their demands in a democracy or do they need to limit it. For instance, in Britain, democracy would only serve to protect the assets of the wealthy elites. Therefore, their interests were 'adaptable' to democracy. At the same time, however, their interests can become unadoptable if elites are fearful that democracy will rob them of their status, power, or riches.
- **Strength of existing political institutions:** When the institutions to run the state are weak, it becomes unavoidable to use nationalism as the tool to mobilize people to act collectively. This is also referred to as revolutionary nationalism. Nationalism is discouraged by strong representative and strong administrative

institutions. This is because it is assumed that they raise a check on nationalist appeals and also provide alternative means to mobilize the masses to take collective action. Despite having a strong administration, institutions that do not represent the masses properly tend to encourage exclusionary nationalism to mobilize support. Nationalist ideas become tempting in the face of weak institutions and they are effective in mobilizing people since there is no other way to bring them together.

- **Four types of nationalism:** Three of these four kinds of nationalism can lead to violence against what are presumed as 'others' (revolutionary, ethnic, counter-revolutionary). The fourth (civic nationalism) does not encourage violence, since it is inclusive.

- o Strong institutions and adaptable interests: Characteristics of civic nationalism

- o Weak institutions and adaptable interests: Characteristics of revolutionary nationalism, which encourages people to mobilize and build the state

- o Strong institutions and unadoptable interests: Characteristics of counterrevolutionary nationalism, which seeks masses to go against the institutions

- o Weak institutions and unadoptable interests: These are characteristics of ethnic nationalism

(iii) Conditions that structure whether the masses are persuaded

The presence of a weak media is supportive in this case. Snyder specifically identifies three conditions which are related to the structure of the 'marketplace of ideas':

- **Control of supply of information:** Early democratization was often referred to the situation where the state does not have the monopoly on information and its institutions, but at the same time where the supply of information is also not completely free. Even in this case it is the elites who have the considerable power over the supply of information. It is believed that this partial monopoly on media or information sources is worse than the complete monopoly of the state on them. For instance, when the media and its institutions are completely under the control of the state, it is not accepted by the people. However, when the competition between the media is minimal, people tend to rely on more without recognizing the extent of distortions.

- **Market segmentation (control of demand for information):** It is believed that if the population is divided for targeted information, then even if the elite only control 50 per cent of the supply of information, it can control all the sources of information in large sections of the country. For instance, it is believed that it was because of a major nationalist supporter who had a near monopoly on the media in half of Germany that Hitler came to power. This was the same 50 per cent that supported Hitler's rise.

- **Journalistic institutions:** Professionalism in journalism, independence, professional think-tank, congressional budget office, and such other institutions are the ones that encourage debates around facts. Without such institutions, it will not be possible to undergo a reliable fact checking and any debate that would follow will be far from enlightening. It, thus, becomes possible to report false facts and news. The media goes spot-free because no one can point

fingers towards misrepresentation of facts. In this case, only misinformation becomes popular as there is no public debate in the media.

How nationalist persuasion causes violent conflict

- By exclusion of groups that encourages enmity (you are disliked if you claim that they are evil)
- Feelings of insecurity are created by portrayal of nation states as more threatening than they really are. At the same time, they are portrayed as weak than they are so that a military solution to this insecurity becomes attractive.
- A log roll is formed by many narrow-interest nationalist veto groups (for example, 'marriage of iron and rye'). In order to obtain their narrow self-interested benefits, this incurs high societal costs.
- While trying to one-up the others, nationalists may get into bidding wars. That they are the strongest defenders of the nation may even become a burden upon the liberals to prove.

Snyder's decision-making framework

According to Snyder, there are two fundamental purposes of the decision-making approach:

- (i) To help identify and isolate the 'crucial structures' in the political realm where action is initiated and carried out and decisions are made.
- (ii) To help analyse systematically the decision-making behaviour, which 'leads to action as well as sustain them'.

Characteristics of the decision-making approach

The decision-making approach involves the study of the following variables:

1. **Decision actors:** The decision-making approach focuses on enquiry of a class of actors called decision-makers because the authoritative action can be decided upon and initiated by public officials who are formally and actually responsible for decisions as well as engaged in the making of decisions.
2. **Decision makers as actors in a situation:** The behaviour of the decision makers has to be studied in terms of action analysis as it is treated in the situation. The analysis is on their perceptions, choices and expectations.
3. **The setting:** The analysis of the nature of the decision-making is done by the researcher who has to recreate the world of decision makers. It is essential to know their view of the environment as well as their situation in which they formulate the decisions. For this the analysis of both the internal as well as the external setting has to be analysed so that the action and policies of the state can be known.

The setting of the foreign policy decision is the one which is perceived by the decision-makers. The setting is conceived as consisting of internal as well as external parts. The internal setting includes personality's roles, organizations in the decision-making unit, the governmental structures within which the decisionmaking functions, the physical and technological conditions, the basic values and goals and the various influences operating in the society. External setting, on the other hand, includes all the relevant factors in the total situation of the international system that exist at a particular time.

However, there are differences of opinion among the advocates of Snyder's approach of decision-making as they emphasize on different factors and follow different details. For instance, Harold and Margaret Sprout emphasize on the environmental (milieu) factor while George Alexander and Gulieete George stress on the personality factor and seeks to study the personality of the decision maker. Harold Lasswell, Gabriel Almond, Hermann, and Milbrath also recognize the importance of the personality factor. Nevertheless, a study of the personality of the decision maker can be helpful to explain things as long as the decision maker continues to shape and control the foreign policy of the nation.

4. **Decision situation:** In Snyder's model, situation is an analytical concept that points to a pattern of relationships among the events, objects, conditions and other actors organized around a focus such as the objective, problem and the course of action in which the center, of interest for the decision makers. It has to be analysed as to whether the situation was certain or uncertain, risky, stressful, crucial, hostile, threatening, short of time or not, tight, controllable or uncontrollable.

5. **Decision process:** Snyder's model gives importance to the study of the decisionmaking process which has been further classified into the following categories:

(i) **Spheres of competence:** It refers to the activities of the decisions makers that are necessary for the achievement of the unit objectives.

(ii) **Communication and information:** It includes meanings, values and preferences available at the time of decision making.

(iii) **Motivation:** It refers to psychological, personality and value factors that influence the actors who enter the process and influence its outcome.

Criticism of the decision-making theory

The decision-making theory is only a partial approach to the study of international politics. It has some serious drawbacks, which can be listed as follows:

- The approach is based on the principle of indeterminism as it fails to suggest which of the elements is really relevant: environment or personality executive or legislature.
- The approach is not value oriented as it does not bother about the correctness of a decision.
- International politics is normally made of highly conscious moves and choices which cannot be analysed in terms of neat categories.
- It ignores the objective nature of international developments along with the facts that the foreign policy of a country does not depend upon an individual or a set of individuals. The foreign policy is determined by the geopolitical realities, the security environment and a lot of other historical, social and economic factors.
- It fails to supply any criteria either to explain the pattern of power politics or to prescribe the rules of international behaviour.

Thus, the usefulness of the decision-making theory is limited to a particular decision which is already taken and implemented and its consequences are already known.

ACTIVITY

Speak to a political science professor of an university and find out how interest groups provide extracurricular activities

for students to participate in educational, intellectual, interdisciplinary as well as cultural and social events.

DID YOU KNOW

The anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), orbitofrontal cortex (and the overlapping ventromedial prefrontal cortex) are brain regions involved in decision-making processes. A recent neuroimaging study found distinctive patterns of neural activation in these regions depending on whether decisions were made on the basis of personal volition or following directions from someone else. Patients with damage to the ventromedial prefrontal cortex have difficulty making advantageous decisions.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- The decision-making approach seeks to study the functioning of states in general and the actual decision makers of the state in particular.
- The basic inquiry in the decision-making analysis is how and why the national actors behave. They focus on the study of the processes' foreign policy formulation.
- The decision-making theory approach is only a partial approach to the study of international politics.
- According to Snyder, the state is the prime actor in international politics and its behaviour should always be understood in terms of the objective realities of its position in the world.
- One of the great merits of the conceptual scheme originated by Snyder was that it joined psychological and sociological levels of explanation.
- The decision-making approach focuses on enquiry of a class of actors called decision makers because the authoritative action can be decided upon and initiated by public officials who are formally and actually responsible for decisions as well as engaged in the making of decisions.
- The behaviour of the decision makers has to be studied in terms of action analysis as it is treated in the situation.
- In Snyder's model, situation is an analytical concept that points to a pattern of relationships among the events, objects, conditions and other actors organized around a focus such as the objective, problem and the course of action in which the center of interest for the decision makers.

KEY TERMS

- **Motivation:** It is a theoretical construct used to explain behaviour.
- **Decision-making:** It can be regarded as the cognitive process resulting in the selection of a belief or a course of action among several alternative possibilities.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Functioning of states, actual decision makers.
2. The basic inquiry in the decision-making analysis is how and why the national actors behave in the way they do.
3. The processes used by the decision-making approach to study the functioning of states in general and the actual decision-makers of the state, in particular, are:
 - (i) Identification of the decision makers
 - (ii) Analysis of the decision-making process
 - (iii) Search of appropriate and precise methods for comprehending the process as well as international politics
4. According to Snyder, there are two fundamental purposes of the decision-making approach:
 - (i) To help identify and isolate the 'crucial structures' in the political realm where action is initiated and carried out and decisions are made.
 - (ii) To help analyse systematically the decision-making behaviour which 'leads to action as well as sustain them'.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES Short-

Answer Questions

1. How has Snyder's model classified the study of decision-making process?
2. List the characteristics of decision-making approach.

Long-Answer Questions

1. State the elements of foreign policy in relation to the decision-making approach.
2. What are the limitations of the decision-making theory?

FURTHER READING

Pruthi, R. K.; *The Political Theory*, Sarup & Sons, India, 2005.

Freedon, M.; *Ideologies and Political Theory: A Conceptual Approach*, Clarendon Press, Gloucestershire, 1996.

Lively, J. *Modern Political Theory from Hobbes to Marx: Key Debates*, Routledge, UK, 1989.

Arora, N. D. and Awasthy S. S.; *Political Theory and Political Thought*, Har-Anand Publications, India, 2007.

UNIT 5 GAME THEORY

Structure

Introduction
Unit Objectives
Game Theory

Usage of Game Theory in International Relations
Security Analysis and Game Theory in International Relations
Game Theory and Economic Relations among Nation-States

Summary
Key Terms
Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
Questions and Exercises
Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

In the last few decades, game theory has become quite popular in the study of international politics. Beginning with economics and mathematics, now it is being used by many in political science to explain the probable behaviour of multiple actors. It has proved its utility in international negotiations and in trade relations among countries.

Game theory is not specific to international relations; it emerged as a branch of mathematics. It was found useful in analysing competitive situations. The outcomes of such situations depend both on one's own choices (and an element of chance), and also on the choices made by other parties or players. As a result, the game is determined by what *all* players do, each participant anticipates the decisions of the other player/s in order to base his own best choices. How these interdependent strategic decisions are taken is the subject of the game theory.

This unit deals with game theory and its application in the realm of international relations.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss how game theory can be used in international relations
- Establish the relationship between game theory and international security analysis

GAME THEORY

Game theory emerged as a popular theory for analysis of behaviour with the publication of *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* in 1944 by John von Neumann (a mathematician) and Oskar Morgenstern (an economist). This was a path-breaking achievement that gave rise to a large number of books and articles in a variety of disciplines. Although it has been widely used in the discipline of international relations, it

has also been regarded as destructive in its calculations. This led to criticisms of game theory in international relations.

D. A. Lake and R. Powell (1994) hold that international relations is the 'study of the interactions themselves rather than of the issues that constitute their substance'. If this view is accepted, then the subject matter of international relations and game theory effectively coincide. International relations then run the risk of becoming an applied branch of game theory, similar to the microeconomic theory being considered as a branch of calculus. This is, however, not true. In order to avoid this, the presence of variables such as international actors, their interactions, the issues negotiated therein, and the specific nature of the interactions themselves need to be highlighted.

Game theory has five important components. First, is the concept of *strategy*. This includes skilful planning of previously decided moves to be taken as and when the expected moves of the other side require them. This strategy takes into account the potential behaviour of opponents and assumes that within the limits of a particular situation, the range of strategy is not infinite. The rational behaviour is that which aims at the selection of a strategy by each player that will maximize the chances of victory. The strategy can be pure or mixed depending upon the number of calculated strategic steps. Thus, game theory assumes an opponent and this is the second important concept of game theory. This sets in the assumption of goals of the game.

The third significant concept of game theory is of *payoffs*, which refers to what the game is worth at the end.

The fourth concept is of *rules* that govern a game. In social and international situations, the rules are the laws governed by geographical, economic, sociological, biological and psychological factors.

The fifth significant concept is *information*. Game theory analyses the conflict essentially in terms of strategy.

British scholar Susan Strange (1991) argues that the two key issues that drive the theory and practice of international relations are: (i) economics and (ii) security. Other important issues include law, education, environmental issues and human rights. Another important dimension in the study of international relations is the interactions that created these relations, which usually transpire along well-defined and predictable lines; unlike those that are usually encountered in interactions among individuals, private entities or different government bodies within nation-states. Diplomacy is the key differentiator as a regular channel for international relations, which does not have an equal in the interactions within nation-states.

Key paradigms of game theory are, as classified by political scientist Steven J. Brams, as follows:

- **Two person versus n-person:** The **two-person game** deals with the optimal strategic choice of two players, whereas the n-person theory (where $n > 2$) addresses which coalitions, or subsets, of players, will form and be stable, and what constitute reasonable results to their members.
- **Zero-sum versus non-zero-sum:** In **zero-sum games**, the payoffs to all players equals zero (or some other constant) at each outcome. This is not the case in **non-zero-sum games**, wherein the sums are variable. Zero-sum games signify total conflict, in which one player's gain is the others' loss; nonzero-sum games, however, permit the players to gain or lose together.
- **Cooperative versus non-cooperative:** In **cooperative games**, players come together to make binding and enforceable agreements, whereas non-

cooperative games may or may not enable communication among the players, but do assume that any agreement reached must be equally beneficial, i.e., a player would not violate it if other players do not, because the player would be worse off if it did.

Brams further elaborates upon the different forms which can be there in games. According to him, there are three most important forms of games:

(a) *Extensive (game tree)*: Explains that there are sequences of choices that players can make, with payoffs defined at the end of each sequence of choices (also possibly determined by chance, nature or some random device).

(b) *Normal/strategic (payoff matrix)*: Indicates strategies or plans which are contingent on the decisions of other players', with payoffs resulting at the intersection of each set of strategies within a matrix.

(c) *Characteristic function*: Indicates the values that all the possible coalitions (subsets) can guarantee for their members, no matter what the other players do. These different forms, or representations, provide progressively reducing information about the game—with the sequences in form 1 dropped from form 2, and the strategies to derive particular outcomes in form 2 dropped from form 3, and so on, to highlight the different aspects of a strategic situation. The premise on which game theory is based is that players are rational. The actors have goals, and they can decide their rank outcomes (or, more stringently, attach utilities, or values, to three them), and choose better over worse outcomes. A basic assumption of this discipline (which, however, is heavily criticized) is that the players are completely self-centred in the pursuit of only their own satisfaction. Game theory finds the closest to real-life examples of its abstract assumptions. This is true no matter whether the interactions are with respect to security or economic issues.

Since the nation-states are self-centred and always try to maximize their interests, there are always more and more complications. These complications stem from the fact that there is usually no dominant, or universally accepted, strategy for a specific player because of the interdependency of players' choices.

A game is the sum-total of its rules. Chess or poker, and other common parlour games, have specific rules and are generally zero-sum games, i.e., cooperating with the other player(s) is not beneficial. Poker differs from chess not only because it is an *n*-person game (though two players can also play it), but also since it is a game of *incomplete information*, i.e., the players do not have complete knowledge of each other's hands, and therefore depend in part on chance.

The rules of most real-life games are equivocal. In fact, the 'game' may be largely about the rules to be used (or abrogated). Rules are generally better known and followed in economics than in politics. It is for this reason that game theory has become the theoretical foundation of economics, especially microeconomics. However, models of game theory have a major role in some other sub-fields of economics including industrial organizations, public economics, and international economics. Even in the area of macroeconomics, wherein fiscal and monetary policies are studied, issues such as setting interest rates and determining money supply have a strong underlying strategic component, particularly when it comes to the timing of such actions. Economics uses game theory at all levels—more than any other discipline.

There are broadly two types of games used in international politics, one is the *chicken game*, and the other is the *game of prisoners' dilemma*. A situation of the

chicken game can be defined by the example of two car drivers. There are two car drivers going in the middle of a road towards each other. If both of them keep on driving in the same direction, a head-on collision is inevitable. But if both of them swerve to avoid a possible collision, they are likely to suffer only from a loss of reputation for not undertaking adventurous actions. On the other hand, if both continue to drive straight, they are likely to face death or serious injury as a result of the collision. If one of them swerved and the other did not, the one who swerved was likely to suffer a loss of prestige and the other person was likely to earn esteem.

The principle characteristic of the chicken game situation is that in spite of not being able to know the interactions of its opponents, a nation can adopt such a course of action as would guarantee its own interests, if only it does not mind the opponent also benefitting from that course of action.

The prisoners' dilemma, on the other hand, does not permit any such possibility. The in-charge of a prison tells the two prisoners that if one of them confesses to a murder, which the two prisoners' have allegedly committed, he would not only be set free but would also be rewarded and the other would be hanged. If none of them confesses to the crime, they would both be freed without reward. But if both of them confess they would both receive serious punishment. Both the prisoners are told to think about it and inform the prison in-charge of the decision the next morning. The difficulty is that they are not allowed to communicate with each other. If one of them decides to confess the crime, he would of course be freed and given a reward. But there is a danger that the other prisoner might also do the same, in which case ultimately both would receive severe punishment.

Similarly, if one of the prisoners decides to deny the allegiance of committing the crime, the risk is that the other prisoner might confess the crime in which case the first prisoner would be convicted and the second would be set free and given a reward. Thus, the only way in which each of the two prisoners can avoid punishment and be freed is that each of them should independently tell the prison in-charge that he has not committed the crime. But this is possible when each of them is convinced that the other would not behave differently and when both of them prefer their acquittal to the temptation of any reward.

The users of game theory in international politics create a model of this game and then try to apply it to the study of international politics. In such models, nations are treated as players competing for the fulfilment of the national interest in the same manner as in a game the players take their turns in order to get victory. The object of a game of chess is to have as many pieces possible at the end of the game. If a player has a smaller number of pieces, he shall be deemed to have lost and the one who scores the highest number of pieces would be deemed to have won.

Game-theoretic modelling has progressed significantly in the area of political science, including international relations. While international politics is reasonably anarchistic, certain constancy does prevail in the way conflicts develop and may, or may not, be resolved. Arms races, for instance, are usually non-zero-sum games as two nations can benefit if they reach some agreement on limiting weapons. However, such agreements are often hard to verify or enforce and may therefore be unstable.

Since the breakdown of the hegemony of the superpowers in the 1990s, the interest of the academicians has moved from looking at the possibility of a new 'balance of power', which has emerged rationally or globally. It is almost similar to the political

struggle in the 19th and 20th centuries Europe. For example, one can ask if China, being the Asian superpower, align itself with other significant countries in its neighbourhood like India and Japan or will it join hands with Western powers to compete against its own neighbours. The tools to explore the stability of new alignments are offered by the game theory, including those that might be developed on the political and economic platforms.

Some of the serious challenges the World Trade Organization (WTO) has been battling are from the different regional trading agreements that have come up in the states of America, Europe and Asia. The game theory can provide assistance in making the strategic decision regarding whether or not to lend support to the WTO, or to be a part of the regional trading bloc. Game theory can also help clear doubts about ways in which the internal politics of a country can influence its foreign policy and vice versa; this has resulted in renewed interest in exploring how these two levels of politics are interrelated.

The game theory offers many other applications in the discipline of political science. These include those that have been developed towards strategic voting in panels and polls, the formation and disintegration of parliamentary coalitions as well as the dispensation of power in weighted voting panels.

Based on game-theoretic analysis, it was found that poll reforms that were proposed lessened the power of some parties on the normative side, like the religious parties in Israel. In the same manner, the voting weights of European Union Council of Ministers members and its decisions pertaining to taking action (for instance simple majority or qualified majority) were explored with an eye to make the body more participatory, of representing the interests of the individual members as well as competent of taking collective action.

In political science, game theory models have become more popular and have at the same time received a great number of criticisms. One of the common criticisms pertains to the argument that its theory is abstract in nature and is removed from strategic situations. Thus, it reduces the players to a position of over rationalism or bloodless automatons and prevents it from reflecting upon the emotions or social situations of people who are involved in conflicts. As per other critics, the game theory models cannot be easily tested empirically. This is so because they are partially dependent on counterfactual events which cannot be observed. That is, it is assumed that players keep in mind those contingencies which cannot be reconstructed or be precisely modeled. However, the supporters of game theory argue that it brings such a method to the study of strategic choices which cannot be matched by any other theory. They further argue that all actors basically make rational choices, i.e. they will naturally choose those means which are good over the worse ones, even of the goals that they seek to meet are not always apparent.

'Bayesian calculations', which take account of the situation when complete information is not available, can be used. It can help analyze the range of different goals that players may possibly have as well as assess their consequences. In real-life settings, such reconstructions are very difficult to make. However, laboratory experiments, which offer conditions that can be controlled, are being conducted more frequently. Experiments that test and prove theories of bargaining, voting, and other politico-economic processes have in fact become frequent in the disciplines of economics and political science. While it is not common in other disciplines of social sciences, social psychology has also used experiments to explore the choices of players in many games, including *prisoners' dilemma*.

This is an infamous game which describes a situation where two players do not intend to cooperate, including arms race or a price war. However, by following this approach an outcome that is worse for both is reached than it would have been had the two players cooperated because mutual cooperation is not 'Nash equilibrium'. Yet, each of the players has the incentive to not cooperate. Some of the other confusing problems confront the players in another well-known game, *chicken*. While non-cooperation leads to a disastrous outcome, cooperation is clearly unstable. It is expected that each player defects only in the situation where the other player cooperates, however, anticipating when an opponent will do so is not easy.

Usage of Game Theory in International Relations

The use of mathematical tools in the international relations theory has increased over the last few decades, especially with the emergence of trade negotiations or environmental negotiations. The early statistical work emphasized that international security, especially the causes and consequences of war. More recent work has addressed a remarkably wide array of topics and has shed considerable light on some of the most heated debates in the field. There are many fields in which game theory has contributed to the understanding of international relations such as security analysis, economic relations trade, and so on.

Game Theory and the behaviour of actors

There have been many attempts to explain the behaviour of state actors in international politics. The decision-making theory was a popular theoretical tool to give explanations of the actions of the actors. One long-standing assumption of the realist approach with respect to international relations is that nation-states are motivated only by their own interests. Realists also assume that nation-states consider the needs and interests of other nation-states only when the latter are strong enough to enforce their demands through threat or by performing damaging actions. This implies that nation-states are not guided by ethics or humanitarian considerations, and that international law, treaties and other formalized agreements do not limit the international activities of nation-states. In such cases, actors have a major role to play. However, much more advanced technique-based attempts are made in game theory.

A basic assumption of game theory is that the actors involved in social interactions are self-centred and work only towards their need and satisfaction. The closest real-life example of the abstract of game theory can be found in the nation-states, both in terms of their interactions for security or economic issues. Nation-states are usually selfish and take into considerations of other nation-states only when the latter is strong (i.e., if it is more powerful and can take damaging actions). This shows that the driver of the respective powers of the different nation-states is one of the main concerns of the theory of international relations.

The game theory assumptions have still been criticized by Steven J. Brams' *Theory of Moves*. According to this theory, game theory pays scant attention to the actual determinants of the actions that are available to the players. It simply assumes that these actions or choices are known and that the players can freely choose from among them without restriction, guided only by their preferences. The determinants of the choices that are available to the players are not studied in the game theory. More importantly, one of the most important factors influencing the actions available to nation-states in the

theory of international relations, i.e., the determinants of power, also receives scant attention in game theory.

Security Analysis and Game Theory in International Relations

A detailed analysis of the formation of international alliances has been presented by Gardner (1995). The focus of the first is on the rational distribution of defense costs among nation states who are interested in defending themselves from a common enemy. The most simplified way in which this decision is made is based upon the length of the boundary of a particular nation state and the direct contact it has with the territory of the enemy. However, it is an implicit assumption of this study that all the nation-states, which are part of this group, will equally benefit from the protection given by the alliance. It is further assumed that all the member nation states will contribute their resources and their capabilities for the protection of each one of them. These weaknesses are not considered. In the second analysis, the situation that prevailed in Bosnia around 1993 is examined and it was concluded that no alliance any of the warring factions (Serbs, Croats and Muslims) could have provided sustainable peace. Yet, the prevalent need for foreign forces and support in this area supports Gardner's theoretical conclusions.

Professor Robert Powell (1999) has conducted a systematic study of the alliances by using the techniques put forth in the game theory. He has explored the interactions between three nation states, out of which two are in direct conflict and the brink of war while the third is yet to decide which side to take. The conclusions he reaches comment on the different choices that the nation states could make and the possible war/peace outcomes that different decisions can lead to. Adding to this, numerous additional factors related to the alliances between the nation-states can be explored with the usage of tools of cooperative game theory.

Steven J. Brams, Ann E. Doherty and Matthew L. Weider (1994) and Alan D. Taylor (1995) also developed and put forth a method to make an index of the kind of power that each member of an alliance has, to influence the affairs of the whole alliance. This was applied to the analysis of the European Union.

Economist Michael D. Intriligator (1994) also used the cooperative game theory and put forward a discussion on the difficulties as well as the possibilities that the nation states have once they start cooperating with each other. It is then applied to the analysis of relationships among China, the European Community, Japan, the Soviet Union and the US (involving both bilateral and multilateral states). The conclusion that he reached differed from those that were earlier accepted by the game theory as a tool for the analysis of international relations.

Analysis of War Politics

War analysis as well as factors with which peace can be achieved is one of the most significant areas of studies of international relations. From Realism period to the Marxists, scholars all of schools of thought have been concerned with international relations. Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham (1998) have argued: 'The idea that violence and war are intrinsic parts of the international system is the distinctive hallmark of realism.' At the same time, Chris R. Mitchell (1985) has opined that the great complexity of the phenomenon of war is reflected in the analysis of the causes initiation, process, and consequences in its economic, political, social and military aspects. Due to these multiple

complexities involved in the politics of war, there is no one complete and comprehensive theory available.

In his research, Barry O'Neil (1994) has tried to cover and bring together the numerous game-theoretic studies that focus on different aspects of war and peace. Attention is given only to military issues in the game theoretical analysis of war. Breaking this down further, this analysis assumes that nation states are already in the situation of conflict. Their objective is to attack the other but at the same time have to defend and protect themselves from the other. Keeping this analysis in mind, two kind of game theory analysis for war have been developed.

In the first kind of analysis, what is studied is the decision to launch the attack first or to wait and respond when attacked. The decision to attack first or to wait and respond when attacked is studied in the first type of analysis. William Poundstone (1992) has argued that this sort of analysis was very useful during the time of the Cold War since nuclear weapons were being progressively developed and delivered. It was, thus agreed upon that the first strike on the USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) was the most recommended policy (at least by several distinguished and influential personalities) since the United States had the monopoly on nuclear weapons and other such related systems.

The relevance of this policy, however, came under the scanner after the USSR developed its own nuclear weapons and the capability of not only surviving the first strike but also respond in an equally damaging responsive strike. Taylor (1995) has formalized the situation mentioned above in a simplified model in which each of the two states involved in conflict in this analysis adopt the following two strategies—the first and second strikes.

Game Theory and Economic Relations among Nation-States

The realist theory draws heavily upon the conflict and power games among various nation states. On the other hand, the liberal school of thought emphasises the cooperation between different countries, especially economic cooperation. Strange (1991) has argued that economic and trade relations among countries are part of the subject matter of international relations as well. On the other hand, Philip A. Reynolds (1994) has opined that the power of the nation states to protect themselves from outside forces and yet survive depends to a large extent on their economic strength.

However, despite its growing significance, the political relevance of economic relationship between nation states has been ignored in the academia. In fact, this area has become a matter of interest for economists only. McMillan (1986) has presented a long list of factors that determine what can be referred to as international economics. The game theory broadly deals with two aspects of international economic relations. These are: factors that lead to agreements between nation states and secondly, international trade relations.

The most significant feature in economic relations among nation-states is agreements pertaining to economic cooperation. This can take the shape of many concrete factors such as formation of economic unions and lead towards pursuing more definite and long-term economic as well as political objectives than what are pursued by security alliances. Different unions among nation states, like the OPEC, have very limited goals. They are differentiated by the fact the main goal of the members is to show to the world that they stand united, without really changing their patterns of interaction.

At the same time, there are many economic and political agreements which are characterized by increasing the interdependence of the member nation states upon each other. These kinds of agreements, ordered by increasing comprehensiveness, include the ones which are most favoured like nation agreements, trade blocs, free trade associations, custom unions, common markets, and integrations or unifications. Most likely, all of these agreements comprise of and also expand upon what was in the previous agreement.

Even before the development of the game theory, the economists' studies of international trade were being undertaken. Yet, as has been argued by Jepma, Jager and Kamphuis (1996), even the first formal theory of international trade - also referred to as mercantilism - explored the relationships among those nation states which were trading with each other by clearly using the game theoretic approaches. However, such a point of view, where simply only two nation-states are considered, is a simplified one and leads researcher to conclude that what is the gain of one is the loss of the other. It is concluded from this analysis that the zero-sum games which are used to explore battles and war could be applied to the study of the mercantilist theory of international trade. Yet, since this theory is not considered valid in the present times, this has not been followed in detail.

There are unrestricted trade benefits for all the nation states involved in such agreements. This is so because each country can specialize in producing those goods in which it has the strategic advantage over the others. That free trade should be made a rule in international economic relations is a conclusion from the previous analysis. Morrow (1994) has argued that if one of the two partners enforces a tax duty, it will lead to the gain in benefits which are above the level of free trade. This will automatically bring down the benefits that the other trading partner makes, who will also in such a case try to correct the imbalance by levying a tariff. This kind of struggle is the trade counterpart of arms races and can be further explored with the usage of *prisoners' dilemma* game. This is a simplified model which can be and has been extended substantially.

The real weakness of game theory is that it can be applied with some success only to the cases of two persons, zero sum games but in international politics such instances are very few. Most often there are multiple actors involved in various issues. Thomas Schelling has questioned the validity of game theory in its 'zero sum' form. His main objection is that game theory in this form has contributed very little to problems like limited war, deterrence, surprise attacks, atomic blackmail and massive retaliation.

According to Schelling, the essence of international politics lies in the conflict and mutual dependence which demands some kind of cooperation or accommodation between the contending parties. In other words, the choice of a national actor depends to a very large extent on what it expects from other nations. Schelling believes that since the range of alternatives is very large, bargaining becomes necessary. He maintains that if bargaining is to result in the convergence of mutually consistent expectation, there should be suggestive clues exchanged by the parties and the collaboration and promise or threat.

ACTIVITY

Analyse the importance of game theory in the current international political scenario.

DID YOU KNOW

One-person games are also called games against nature. Having no opponents, the player merely requires listing available options and selecting the optimal outcome. In the case of chance being involved the game might seem more complicated, but in principle the decision remains relatively simple. For instance, a person deciding whether to carry an umbrella analyses the costs and benefits of carrying or not carrying it. While this person may make the wrong decision, there does not exist a conscious opponent. In other words, nature is presumed to be absolutely indifferent to the player's decision, and the person's decision can be based on simple probabilities. One-person games are of little interest for game theorists.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Game theory has become quite popular in the study of international politics in the last few decades. Beginning with economics and mathematics, now it is being used by many in political science in order to explain the probable behaviour of multiple actors. It has proved its utility in international negotiations, and in trade relations among countries.
- Game theory emerged as a popular theory for analysis of behaviour with the publication of *Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* in 1944 by John von Neumann (a mathematician) and Oskar Morgenstern (an economist). This was a path-breaking achievement that gave rise to a large number of books and articles in a variety of disciplines.
- Lake and Powell (1994) highlight that international relations is the study of the interactions themselves rather than of the issues that constitute their substance.
- There are broadly two types of games used in international politics, one is the *chicken game*, and the other is the *game of prisoners' dilemma*.
- The principle characteristic of the chicken game situation is that in spite of not being able to know the interactions of its opponents, a nation can adopt such a course of action as would guarantee its own interests, if only it does not mind the opponent also benefitting from that course of action. The prisoners' dilemma, on the other hand, does not permit any such possibility.
- As game-theoretic models have become more prominent in political science, they have received a great number of criticisms at the same time. A common criticism is that the theory abstracts too much from strategic situations, thereby reducing the players to over-rational or bloodless automatons, and that this is not reflective of the emotions or social circumstances of people involved in the conflicts.
- A basic assumption of game theory is that the actors involved in social interactions are completely self-centred and in pursuit only of their own satisfaction. Game theory finds the closest real-life examples of its abstract constructs in the nation-states.

- Unlike the realist theory which pays heavy attention to the conflict and powergame among the states, the liberal school of thought emphasizes more on the cooperation aspect especially on the aspects of economic cooperation among the states.

KEY TERMS

- **Payoff:** It is the return on an investment or a bet.
- **Zero-sum game:** In game theory and economic theory, a zero-sum game is a mathematical representation of a situation in which a participant's gain (or loss) of utility is exactly balanced by the losses (or gains) of the utility of the other participant(s).
- **Nations state:** A nation state is a geographical area that can be identified as deriving its political legitimacy from serving as a sovereign nation.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Game theory is found very useful in analysing competitive situations. The outcomes of such situations depends both, on one's own choices (and an element of chance), and also on the choices made by other parties, or 'players'. As the result, the game is determined by what *all* players do, each participant anticipates the decisions of the other players in order to base its own best choices.
2. Game theory has five important components: (i) strategy, (ii) opponent, (iii) payoffs, (iv) rules, and (v) information.
3. According to Brams, the three forms of games are the following:
 - (a) Extensive (game tree), which explains that there are sequences of choices that players can make, with payoffs defined at the end of each sequence of choices (also possibly determined by chance, nature or some random device).
 - (b) Normal/strategic (payoff matrix), which indicates strategies or plans which are contingent on the decisions of other players', with-payoffs resulting at the intersection of each set of strategies within a matrix.
 - (c) Characteristic function, which indicates the values that all the possible coalitions (subsets) can guarantee for their members, no matter what the other players do.
4. chicken game, game of prisoners' dilemma
5. Alliance
6. False

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What are the key paradigms of game theory?
2. List the five major components of game theory

3. Write a short note on security analysis and game theory in international relations.
4. What are the two types of games used in international politics?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Assess the significance of game theory in international politics.
2. Write a short note on game theory and economic relations among nation-states.

FURTHER READING

Curtis, Michael. *The Great Political Theories, Vol. 2.* New York: HarperCollins. 1976.

Hoffman, John and Paul Graham. *An Introduction to Political Theory.* Second Edition, New Jersey: Longman. 2009.

McCartney, Nolan and Adam Meirowitz. *Political Game Theory: An Introduction.* London: Cambridge University Press. 2007.



INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University

Institute of Distance Education

Rajiv Gandhi University

A Central University

Rono Hills, Arunachal Pradesh

Contact us:



+91-98638 68890



Ide Rgu



Ide Rgu



helpdesk.ide@rgu.ac.in



**INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION** **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University

Institute of Distance Education Rajiv Gandhi University

A Central University

Rono Hills, Arunachal Pradesh

Contact us:

 +91-98638 68890

 Ide Rgu

 Ide Rgu

 helpdesk.ide@rgu.ac.in