



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



MAPOLS-505

Modern Political Analysis -II

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

4th Semester

Rajiv Gandhi University

www.ide.rgu.ac.in

MODERN POLITICAL ANALYSIS- II

MA [Political Science]
[Fourth semester]
MAPOLS 505



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: 1,9.0-9.1,9.2,9.5r9.9)

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. Revised Edition 2021.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

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

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: 571, Masjid Road, Jangpura, New Delhi 110 014

• Website: www.vikaspubtshing.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 1.5 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 1 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-II

UNIT 1: Political Culture and Political Socialization

- Political culture - Meaning, Determinants and Typology
- Political Socialization - Meaning and Agents

Unit 1: Political Culture and
Political Socialization

UNIT 2: Political Development

- Meaning and Determinants (Liberal approach)
- Meaning and Determinants (Marxist approach)

Unit 2: Political Development

UNIT 3: Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

- Genesis, Application and Relevance

Unit 3: Centre-Periphery and
Dependency Model

UNIT 4: Social Change: Concept and Approaches

- Approaches (Evolutionary and Structural)

Unit 4: Social Change

UNIT 5: Political Modernization: Concepts and Approaches

- David Apter
- Lucian Pye
- Sidney Barva

Unit 5: Political Modernization

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

UNIT 1 POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Political Culture

Meaning

Determinants of Political Culture

Typology of Political Culture

Political Socialization: Meaning and Agents

Political Sociology

Agents of Political Socialization

Socio-political Explanation of Political Stability

Socio-Political Change

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

UNIT 2 POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Political Development

Liberal Approaches to Political Development

Marxist Approach: Meaning and Determinants

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

UNIT 3 CENTRE-PERIPHERY AND DEPENDENCY MODEL

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Genesis of the Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

Application of the Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

Relevance of the Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

UNIT 4 SOCIAL CHANGE

Introduction

Unit Objectives

- Social Change - Concept

- Social Change - Revolutionary Approach

4.3.1 Patterns of Social Change

- Structural Approach to Social Change

Nature of Social Change

4.4.2 Forms of Social Change

Interrelationship between Change and Development

Change in Structure and Change of Structure

- Summary

- Key Terms

- Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

- Questions and Exercises

- Further Reading

UNIT 5 POLITICAL MODERNIZATION

Introduction

- Unit Objectives

- Political Modernization: Basic Concepts

- David Apter's Analysis

- Lucian Pye's Analysis

Sidney Verba's Analysis

- 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: Explores the concepts of political culture and political socialization.

Unit 2: Familiarizes you with the idea of political development.

Unit 3: Covers the Centre-Periphery and Dependency model.

Unit 4: Describes the concepts and approaches associated with social change.

Unit 5: Discusses concept and approaches in relation to political modernization.

UNIT 1 POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICALSOCIALIZATION

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Political Culture

Meaning

Determinants of Political Culture

Typology of Political Culture

Political Socialization: Meaning and Agents

Political Sociology

Agents of Political Socialization

Socio-political Explanation of Political Stability

Socio-Political Change

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Political sociology is concerned with the social circumstances of politics, i.e., how politics is shaped and how it shapes other events across societies. On the whole, it forms an integral component of sociology. Broadly conceived, political sociology is the study of power and domination in social relationships. It tries to identify and interpret various intersections between politics and society. Political sociology highlights the problems of state and societal relations and constructs empirical studies regarding the exercise of power, both within and between states. Further, it analyses the role of political institutions in social development. Traditionally, it has been concerned with relations between the society and the state. Political sociology may be distinguished in this respect from political science, which takes politics much more directly as its object of study and is, therefore, more concerned with government and the state. Both political sociology and political theory are concerned with the empirical study of politics and also with conceptual definitions. Both disciplines have, therefore, been engaged in defining that domain of politics on which traditional sociology and political science have been based. This unit specifically deals with political culture and political socialization.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss political culture, its determinants and typology
- Explain the concept of political socialization

POLITICALCULTURE

The concept of 'political culture' emerged from the wave of democratization studies and the seminal study was *The Civic Culture* (1913) by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. Here, they studied five democratic societies and concluded that a nation's political culture exerted an independent influence on social and political behaviour.

In 1915, a group of area specialists published their comparative study of the political systems of select countries in Africa

(Egypt and Ethiopia), America (Mexico), Asia (India, Japan), Europe (England, Germany, Italy) and Eurasia (Soviet Russia and Turkey) in the form of a book *Political Culture and Political Development*. It was edited by Lucian Pye and Sidney Verba and dedicated to Gabriel Almond, who was the guiding force behind the endeavour. This work epitomized the 'political culture' approach. The concept of political culture was based on the observation on Gabriel Almond that 'every political system is embedded in a particular pattern of orientation to political actions'.

The concept of political culture, thus suggests that the traditions of a society, the spirit of its public institutions, the passions and the collective reasoning of its citizenry, and the style and operating codes of its leaders are not just random products of historical experience but fit together as a part of a meaningful whole and constitute an intelligible web of relations. For the individual, the political culture provides controlling guidelines for effective political behaviour, and for the collectivity it gives a systematic structure of values and rational considerations which ensures coherence in the performance of institutions and organizations.

Political culture does not refer to the formal or informal structures of political interaction, i.e., the study of governments, political parties, pressure groups or cliques. Instead, it refers to the system of beliefs about patterns of political interaction and political institutions. It does not refer so much to what is happening in politics as much as what people believe is happening. Political culture, therefore, is an important link between political events and people's reactions to those events. It studies the fundamental political beliefs of the people because these are particularly relevant to understanding social change as well as political stability.

The study of political culture has had a long history before American political scientists began studying different areas of the world. Though it could be even traced back to the Ancient Greeks, scholars such as Gabriel Almond, Sidney Verba et al. derived their inspiration from Montesquieu, Tocqueville and Walter Bagehot. Although the political culture approach provides a subjective orientation to the study of politics, it is but one aspect of the study of the political system.

The concept of political culture helps one to separate the cultural aspects of politics from other forms of culture. It ties the study of political beliefs to the sociological and anthropological works on culture and focuses attention on basic values, cognitions and emotional commitments. The study of political culture also leads to political socialization, because the manner in which political knowledge is learnt or transmitted from one generation to the next determines the political culture of a system.

Besides the work of Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba on political culture, there are others who have worked on the same theme since the decade the 1910s. The earliest is that of Eckstein, who studied how culture could play a role in political change. This tendency is known as the 'authority-culture' theory. Aaron Wildavsky analysed political culture on the basis of the grid-group approach and developed a typology of cultures. These types were based on social relations and the values they exemplified. The most recent works that update the field are those of Ronald Inglehart and Robert Putnam.

Meaning

Political culture stands for the basic attitudes of people towards politics, policy and the polity. Political culture analysis investigates the implications of ethnicity, religion and value orientations for government, polity and governance. Political culture is part of the more general phenomenon of culture, for which there are several definitions in social sciences, focusing upon different phenomena: mind, behaviour or artifacts. One definition reads: 'The political culture of a society consists of the system of empirical beliefs, expressive symbols, and values which defines the situation in which political action takes place.'

For sociologists and anthropologists, culture constitutes 'ways of life'. Political sociologists tend to focus more upon culture as attitudes or belief systems. According to Almond and Powell, 'political culture is the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations towards politics among the members of a political system'. A.R. Ball defines political culture as 'the set of the attitudes, beliefs and values of society that relates to the political system and to the issues'. Lucian Pye describes political culture as 'the set of attitudes, beliefs and sentiments that give order and meaning to a political process and that provides the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behaviour in the political system'. In the words of Dennis Kavanaugh, 'political culture may be defined as the shorthand expression to denote the emotional and attitudinal environment within which the political system operates'.

Determinants of Political Culture

There are three components of political culture that can be derived on the basis of the definitions, which have been discussed above. These are:

- (i) Cognitive orientation
- (ii) Affective orientation
- (iii) Evaluative orientation

The knowledge of the political system, whether exact or not, are referred to as cognitive orientations. Those orientations that imply feelings towards political objects, like attachment, involvement, rejection and others, are known as affective orientations. On the other hand, those that indicate towards judgments and opinions towards political objects or such events are called evaluative orientations.

Approaches towards elements of political culture: Discussing Almond, Verba et. al.

- The collective history of a political system produces what is called a political culture and also the life histories of those individuals who are part of the system.
- On the basis of those variables which are common to political sociology, the theories of political culture act as a bridge between behavioural approaches of political science and their macro analysis.
- Political ideology, national ethos and spirit, national political psychology, and the fundamental values of the people are studied systematically as part of political culture.
- Non-political behaviour, such as feelings of basic trust in human relations, orientations towards time and the possibility of progress, are also examined under political culture.

- Political culture is learnt from active training in citizenship as well as the day-to-day working of a political system. It needs to be rationally understood and its concepts articulated well.
- Emotional dimension is also a part of political culture, including attributes such as loyalty towards community and geography.
- The structure and meaning to the political sphere is provided by political culture and thus this approach is important. Political culture studies a political system in totality and includes micro and macro analysis.

Source: Pye and Verba, eds., *Political Culture and Political Development*

Mapping levels of political culture

Citizens' are oriented towards a nation's political culture at three levels. These are:

- (i) The political system
- (ii) The political process
- (iii) Policy outputs and outcomes.

At the level of the political system, it is the citizens' and leaders' views on the values and organizations that comprise the system. The expectations about the working and functioning of politics comprise the political process. The citizens' and leaders' expectations of policy from the government are included in the policy level.

Culture of alienation

Alienation has become an important aspect of the empirical research into public opinion. It is discussed as under. The concept of alienation is fundamentally diffused in nature. However, its larger focus is on examining the processes, both social and psychological, which can cause withdrawal or disengagement with the activities in politics or participation in these activities. One of its broader categories is political apathy, which includes both alienation and a disinterest in politics which is socially inherited. Additionally, research carried out in this area till now does not suggest any definition or statement on the rise or decline in political alienation. Instead, it points towards social groups which are most susceptible to alienation, including youth, minorities as well as intellectuals. The researches are relevant for they highlight the processes through which a person becomes alienated. Studies argue that alienation is not a 'steady state' but an

orientation which can be reversed, whether gradually or suddenly, to produce direct intervention which is outside the usual channels of political action.

Political alienation

In the contemporary societies, alienation is much debated apprehension. Given its nature, alienation is an intriguing concept and is a source of intense conceptual analysis and research. This concept has been used across disciplines such as philosophy, psychology and sociology. Nowadays, it is being used actively in political sociology as well. Since it is an aspect of social life, especially in industrial societies, the concept draws heavily from the work of social scientists of the nineteenth century, such as Emile Durkheim and Karl Marx. The concept possesses different possible dimensions even when applied generally to social phenomena, such as powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and isolation.

The dimensionality of the concept of political alienation has been debated by numerous scholars, including Citrin, McClosky, Shanks, Sniderman, Seeman and Finifter.

Since there are many perspectives related to alienation, a multi-dimensional concept has been created, especially in the different contexts within which it is studied (Pearlin, 1912; McClosky and Schaar, 1915; Neal and Rettig, 1917; Holian, 1972; Neal and Groat, 1974). Philosophers and sociologists, and several other writers have related the concept to different human 'states' like powerlessness, apathy, loneliness and loss of values. However, it is not limited to these states. Josephson and Josephson (1912) have argued that the concept is related to the feelings of an individual, like his/her state of dissociation. On the other hand, *Oliver Wendell* Holms, the author of *The Common Law*, is of the opinion that alienation is comprised of an incongruity in social conditions when it is expressed. Therefore, succinctly, 'alienation' can be referred to as estrangement, aloofness, apathy, indifference, cutting off or keeping away from someone or from something. To conclude, we can say that alienation may refer to:

- A state of estrangement or separation which is objective
- State of mind which is motivated by feeling of estrangement
- The state of feeling of estranged personality.

It is in the following context that the term 'separation' can be used:

- Separation between the self and the objective world
- Separation between the self and the self
- Those aspects of the self and the aspects of the self that have become separated and placed over against the self.

Alienated labour can be referred to as an example.

The various dimensions of political alienation are: (i) Political powerlessness (ii) Political meaninglessness (iii) Political normlessness (iv) Political isolation

Evolved at the University of Michigan, a model of political behaviour explains political powerlessness. It refers to an individual's belief that he/she does not have the power or influence to change government's actions. This has been termed under the Michigan Model as 'efficacy'. In the same vein, 'political meaninglessness' is referred to as the discernment of an individual that politics cannot be predicted. These are two dimensions of political behavior which materialize to be termed as external and internal efficacy in political liberation in an operational sense. When it is believed that the rules which were made to govern political relations have broken down, it is referred to as political normlessness. In the end, political isolation hints as rejection of those political norms and objectives that are commonly shared in a particular society.

Typology of Political Culture

Elazar's political culture typology has divided state political culture into the following three dominant categories:

(i) Moralistic political culture: It is by commitment to public good and concern for public welfare that the moralists evaluate their government. Constructive changes are encouraged by communal power, whether governmental or non-governmental, but at the same time it puts moral obligations on public officials. Citizen's participation in the political

process is encouraged by democracy. The moralists, by their very nature, put emphasis on greater participation in government activities, whether politically, economically or socially.

(ii) Individualist political culture: The emphasis of individualists is on private concerns and they work towards limiting community involvement in political activities. To control the government, politicians attempt to control distribution of favours. It is through politics that they seek to better their condition socially, economically, and politically. In this case, public good and welfare is not the prerogative since much of politics centres around the initiative of individual and his control. Democracy functions as a marketplace in this case, where politicians rely on public demand but are guided by strictly by utilitarianism. However, public good is eclipsed since community activity is limited and individual initiative results are encouraged since a marketplace emerges and private players become active.

(iii) Traditionalist political culture: As the name suggests, the traditionalists focus towards maintaining the existing social order. In this case, a social hierarchy is entrenched and those who are at the top of this hierarchy dominate politics and government. Under this system such public participation is discouraged which can undermine those who are politically powerful. Traditionalists do not make any attempt to promote public participation as their main motive is continuation of the status quo. Like moralists, individualists believe that government is a constructive force in society, but its powers are limited to the elite few. Hierarchical control and established elite power-holders are preferred by traditionalists.

Within the states, however, these three mentioned dominant political cultures can overlap. Research indicates that it is difficult to name an entire state which has one dominant political culture. This necessitates formation of political subcultures. These comprise of combinations of the dominant political cultures in states. A nine-point categorization of political culture was developed by Sharkansky as part of quantification of Elazar's typology.

POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION: MEANING AND AGENTS

It is said, 'citizens are not born, but created.' Political socialization is concerned with the learning of political response, of absorbing preferences, and in a sense, with the wide problems of allegiance to and alienation from the body politic. Effective political participation is possible only if citizens are trained for political tasks at all levels. The virtues of a good citizen must be inculcated in children through schooling for which teachers should be sufficiently enabled. Great care should be advanced in the drafting of curricula so that students are not indoctrinated rather taught to think and act critically and responsibly. The key strands of an informed curriculum for creating effective citizens should have at least the three following features:

- (i) Knowledge and understanding about becoming an informed citizen
- (ii) Developing skills of enquiry and communication
- (iii) Developing skills of participation and responsible action

Political socialization is a concept concerning the 'study of the developmental processes by which children and adolescents acquire political cognition, attitudes and behaviours'. It refers to a learning process by which norms and behaviour acceptable to a well running political system are transmitted from one generation to another. It is through the performance of this function that individuals are inducted into the political culture and their orientations towards political objects are formed.

Political socialization is the process of transmission of the country's political culture from one generation to the next. This is learned but not conscious effort. It is adopted unconsciously during the course of interaction. It is a natural process that goes on throughout life. It is a result of complementary nature of different political institutions. The stability of a political system totally depends upon the adequacy of political socialization. Political socialization may have two forms: (i) direct or manifest and (ii) indirect or latent. Direct or **manifest political socialization** refers to the process in which the content of the transmitted information, values or feelings is clearly political. Hence, an individual under the influence of his family, teachers or some other agencies gains knowledge of the pattern and functions of the government and the ideologies of political parties. On the other hand, an individual may build up an attitude to authority

as a result of his relationships with parents, teachers or some other agencies. This attitude to authority in general may later on be directed to political authority in particular, and thus the orientation with a non-political object is transformed into a political orientation. This is an example of indirect or latent political socialization.

Basically, socialization means the process of norm-internalization. According to Almond and Powell, 'political socialization is the process by which political cultures are maintained and changed'. Through the performance of this function, individuals are inducted into the political culture; their orientations towards political subjects are formed. The emphasis of the concept of political socialization is on the acquisition of political values and their transmission from one generation to the next. Most children acquire their basic political orientations and behaviour patterns at a relatively early age. Some of these attitudes will evolve and change through life but others may remain part of the political self throughout life. So, the concept of political socialization could be taken as a doctrine that seeks to instill values, norms and orientations in the minds of the individuals. In this way, they develop faith in the political system.

Political Sociology

Thomas Burton Bottomore, a British sociologist, defined Political Sociology as 'the study of power' i.e., in this discipline a person studies the political and social explanation of power. You are acquainted with the fact that power is an element in most social relationships—in the family, religion, associations, organizations, universities, trade unions, and others. Power signifies the ability of an individual or a social group to pursue a course of action, if necessary, against the interests and even against the opposition of other individuals and groups. However, there are diverse conceptualizations of power which have their own place within particular theories of politics. It could, thereby, include analysis of all social institutions, for example, the family, the mass media, universities, trade unions. Giovanni Sartori said it is necessary to explain power both in social and in political terms. Thus, one could say, political sociology is the study of interactions and linkages between politics and society; between a political system and its social, economic and cultural environment. It also tries to understand the process of interaction between government and society, decision-making authorities, and conflicting social interests.

Old or traditional political sociology focuses on the modern nation-state as the centre of political activity. It is concerned with the relations between classes as the main dimension of stratification in modern societies and politics. Power is perceived as exercised by the state. In new political sociology the focus shifts from formal politics at the level of the nation-state, and its relationship to class, to politics as an intrinsic possibility in all social relations. The state remains important, but it is treated as the centre of political activity. The emphasis in new political sociology is on the contestation of social relations in culture; in everyday life, media representations and institutional practices. The society is not set against politics as the dominion of politics, but politics is a potential in social life itself.

Dowse and Hughes define political sociology as 'the study of interrelation between politics and society'. According to them, both politics and society are dependent on each other. This definition is acceptable to political scientists as well. We have to accept that society is the pre-condition of politics. Politics comes into play if there is society. In the absence of society, it is impossible to come across the elements of politics. Further, we cannot find a society without politics. The instant society comes into existence, politics also takes shape.

The following definitions of political sociology will further help in understanding its meaning:

'Political Sociology starts with society and examines how it affects the state.'

— **R. Bendix and S.M. Lipset**

'Political Sociology is that branch of sociology which is concerned with the social causes and consequences of given power distribution within or between societies, and with the social and political conflicts that lead to changes in the allocation of power.'

— **L.A. Coser**

'Political Sociology is the study of the interrelationship between society and polity, between social structures and political institutions.'

— **S.M. Lipset**

'Political Sociology is the study of political behaviour within a sociological perspective of framework.'

— **Robert E. Dowse and John Hughes**

'Political Sociology is a subject area which examines the links between politics and society, between social behaviour and political behaviour.'

—**Michael Rush and Phillip Althoff**

'At its broadest level, political sociology is concerned with the relationship between politics and society. Its distinctiveness within the social sciences lies in its acknowledgement that political actors, including parties, pressure groups and social movements, operate within a wider social context. Political actors therefore inevitably shape, and in turn are shaped by, social structures such as gender, class and nationality. Such social structures ensure that political influence within society is unequal. It follows from this that a key concept in political sociology is that power, where power is defined as the capacity to achieve one's objectives even when those objectives are in conflict with the interests of another actor. Political sociologists therefore invariably return to the following question: which individuals and groups in society possess the capacity to pursue their interests, and how is this power exercised and institutionalized.'

— **Keith Faulks**

Political sociology is treated as a theoretical and methodological bridge between sociology, political science; what Giovanni Sartori addressed as an 'inter-disciplinary hybrid'.

Some essential features of political sociology are as follows:

- Political sociology tries to resolve the traditional dichotomy between state and society.
- It is not political science because, unlike the latter, it is not a study of statecraft. As the stability of society is a central issue for sociology, the stability of a specific institutional structure or political regime—the social conditions of democracy—is the prime concern of political sociology.
- Political sociology is also not the sociology of politics because, unlike the latter, it is concerned with both social and political aspects.
- Political sociology is the product of cross fertilization between sociology and political science that studies the impact of society on politics and also the vice versa, although presenting the substance of politics in a social form.
- Stability of the democratic political system has been the central concern of political sociology.
- It sets an identity between the social process and the political process.
- Political sociology lies at the intersection of the politics of sociology and the sociology of politics.

Political sociology is relevant to political science and other social sciences in many ways, which are as follows:

- Political sociology has broadened the area of enquiry by widening the scope of what is considered 'political' phenomena today. Political science restricts the study of political phenomena by limiting its contacts with other disciplines of social science, whereas the Political sociology has a tendency to restore the political phenomena to their proper location within the broad range of social phenomena.
- Political sociology also has the tendency to remove barriers between disciplines and emphasize the essential unity of all the social sciences.
- Political sociology has established that political variables influence social, cultural and economic variables.
- Political sociology also stresses upon the use of empirical and experimental methods of research instead of philosophical reasoning. Hence, in the contemporary highly complex and changing society, political sociology has opened a new vista of research.
- It studies political or social institutions as a separate entity in the modern society. Concepts like state, constitution, representation, and the rights and duties of citizens can no longer possess and provide details of the activities of political parties, pressure groups and the mass media. Political sociology fills up this gap by constructing theoretical formulations around single central concepts such as group, power, decision or conflict, and also by introducing comprehensive and highly abstract formulations such as system, process,

development or communication.

- Because of political sociology, new concepts of role and political socialization, together with functional categories including the conversion functions, capabilities of the system, and system maintenance and adaptation functions, have gained recognition today.

- Political sociology involves an ongoing search for a more wide-ranging scope, as well as more realistic, precise and theory conscious analysis. The attainment of depth and realism in the study of political systems facilitates us to locate the dynamic forces of politics wherever they exist—in social class, in culture, in economic and social change, in the political elite or in the international environment.

- Some important concepts of political sociology such as role analysis, focusing on problems such as role conflict, role consensus and role structures, come together with theoretical notions such as system, decision-making power, has been useful in structural-functional approaches to the political process, and especially useful in closing the gap between the macro-analysis and micro-analysis of politics.

- The implications of modern political sociology are as much important to the democratic society as to monarchical, dictatorial and communistic states. In all the developed and developing countries, therefore, political sociology is a very important subject of study.

The scope of political sociology is immeasurable. There is dearth of any simple definition that would adequately cover the scope of political sociology and that would give a clear and lasting boundary *vis-a-vis* political science. There is no part in contemporary society which is not touched by some form of political association and activity. Thus, the main objective of political sociology is to study and examine interaction between social and political structures. Political sociology may be said to encompass several lines of inquiry:

- Voting behaviour in communities and in nations
- Purpose of economic power and political decision-making
- Ideologies of political movements and interest groups
- Government and the problem of bureaucracy
- Political parties, voluntary associations, the problem of oligarchy and the psychological correlates of political behaviour
- Effects of social attitudes on political participation.
- The characteristics of a multi-group society, the political and social implications, and nature of modern bureaucracy and its form in different political social context
- Impact of social groupings upon political activity
- The nature of welfare state
- The effectiveness of propaganda and public opinion as means of informal political education

In short, political sociology includes all the political and social aspects which arise time and again in contemporary society. Basically, it is concerned with the causes, patterns and consequences of the distribution and process of power and authority in all social systems ranging from small groups and families to educational, religious, governmental or political

institutions. The heart of political sociology comprises the study of both formal and informal party organization, with its linkages to the governmental bureaucracy, the legal system, the interest groups and the electoral.

The aim of political sociology would be the analysis of institutions of the state. Thus, the major problem of this subject is the explanation of atypical social structure, i.e., the state. There are several schools which determine the scope of political sociology.

Some scholars believe that state is the subject matter of political sociology and not the group. In this context, Bernard Crick argued small groups are part of the state. They may facilitate to create politics, but their intrinsic behaviour is not political because their function is different from that of the state. Drawing upon this viewpoint, Grear and Orleans describe political sociology as being mainly concerned with the description, analysis and sociological explanation of the peculiar social structures called the State. There is another school which argues that politics is present in almost all social relations. They emphasize that individuals and small groups engage in the exercise of 'power' in terms of enforcement of their parent organizations, family, club or college. Political sociologists have shown interest in studying the 'power behaviour' in order to understand the way political system works.

Various political sociologists have studied the political systems of various countries along with their functions, roles and structures. So, the process of political socialization has also been studied. Political sociologists are interested in analysing and finding why human beings behave in a particular way so far as politics is concerned. Sociologist Harold D. Lasswell explains that politics permeates every social group, association, class and profession because the whole society is characterized by the political interaction permeating throughout the society. Everything which is influenced by power and influence is political in nature.

Andreu Affrat methodically summarized the concerns of the field in terms of a series of overlapping circles—some circles containing others completely and some just partially. The innermost and smallest circle signifies the smallest unit of analysis, i.e., the individual or a role. At this stage, individuals or role incumbents bargain and communicate with each other regarding political issue, individual's political attitude or ideology and voting behaviour. The next circle represents small-scale primary groups wherein individuals interact usually on an informal face-to-face basis, e.g., families, friendship groups and small-scale neighbourhood clustering. Another circle may be a bigger aggregate of individuals who are also not formally organized, for example, social classes, religious, ethnic and regional groupings. Another overlapping circle comprises more formal organizations like political parties, business firms, governmental agencies and ethnic organizations. The next larger or more macro-level circle is traditionally found to be institutional in nature. This term connotes functionally related complexes of roles, norms and organizations like the economy, polity or religious sector. In a more comprehensive sense, this circle may also be called the societal one. Hence, it may be said that political sociology comprises the following areas:

- Political structures (social class/caste, elite, interest groups, bureaucracy, political parties and factions).
- Political life (electoral process, political communication, opinion formation and so on).
- Political leadership (bases, types and operation of community power structure).
- Political development (concept and indices of its measurement, its social bases and prerequisites and its relationship to social change and modernization).

Some political sociologists are interested to study the 'rule-making' process in society. The rule-making activity is perceived in the context of self-contained social unit, e.g., a tribe, a village or a nation-state. The

other social institutions along with the government are also involved in rule-making activities. Thus, political sociologists are interested to examine the nature of rule-making and how the rules are obeyed at mass level. They study the social structures and their development within which the rules are made.

Many political sociologists have also shown great interest in the analysis of those institutions and social systems which play crucial roles in the operation of political process. They have been influenced by elite theories. Gaetano Mosca, Vilfredo Pareto and Robert Michels has significantly contributed in this regard by undertaking sociological studies of elites and the sociology of political organizations. The perspective of elite study has been elaborated by many sociologists who have specialization in the study of total societies and political change at the societal level. At the empirical level, political sociologists have done research to investigate the social basis of political cleavage and consensus. Political cleavage and consensus are the important parts of the political system. These are primarily derived from the social stratification theory of politics. It comprises analysis of voting statistics and sample surveys, affiliation to a political party and the voting behaviour of the electorate. In this way, this is an important source of explanation and historical documentation.

Sheldon S. Wolin restricts the scope of politics to those activities only which 'affect in a significant way the whole society or a substantial portion of it'. According to him, the word 'political' means:

- A form of activity revolves around the quest for competitive advantage between groups, individuals, or societies.
- A form of activity conditioned by the fact that it takes place within a situation of change and relative scarcity.
- A form of activity in which the quest of advantage creates consequences of such a magnitude that they effect, in a significant way, the whole society or substantial portion of it.

So, the politics of trade unions, civil societies, teacher's associations, student's union, etc., are 'political' because other groups in the society are affected vitally by their activities. These types of groups or associations are the relevant matters for the study of Political Sociology. In this context,

Arthur F. Bentley made it clear that no group can be stated, or defined, or valued, except in terms of other groups. No group has meaning except in terms of other groups. For his statement, Bentley has given rationale that it is not groups as such, but interactions and linkages of public significance among groups that are the relevant matters for political sociology.

An important concern for political sociology is the analysis of socio-political factors in economic development. There is a better understanding on the fact that the problems of development are not merely technical or bureaucratic in the narrow sense, but are essentially socio-political in a wider sense. It is also realized that political forces must organize in a way to ensure effective implementation of development plans. Therefore, political sociologists could study the problems of administrative development, of bureaucracy steeped in a country's native culture and society, of the relationship between the bureaucratic officials and the political leaders, etc.

According to Greer and Orleans, political sociology is concerned with the structure of the state; the nature and condition of legitimacy; and nature of the monopoly of force and its use by the State; and the nature of the sub-units and their relation with the State. They treat political sociology in terms of consensus and legitimacy, participation and representation, and the relationship between economic development and political change.

By implication, whatever is related to the state is alone held as the subject matter of political sociology. Andreu Effrat takes a broader view of the picture and suggests that political sociology is concerned with the causes, patterns and consequences of the distribution and process of power and authority 'in all social systems'. Among social systems, he includes small groups and families, educational and religious groups, as well as governmental and political institutions.

Lipset and Benedix suggest a more representative catalogue of topics when they describe the main areas of interest to political sociologists, as voting behaviour, concentration of economic power and political decision-making; ideologies of political movement and interest groups; political parties, voluntary associations, the problems of oligarchy and psychological correlates of political behaviour; and the problem of bureaucracy.

To Dowse and Hughes, one area of substantive concern for the political sociologist is the problem of social order and political obedience.

Richard G Braugart has pointed out that political sociologists are concerned with the dynamic association among and between: (a) the social origin of politics, (b) the structure of political process, and (c) the effects of politics on the surrounding society and culture. Political sociology should include four areas that are as follows:

(i) Political structures (social class/caste, elite, interest groups, bureaucracy, political parties and factions) (ii) Political life (electoral process, political communication, opinion formation, etc.) (iii) Political leadership (bases, types and operation of community power structure) (iv) Political development (concept and indices of its measurement, its social bases and prerequisites and its relationship to social change and modernization).

To illustrate, it can be pointed out that on one hand, sociologists focus their attention on the sub-areas of the social system, and political scientists concentrate on the study of law, local, state and national governments, comparative government, political systems, public administration and international relations. On the other hand, political sociologists ought to be concerned with topics of social stratification and political power: socio-economic systems and political regimes, interest groups, political parties, bureaucracy, political socialization, electoral behaviour, social movements and political mobilization. A significant concern of political sociology is the analysis of socio-political factors in economic development.

There are four main areas of research that are important in present-day political sociology. They are as follows:

(i) The socio-political formation of the modern state.
(ii) How social inequality between groups (class, race, gender, etc.) influences politics, (iii) How public personalities, social movements and trends outside of the formal institutions of political power affect politics, (iv) Power relationships within and between social groups (e.g., families, workplaces, bureaucracy, media, etc.). Contemporary theorists include Robert A. Dahl, Seymour Martin Lipset, Theda Skocpol, Luc Boltanski and Nicos Poulantzas.

So traditionally political sociology was concerned with how social trends, dynamics, and structures of domination affect formal political processes, as well as exploring how various social forces work together to change political policies. From this perspective, three major theoretical frameworks that can be identified include: (i) pluralism, (ii) elite or managerial theory, and (iii) class analysis.

In a pluralistic society, no group is required to abandon its own values and culture. Pluralism is based on mutual respect of the groups for each other's values, culture and traditions. In a pluralistic society, the equal validation is given to different subcultures. A pluralist approach regards ethnic minority groups as equal stakeholders in society, meaning that they enjoy the same rights as the majority population. The idea of the Indian nation-state embodies this pluralism. Elite theory of the state attempts to describe and explain the power relationships in a contemporary society. This theory posits that a small minority, comprising members of the economic elite and policy-planning networks, holds the maximum power which is independent of a state's democratic elections process. Class analysis studies the various aspects of stratification in a society into dynamic classes, and in the process highlighting the fundamental conflicts that are intrinsic in the society.

Agents of Political Socialization

There are many agents of political socialization which affect individuals. These are as follows:

(i) **Family:** The first socialization source that an individual encounters is family. It has powerful and lasting influence on the individual. Participation in family, decisionmaking can enhance a child's sense of political competence. It also provides skills for political interaction and encourages children for active participation in the political system as an adult. In this way, the family shapes future political attitudes by locating the individual in a vast social world. Nowadays, gender

equality in education, occupation and profession has transformed the structure of the family. A more open family and equality of parenting have modified the impact of family in the socialization process.

(ii) **School:** The imparting of education at school has a crucial role in the process of political socialization. Schools provide children and adolescents with knowledge about the political world and their role in it. The major role of a school is to transmit the values and attitudes of the society. It plays an important role in shaping attitudes about the unwritten rules of the political game and developing informal political relations. Education also affects the political skills and resources of the public. Educated persons are more conscious about the influence of government on their lives.

(iii) **Religious institutions:** Religions are the vehicles of cultural and moral values which have political implications. Basically, the great religious leaders have declared themselves as teachers. Therefore, they have usually attempted to shape the socialization of children through, schooling. Religious affiliations are often important sources of partisan preferences and can guide people in making a political choice.

(iv) **Peer groups:** Peer groups being important social units shape the political attitudes of individuals. They include childhood play groups, friendship cliques, etc. In play groups, members share relatively equal status and strong bonds. Individuals often follow the views of their peers. So in this way, a peer group socializes its members by motivating or pressuring them to conform to the attitudes or behaviour accepted by the group. For example, an individual may become interested in politics or attend a political demonstration because friends do so.

(v) **Social class:** Almost every society has significant social division based on class. For example, according to Karl Marx, mode of production created two classes of haves and have-nots of society. In many instances, these social divisions are politically relevant. For example, identifying oneself as a member of the working class or the peasantry leads to different political views about what issues are important and which political groups best represent one's interest.

(vi) **Gender:** Gender also plays an important role in social and political learning. Actually, gender determines different patterns of behaviour of males and females. Traditionally, gender-based social divisions define politics as a male domain. In many underdeveloped nations, these gender roles still exist.

(vii) **Mass media:** The mass media—newspapers, radio, television and magazine— play an important role in internalizing attitudes and values around the globe. In addition, media also provide specific and immediate information about political events. The mass media also convey major societal values.

The most vital problem of a political sociologist is the explanation of social and political changes along with agitations, revolutions, conflicts and violence. The political sociologists never consider these only as political in nature. These phenomena are due to discrepancies of speed between the processes of social change and political change. Therefore, they are temporary in nature. So, the political sociologists try to establish the parity between the social and political change.

During the past few decades, sociologists, political scientists and politicians have shown great interest in discovering the determinants of individual's political participation. The area is important for theoretical reasons and academics seek to discover the factors which motivate and limit political expression. Policymakers are interested in exploring the

mechanisms through which greater participation may be encouraged and in predicting the composition of the participating electorate for specific situations.

Political participation refers to a wide range of activities, including voting in elections, donating time or money to political campaigns, running for office, writing petitions, boycotting, organizing in unions, demonstrating, carrying out illegal sit-ins or occupations, blockades, and even physical assault on the forces of order. It also establishes links from the mass public to the political elites. Therefore, it is an essential means of making elite rules acceptable to modern society. It varies at different levels in the same society as well as in different societies. Political participation results in greater stability of political culture and political system. The expression 'political participation' comprises those voluntary activities by which members of a society share in the selection of rulers and directly or indirectly in the formation of public policy. These activities can be holding discussions, organizing demonstrations and strikes, attending meetings, etc. According to Herbert McClosky, the most active forms of political participation are formal enrolment in a party, canvassing and registering votes, speech writing and speech making. Political participation may range from non-involvement to office holding. The determining factors of political participation are: (i) social environment, (ii) psychological environment, and (iii) political environment.

(i) *Social environment*: The degree of political participation in a country may be dependent upon a number of variables, e.g., education, religion, age, race, gender, domicile, mobility, occupation, etc.

(ii) *Psychological environment*: Political participation is also dependent upon the psychological need of participation. So some variables e.g., need for prestige, status, recognition, sympathy, achievements, etc., affect human behaviour.

(iii) *Political environment*: We can say that political participation is affected by obstacles like complicated registration procedures, literacy tests, poll taxes, residence requirement, inadequate provisions for absentee voting, inaccessibility of polling places and some 'situational factors' like war, external aggression, and serious disturbances in the country or abroad.

Levels of political participation

Now, we will throw light on the levels of political participation in the political processes in a state. It is true that the level of participation varies from place to place, time to time, and from one section of the people to another. Important levels of political participation are as follows:

(i) **Very active level**: In this category, we may refer to the leaders holding high positions in the legislative and administrative spheres; who are basically concerned with the exercise of formal political power. Actually, such leaders are the repositories of power. They play a very crucial role in the political parties and in the political mobilization.

(ii) **Occasionally active**: Those people, who take part in the political process of their country occasionally and also in an informal manner, comprise the occasionally active category.

(iii) **Inactive level**: This type of level of political participation focuses on the elements of apathy, alienation, anomie and violence. For example, very large numbers of people usually do not take part in voting as they hold an opinion that such an exercise is useless, or it may be the events of violence which frighten them from taking part in the electoral

process.

Socio-political Explanation of Political Stability

The two most significant attributes of a modern state are political stability and liberal democracy. It is on the rule of law that political stability is highly dependent upon, but a high degree of autocracy or democracy as well as the amount of trade done by a country are also effective indicators of political stability. Most political scientists approach the concept of stability from the behavioural point of view. This means that a definition of the concept is possible and that it can be measured through reproducible and verifiable techniques. Most of the literature on political stability is in agreement of the basic and the broad meaning of the term. Confusion, however, exists due to the lack of agreement that concerns the meaning of those terms which are used to define 'stability'. There also exists a lack of agreement on the operational use of these terms. One needs to examine and explore a wide variety of variables which influence political stability to be able to analyse and explain the phenomenon of political stability.

Broadly, there are four dimensions of political stability — stable government, stable political system, internal law and order, and external stability. It is important to keep in mind that further sub-divisions are also possible. These four aspects of political stability can be explained as:

- **Stable government:** Does the government continue in office for a full election period and has a majority?
- **Stable political system:** Do governments change legally according to the constitution?

- **Internal law and order:** The level of industrial conflict is a sub-aspect
- **External stability:** Are the borders of a country contested or actively threatened?

If we take examples of a few countries, it will become apparent that lack of stability is the common aspect of them. For instance, Angola suffers from lack of all four stability conditions. Bolivia is battling the first three while Japan, which is otherwise a stable country, is a significant example of the first condition. Colombia, on the other hand, is too stable but lacks the third condition.

It has been commonly argued that when the rule of law increases, political stability in a country gets strengthened. Paulo Sergio Pinheiro, a Brazilian diplomat and legal scholar, has opined that if a country is lacking in the rule of law, it loses its legitimacy and consequently, political stability. Political stability is weakened when the rule of law decreases. Political stability is influenced by the rule of law because it is an indicator of the effective working of the executive. In fact, the army in a totalitarian regime is also expected to follow the rules drafted by the dictator. In case there is a high degree of democracy or autocracy, even the degree of political stability will be high.

David Beetham, a social theorist, has argued that the relationship between society and legitimacy sees its biggest shift when political or social order gets altered. This alteration is best withstood by strong democracies or strong autocracies and thus they are always more stable in nature. In effect, states which have political or social stability in lower percentage are always bound to be less stable.

Economic factors also influence political stability of a country. There are apparent reasons for this: when people are motivated to invest and trade, it shows that the future seems promising to them. Thus trade is a key indicator for political

stability as is also of political stability. Lack of trade within a country is not only an indicator of lack of production but also of low political stability. Thus, political stability is only possible with economic stability.

Trade also influences the development indicators of a society. For instance, all countries are dependent on the other for some goods. That is, a country is only technically strong to produce a kind of good and is dependent on another for some goods. Trade with other countries thus indicates how well a state maintains its relationships with others. In case these are not good, then both the degrees of political stability and volume of trade are low. It is thus true that political stability emerges from the reliance on the rule of law; when there are stable laws and they are followed, one finds an increased amount of trade, economic growth and development as well a growing degree of democracy (or even autocracy) in a state.

The opposing arguments as well as approaches to political stability are seen to be during:

- The absence of violence
- Governmental longevity/duration
- The existence of a legitimate constitutional regime
- The absence of structural change
- Multi-faceted societal attribute

Absence of violence

The most common as well as immediate indicator of political stability is reached when the concept of political stability is studied with the absence of domestic civil conflict and violent behaviour. A state that is peaceful is seen as stable and a law and order abiding society wherein any politico- societal changes as well as those in decision making processes are the results of proper institutionalized and functional procedures and not the outcome of atomic processes wherein internal conflicts are resolved through conflict and aggression. This approach posits, for example, that the rapid turnover of a system's governors by violent processes is evidence of instability. Although consent of the governed is necessary in a democracy and although the utilization of this consent will necessitate change, this consent must be given in a peaceful manner. That is to say, to determine elite replacement by assassination rather than by the electoral process is a denial of democratic change; and such actions lead various people to infer that the potential of such systems for stable adaptive change has not yet been attained.

Bruce M. Russett, Dean Acheson Professor of International and Area Studies at Yale University, in *Deaths from Domestic Group Violence per 1,000,000 Population, 1950-1912*, measures in seventy-four independent countries, 'the number of people killed in all forms of domestic violence of an intergroup nature, thus excluding deaths by murder and execution'. Notwithstanding the problem regarding the availability and reliability of the data, this is an adequate, although gross, representation of civil violence.

Authors of *Anger, Violence, and Politics: Theories and Research*, Ivo K. and Rosalind L. Feierabend recognize that there is more than one definition of and approach to political stability/instability. However, they restrict their conception of the term to 'the degree or the amount of aggression directed by individuals or groups within the political system against other groups or against the complex of office holders, (as well as) the amount of aggression directed by office holders against other individuals and groups'. Data on internal conflict behaviour were collected for eighty-four

countries over seven years (1955-1911) and a 7 point scale ranging from 0 (denoting extreme stability) to 1 (denoting extreme instability). Each specific behaviour datum (some 5000 events) was then ranked along this scale, and countries assigned to groups were ranked on the basis of the most 'unstable' act, which took place over the time span. Civil war countries are in group 1, coups detained in 5, mass arrests in 4, and so on.

The Feierabends write that, 'the purpose of this assignment was to weigh intensity (or quality) of instability of events equally with the frequency (or quantity) of events'. After grouping, a sum total of each country's ratings was calculated and then the countries' rank ordered within the six groups according to the frequency sum total. This measure of stability qua violence is more sophisticated than Russett's, but there is some question as to its applicability. Although complex, it is still a mono-measure, reducing this very elusive concept of stability to one particular societal characteristic. Moreover, although it avoids the problem of no differentiation, the index is open to criticism regarding the weight or value assigned to each specific aggressive behaviour and the constraining influence of the six main groupings.

For Russett, a death equals a death; but how many 'micro-strikes' equal 'imprisonment of insignificant persons?' And what number of acts in group 4, for example, is necessary before the country is demoted to group 5? Frequency distributions cannot lead to a group change given the parameters of this approach. These questions are not dealt with by the Feierabends. In their book, *The Conditions of Civil Violence: First Tests of a Causal Model*, Ted Robert Gurr and Charles Ruttenberg examine the duration, pervasiveness, intensity, amplitude and total magnitude of civil violence in 119 countries from 1911 to 1913. Civil violence is defined as 'all collective, non-governmental attacks on persons or property, resulting in intentional damage to them that occur within the boundaries of an autonomous or colonial political unit'. The final magnitude of civil violence, presented as interval data, is a composite scale composed of the duration and amplitude of violence indicators. The amplitude scale itself is a composite measure calculated by summing intensity (casualties and damage) and pervasiveness (participants and area). The magnitude range for each year is 0 to 14; the score for 1911-1913 ranges from 0 to 192.

This short time span detracts from an otherwise incisive analysis. There are, however, two comments which must be made regarding the Gurr/Ruttenberg measure. First are the availability, reliability and interpretation of the data. Ruttenberg himself writes that the coders found absence of 'quantitative precision' in sources that were for the most part 'journalistic' in treatment. How, Ruttenberg continues, is one to interpret and code data presented in terms of many, a few thousand, a wide area, or sporadic? There is also the problem of very little differentiation among the reviewed countries: 33 per cent or 27.7 per cent receive a value of 0, denoting no violence and extreme stability.

Rudolph J. Rummel's major aim, in *Dimensions of Conflict Behaviour within and between Nations*, was to examine the relation between the incidence and nature of domestic violence and international aggressive behaviour. He was, therefore, not directly concerned with the stability/instability continuum. However, his data can nonetheless be employed as a measure of stability if one accepts the 'absence of violence' as evidence of stability. Rummel's view of violence equates the concept to a zero sum game. According to him, 'Violence is a situation in which two or more parties direct their energies at each other to achieve goals that can only be achieved at each other's expense'.

Nine measures of internal conflict were isolated and examined for seventy-seven countries for three year period from 1955-1957. These include:

- Assassinations
- Strikes

- Guerrilla warfare
- Major government crisis
- Riots
- Demonstrations
- Revolution
- Number of people killed in domestic violence

The raw data are not combined into one final composite measure, although each specific indicator is transformed into group categories. The same questions raised above, however, can be applied to Rummel's analysis: the availability and reliability of the data, a relatively short time span, a partial measure of the concept of stability, and very little differentiation among the countries reviewed.

Governmental Longevity/Endurance

A second common approach to political stability is to equate the concept with governmental/cabinet longevity or duration. Country A is deemed to be more stable than Country B, if the former has a government/administration which remains in office, on average, for a longer time span than that of the latter. One is constantly and consistently shown the ephemeral nature of the Italian, Finnish and French governments (especially for the 4th Republic) as evidence of these countries' instability. Mere duration in office can, of course, be regarded as stubbornness and as static resistance to change which, from another point of view, is not stability at all. But it is sufficient at this point to note that the length of time in office is one of the basic and most easily understood and quantified views of political stability.

In *Executive Stability: Number of Years Independent/Number of Chief Executives, 1945-1911*, Bruce Russett has considered government/cabinet longevity as the best known and most often cited measure for political stability. This measure gives the rate of turnover in office of the legally designated chief executive in eighty-seven countries. The stability index is presented as the average number of years the chief executive remains in office. This approach and index, as Russett readily admits, are far from perfect. Each and every change in the chief executive is interpreted as evidence of instability, and the longevity approach makes it impossible to differentiate among the very real and non-theoretical types of governmental change.

To reduce the concept of 'stability' to 'longevity' is in effect to say that any change for whatever reason denotes less stability; but this is a very tenuous homogenization. According to Russett, the nature or content of change is as relevant to the concept of political stability as is the actual process of change. He further says that the longevity approach denies the functional effects of some types of governmental change or turnover. It is obvious that, even without adequately defining this concept of stability, some types of governmental change are more or less stable than other types. These non-theoretical differentiated types include:

- Assassination
- Revolution
- Coup d'etat
- Withdrawal of a party from the governing coalition
- Loss of a vote of confidence

- Voluntary resignation of the Prime Minister
- Illness
- Accidental death

The normal process of governmental change resulting from a regularly scheduled and institutionalized general parliamentary election.

The longevity approach is unable to take these factors into consideration: assassination is equated to an election, accidental death to a coup d'etat and the change in France from the 4th to 5th Republic is equated to Labour's 1914 electoral victory in Great Britain. Political critics, Jean Blondel, Michael Taylor and V.M. Herman also approach stability as longevity or governmental duration. Blondel's operational definition of government, one which Taylor and Herman borrow, is that, 'any administration is considered as one government which fulfilled two conditions: that of being headed by the same Prime Minister and that of relying on the support of the same party or parties in the Chamber'. The indices are presented in terms of years per government (Blondel) and number of separate governments, and the duration of those governments in days (Taylor/Herman). These measures are excellent examples of this suspect genre of equating political stability with governmental longevity.

In his *A Theoretical Approach to Political Stability*, Arthur S. Goldberg presents a mathematical probability analysis of the likelihood, according to which any one regime will be displaced by another. Goldberg conceives stability as 'a function of the extent to which decisions are made on the basis of power weighted preference ordering... [and] to what extent... the regime makes decisions which do not offend those who have the ability to displace it'. Goldberg presents his theory as descriptions of the preference ordering of the components of the system (army, church, warlord, party), who have some ability to displace the regime, as well as estimates of the probability of success for each component that opts to move against the regime.

Goldberg represents an admirable example of a highly mathematical approach to political stability seen as governmental longevity. If Goldberg represents one approach in the definition and measurement of political stability, authors of *A Cross-Polity Survey*, Arthur S. Banks and Robert B. Textor represent quite a different approach, one that mirrors some of the confusion and vagueness connected with political stability. They classify 115 countries according to 'degree of stability' based upon some vague notion of governmental longevity and cabinet change.

- Twenty-two are classified as 'generally' stable since World War I
- Twenty-eight as 'generally' stable since World War II
- Eleven as 'moderately' stable since World War II
- Twenty-two as 'unstable' since World War II
- Three as 'ambiguous' and
- Twenty-nine as 'unascertainable'

According to Banks and Textor, it is difficult to assess the significance of frequent cabinet changes under a parliamentary system. It is satisfactory to note that the contribution by Banks and Textor is limited to gross nominal distinctions, which are based more upon individual intuition than upon empirical analysis.

Existence of a Legitimate Constitutional Order

A third important definitional construct of and approach to political stability is presented as 'legitimacy'. This is an extent to which the political system and the system's outputs are accepted as right and proper by the population. This view states that legitimacy helps to define the very concept of stability and is not to be regarded as a consequence or result of a stable system. Such an approach views stability not just as the absence of negative phenomena but as the presence of positive support and acceptance. But the concept of legitimacy is itself vague.

An example of the confusion may be seen by comparing the views of Seymour Martin Lipset, American political

sociologist, to the views of Martin C. Needier, author of *Political Development and Socioeconomic Development: The Case of Latin America*. Lipset's *Some Social Requisites of Democracy: Economic Development and Political Legitimacy* regards legitimacy as a vital component of any serious study of political stability. He states that a legitimate [stable] society is evidenced by the absence of a major political movement for over the past twenty-five years as opposed to the democratic 'rules of the game'. Such political movements are defined as any totalitarian movement, either communist or fascist, receiving at least 20 per cent of the vote during the covered time span. This reliance on the presence or absence of anti-system tendencies does not, however, allow for differentiation, because nominal distinctions are all that is possible. Lipset isolates four categories and forty-eight countries, out of which thirteen are located in the 'stable democracy' grouping.

Another criticism of this approach is directed at Lipset's 20 per cent cut-off figure: Country A with 19 per cent anti-system vote will be stable, while Country B with 21 per cent will be unstable. Such a differentiation is quite arbitrary and indefensible on theoretical grounds. This view and measure can be contrasted to Needier's *Political Development and Socioeconomic Development: The Case of Latin America*. Needier regards the degree of legitimacy and stability in twenty Latin American countries as the number of years during a given period in which the country has been ruled constitutionally. He defines a constitutional year as one in at least six months:

- Of which the country was ruled by a government chosen by more or less free elections
- In which that government on the whole respected constitutional procedures and individual civil liberties
- In which no extra constitutional change of government took place

It is obvious that this approach is much more impressionistic than others. Lipset and Needier both agree that stability is related to legitimacy, but each has measured different phenomena. It appears that Lipset is much closer to the concept of legitimacy and stability than is Needier. Needier appears to be measuring 'degree of democratic attainment' rather than 'degree of stability seen as legitimacy'; and one is not yet prepared to equate political stability with the presence of democracy.

Absence of Structural Change

A fourth common approach to political stability relates the concept to the absence of structural change. A system is seen as stable if it has been able to avoid changes in its basic structural arrangement/configuration over the years. Continuity or persistence of form distinguishes stable polities from those unable to maintain their pattern in the face of environmental pressures.

However, there are some problems involved with this approach. First, one can, at best, make only nominal distinctions among the countries which have been examined. A country will either be free of structural change, in which case it is classified as stable, or its basic patterns are changed, and thus identified as unstable. The second problem relates to what one actually means by structural change. There is very little disagreement that the change in France from the 4th to the 5th Republic could illustrate a structural transformation; but as an analytical concept, the French system remained intact. There is also the problem as to the number or frequency of small variations needed before one can say that a change occurred. That is to say, there may be many minor political upheavals and institutional rearrangements throughout a country's history, yet its social and political systems have not disappeared (e.g., the United Kingdom).

In his book, *A Theory of Political Integration*, Claude Ake equates political stability with the absence of structural change or, conversely, with the presence of continuity of form and pattern. He writes that a political system is stable when the inputs and outputs between its component units and its environment are regular enough to make the persistence of the main structural pattern of the system possible. Ake continues: 'We may say that the political system is stable when the impact on the system of the dysfunctional processes generated by the system and the environment are neutralized to the extent of keeping them from altering the structure of the political system.'

Ake also describes the type of political system that is most able to neutralize the dysfunctional processes that social mobilization unleashes. Such a system should be, in his terminology:

- Authoritarian (when the government's power can be mobilized to carry out stated policies)
- Paternal (when the system has a political class willing and able to lead)
- Identifiable (when the system has a mutual identity between the political class and the governed)
- Consensual (when the political class is not threatened by a counter elite)

If any of these attributes are missing, the particular system's tendency toward instability will increase. G. Lowell Field's *Comparative Political Development: The Precedent of the West* never explicitly links stability with the absence of structural change.

Field's analysis is limited to a discussion of the various regimes which exist, with focus on the relative stability/instability of each, and some examples of changes from one regime to another. He identifies three main types of regimes and, with their variants, a total of eight detailed types of regimes/structures are isolated. Field writes that his process of classification largely ignores constitutional structures and it does not seek to distinguish regimes accurately on the basis of how democratic they are. Its criteria relate rather to the stereotypes through which political activity is perceived by participants. It rests in part upon a judgment that such viewpoints and their consequences in action represent major stabilities of politics. The three main types of regimes/structures isolated by Field are:

- **Utopian** (where all influential persons share a particular ideology) and its variants are radical egalitarian and totalitarian
- **Mainstream** (characterized by some personalized centre of power willing and able to employ its power) and its variants are traditional, dichotomized, trichotomized with a right, and trichotomized without a right
- **Consensual** (where there is not one imposed ideology and factional bitterness is not present) and its variants are citizen community and representative consensual

Multifaceted Societal Attribute

The final major approach to political stability regards the concept as a multifaceted societal attribute in the sense that it is 'systemic stability' rather than any one isolated mono-measure. This approach, of course, is less amenable to precise quantification because the various societal attributes, offered by some, do not easily lend themselves to mathematical indicators. This does not mean that the approach is without merit; however, it rightfully recognizes that the concept of stability cannot be reduced to isolated variables. This approach is an attempt to integrate and synthesize the various other approaches.

The multifaceted societal attribute necessitates greater reliance upon in-depth country studies in place of cross-national analysis based upon aggregate data. In *Measuring Social and Political Requirements for System Stability in Latin America*, Ernest A. Duff and John F. McCamant approach stability with in-depth country studies, although they appear to be confused as to what constitutes the societal attributes of systemic stability. They write that no attempt was made to calculate an absolute value of systemic stability for the nineteen Latin American countries reviewed but, rather, the study was limited to an examination of the relative values of each country vis-a-vis the others.

According to Duff and McCamant, the criteria for a stable democracy should be that welfare must be greater than social mobilization. They also emphasize that there must be a high rate of economic growth, an equal income distribution, a high political capacity and broad-based institutionalized political parties. Moreover, societal welfare,

economic growth and distributive capabilities are more useful as explanatory tools and should not be used to define the concept of political stability. Harry Eckstein presents perhaps the best theoretical study of the entire problem with his *Division and Cohesion in Democracy: A Study of Norway*. For Eckstein, the concept of (democratic) political stability entails several attributes. His definitional constructs are:

- **Persistence of pattern:** Not mere longevity or governmental endurance, but persistence in the sense of having the capacity to adapt to changing conditions, for realizing political aspirations and holding fast allegiances
- **Legitimacy:** Not only the absence of strong dissent but also the presence of positive acceptance and support
- **Effective decision-making:** Effective, not in the sense of right action on the basis of some particular scheme of values, but in the basic sense of action itself, any sort of action, in pursuit of shared political goals or in adjustment to changing conditions
- **Authenticity:** The democratic structures must not be mere facades for actual government by non-democratic structures

Eckstein suggests that this composite societal attribute of stability/instability may be explained by the congruence, or lack of congruence, between the social norms of the polity and the country's public governmental authority patterns. According to him 'government will be stable':

1. 'If social authority patterns are identical with the governmental pattern'
2. 'If they constitute a graduated pattern and a proper segmentation of society'
3. 'If a high degree of resemblance exists in patterns adjacent to government and one finds throughout the more distant segments a marked departure from functionally appropriate patterns for the sake of imitating the governmental pattern or extensive imitation of the governmental pattern in ritual practice'

Why this should be so is illustrated by Eckstein with reference to Weimar Germany and the United Kingdom. Weimar Germany experienced intolerable strains between governmental and non-governmental patterns, for a pure democracy had been superimposed over a more traditional social structure. The United Kingdom, on the other hand, has a more tempered public authority pattern based upon hierarchy which dovetails with the social structure. Although this mode of explanation is sound, Eckstein himself writes that further cross-national analysis is required before his congruence theory can be employed as a general explanatory tool.

Arend Lijphart's *The Politics of Accommodation, Pluralism and Democracy in the Netherlands* likewise approaches stability as a multifaceted societal attribute. He points to the absence of several negative indicators (revolution, violence, political movements opposed to the existing system) and to the presence of several positive indicators (governmental longevity, constitutional continuity, effective decision making, and positive systemic acceptance and support) as evidence of the stability in the Netherlands.

The differing approaches to and views of stability are not that highly inter-correlated, for each approach is, in effect, measuring separate and distinct dimensions within the larger concept of political stability. This would appear to lend even greater credence to the view that political stability must be approached as a multifaceted societal attribute, composed of the various sub-indicators, rather than as any one particular mono-measure.

The concept of political stability, thus, remains as elusive as other abstract concepts in political science. If emphasis is placed upon isolated mono-measures, great precision in quantification will result but to the detriment of theoretical requirements and considerations. If emphasis is placed upon composite societal attributes, which is intuitively more acceptable, one must then forego neat and precise measurement. There is the basic agreement that political stability somehow means the absence of violence, governmental longevity, the absence of structural change, legitimacy and effective decision-making. But the problem and task still remain to organize and synthesize these concepts into a truly cross-national comparative analysis.

Socio-Political Change

The word 'state' is derived from the Latin verb '*status*' which means social condition or social classes arranged as estates. In western Europe, the first estate comprised the clergy and the second estate comprised the nobility. The third estate had all those who did not belong to the first two estates. Max Weber described it as an institution which claims a 'monopoly on the legitimate use of violence' within a certain territory.

Emergence of the state

The *Montevideo Convention of Rights and Duties of States* (1933) put forth what is often considered as the legal definition of the State. According to this convention, the States must have a permanent population, a defined territory, a government maintaining its control over the said territory and good relations with other States. According to the documented history of the Western world, the state is more than 2500 years old. However, contemporary understanding of the state is based on the idea of the state that emanated from early-modern Europe. The idea was of the impersonal form of authority by which the authority of the state was distinguished from those of its agents (rulers).

Does the idea of the impersonal state exist in the work of Machiavelli? This question does not have a clear answer because the debate has not been settled. According to Quentin Skinner, Machiavelli *in Prince* distinguishes the institutions of the State from its agents. However, Harvey Mansfield argues that the mere semantic use of a word is not sufficient to establish the origin of the idea of the impersonal State in Machiavelli. Considering the importance of this debate between the two scholars, it is worth citing Skinner's critique on Machiavelli put forward by Mansfield.

Merely because the word *stato* in the Italian of Machiavelli and of his contemporaries had acquired the ability to stand alone by contrast to the Latin *status*, it does not follow that *stato* meant 'impersonal State' any more than did *politia* in Moerbeke's translation of Aristotle's *politeia*, which also stood by itself. The phrases Skinner cites as possible counter examples suggesting a tincture of impersonality in Machiavelli's *stato -la maestd dello stato, l'authorita dello stato, la mutazione dello stato*-prove on examination to refer to the majesty, authority, and change of someone's state.

Mansfield, *Machiavelli's Virtue*

Notwithstanding this debate, it is believed that the impersonal conceptualization of the state, in the history of European political thought, occurred between the time of Machiavelli and Thomas Hobbes. In between, there were probably a couple of thinkers, who were referring to the impersonal nature of the state. Giovanni Botero's *work Reason of State* (1589) is an important point of reference. However, the idea of the modern State most clearly emanates from Hobbes' writings. In the works of Hobbes, the theorization of power moves on to an abstract entity: the sovereign state.

According to Hobbes, the state came into being because life without the State was chaotic. Thus, the individuals of the state contracted amongst themselves to endow a sovereign with their collective wills. It is because of this idea of contract amongst the free-willed individuals that Hobbes is considered to be a philosopher of the 'social contract'. The sovereign had to protect the individuals both from themselves and from any foreign power. The sovereign could be an individual or a body. Hence, it was called the

'commonwealth'. What was submitted by the individuals was regained in the form of rights that they enjoyed as citizens of the commonwealth.

The powers of the sovereign, by virtue of the common consent, belonged to the subjects that made up the commonwealth. It is at this juncture that the impersonal idea of the State became apparent. These ideas are found in chapter XVII 'Of commonwealth', and chapter XVIII 'Of the rights of sovereigns by institution' of the *Leviathan* (1151).

The only way to erect such a common power, as may be able to defend them from the invasion of foreigners, and the injuries of one another, and thereby to secure them in such sort, as that by their own industry, and by the fruits of the Earth, they may nourish themselves and live contentedly; is, to confer all their power and strength based upon one Man, or upon one Assembly of men, that may reduce all their Wills, by plurality of voices, unto one Will: which is as much as to say, to appoint one Man, or Assembly of men, to bear their Person; and every one to own, and acknowledge himself to be Author of whatsoever he that so bears their Person, shall Act, or cause to be Acted, in those things which concern the Common Peace and Safety; and therein to submit their Wills, every one to his Will, and their judgments, to his judgment. [...] This is the Generation of the great Leviathan [...] And he that carries this Person, is called Sovereign, and said to have Sovereign Power; and every one besides, his subject. [...] From this Institution of a Commonwealth are derived all the rights, and faculties of him, or them, on whom the sovereign power is conferred by the consent of the people assembled.

The modern state has seen conceptual variations in the last two hundred years. We shall look at the Utilitarian, Liberal, Marxist and Feminist perspectives briefly. Unlike the social contract idea of the state as seen in the works of Hobbes, Utilitarian philosophers like Jeremy Bentham and James Mill justified the State on the grounds that it brought about greater and more happiness to more number of people than any alternative political arrangement. However, Liberals argued that an individual's rights were sacrificed in such a conception.

According to Liberals, the state is concerned with rules that would enable individuals to pursue their own ideas of good life so long as freedom of others was not infringed upon. This view was challenged by Karl Marx and other Marxist thinkers.

Marx believed that it was an illusion to consider the state as a neutral arbiter which was capable of harmonizing the discordant elements in society. While he criticized the institution of the state as being responsible for the alienation of man, he viewed the state as the statement of man's ideal aims. In his *The German Ideology*, Marx traced the origin of the state. His views on the state are also found in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of the State*, and the *Communist Manifesto*.

In the last work, Marx viewed the executive of the modern state as a committee to manage the affairs of bourgeoisie. Thus, if class rule disappeared, the state would not exist in the sense that we understand the word 'State'.

Radical critiques of the state

The radical critique of the State was furthered by a variety of currents within Feminism that emerged in the 20th century. Most of the feminists believed that the State was an instrument of male power. Many feminists shared their ideas of power with Michel Foucault (1928-1984), a French scholar, for whom the State was an instrument that governed human conduct.

As the 20th century was moving towards a close, the world was becoming a smaller place. With the onset of globalization, the ability of the State to act as an arbiter of competing interests was reduced. This is described in political science as the decline of the 'relative autonomy' of the State.

The State in Political Sociology

Karl Marx believed that bureaucracy was the most essential part of the state apparatus. His views of bureaucracy appear in his *Critique of Hegel's philosophy of the State* (1843) and in the *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte* (1851). Marx traced the history of bureaucracy from Medieval Europe to his own time.

According to Marx, bureaucracy had its origin in the absolutist monarchies and was initially a progressive force because it curbed the autonomy of medieval guilds and built a centralized administrative structure. - However, with the passage of time, bureaucracy became a caste by itself where entry was determined on the basis of one's education. It interpreted the interests of the State and when challenged, it enclosed itself in mystery, hierarchy and authority. In some countries, like in revolutionary France, bureaucracy was so powerful that it controlled the state and was able to resist the process of transforming the state. The critique of Marx on the power of bureaucracy is so insightful that it remains valid to date.

The aims of the State are transformed into the aims of the bureau and the aims of the bureau into the aims of the State. Bureaucracy is a circle from which no one can escape. Its hierarchy is a hierarchy of knowledge. [...] Bureaucracy constitutes an imaginary State beside the real State and is the spiritualism of the State. [...] Bureaucracy holds in its possession the essence of the State, the spiritual essence of society, it is its private property. The general spirit of bureaucracy is secret, mystery, safeguarded inside itself by hierarchy and outside by its nature as a closed corporation. Thus public political spirit and also political mentality appear to bureaucracy as a betrayal of its secret. The principle of its knowledge is therefore authority, and its mentality is the idolatry of authority. But within bureaucracy the spiritualism turns into crass materialism, the materialism of passive obedience, faith in authority, the mechanism of fixed and formal behaviour, fixed principles, attitudes, traditions. As far as the individual bureaucrat is concerned, the aim of the State becomes his private aim, in the form of a race for higher posts, of careerism.

Critique of Hegel's philosophy of State (1843)

As economic life became complex, bureaucratic administration turned out to be essential. About bureaucracy, Weber said that the administration was based on written documents, specialist training was presupposed and candidates were appointed according to qualification. He also insisted that officials were separated from ownership of the means of administration.

Weber said that the state has a 'monopoly over the legitimate use of violence'. The violence is often employed by the state through its repressive apparatus like the police, the para-military forces and the penitentiary system. However, the power of the state also filters through, what Louis Althusser called, the ideological state apparatuses.

As the repressive apparatus too has its own ideology, it is very important that a distinction is made between the two apparatuses of the state. The essential difference between the two apparatuses is that while the repressive apparatus employs violence explicitly, the ideological state apparatuses function in a covert manner. Althusser listed

out the religious system, educational system, family and mass media as parts of the ideological State apparatuses.

A Nation and Civil Society

Weber's view that the State uses violence legitimately in a number of forms, helps us distinguish the State from a nation and civil society. A nation, in the most elementary sense, is a community whose cohesive identity has been built over time. Civil society is a loose conglomeration consisting of organizations based on voluntary participation. Now, let us understand the concepts of a nation and civil society in a detailed manner:

A nation

According to historian, Hugh Seton-Watson, there are 'old, continuous' nations and new nations. Old nations evolved by integrating wider sections of population through the expansion of the state, growth of trade and communications as well as the rise of vernacular literature. New nations were the ideological products of educated elites, who modelled their populations according to their own models, often based on the old nations.

Ernest Renan says, 'a great aggregation of men, with a healthy spirit and warmth of heart, creates a moral conscience which is called a nation. When this moral conscience proves its strength by sacrifices that demand abdication of the individual for the benefit of the community, it is legitimate, and it has a right to exist.'

Clifford Geertz distinguished between civic nationalism and ethnic nationalism. The former is a desire for citizenship in a modern State and the latter is a commitment to primordial loyalties. These primordial loyalties could take the form of blood ties, race, language, religion, region and custom.

For Elie Kedourie, nationalism was the product of the desire of individuals to achieve an independent state and this desire was driven by a belief in a unique cultural community. Ernest Gellner argued that nationalism was rooted in modernity, and was the consequence of a modern society's need for cultural homogeneity. Tom Nairn shared some of the inclinations of Gellner but added that nationalism arose when the intelligentsia in underdeveloped or peripheral societies was threatened. As a result, they would use history to modernize a vernacular culture often around the goals of the local bourgeoisie.

The idea of a nation was also suggested by Benedict Anderson in his classic work on nationalism *Imagined communities*.

Benedict Anderson's definition of a nation?

'A nation is an imagined political community, and it is imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. [...] It is *imagined* because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion. [...] The nation is imagined as *limited* because even the largest of them, encompassing perhaps a billion living human beings, has finite, if elastic, boundaries, beyond which lie other nations. No nation imagines itself coterminous with mankind. [...] It is imagined as *sovereign* because the concept was born in an age in which Enlightenment and Revolution were destroying the legitimacy of the divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm. [...] Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.'

Anderson, 1995, *Imagined Communities*, pp. 1-7

Anderson argued that the use of vernacular languages in print media helped in the formation of national consciousness. This created a group of people who could understand each other. They, then, thought of creating a cohesive, political and sociological community called a nation.

Civil society

Civil society is neither mandated nor run by the state institutions. It springs from the activities of interest in everyday life. The idea of civil society has a long history beginning with the writings of John Locke (1632-1704) up to the writings of Antonio Gramsci (1891-1937). Let us look at how Locke, Hegel and Gramsci conceived civil society:

Before we explain what John Locke meant by civil society, one needs to understand his idea of the 'state of nature'. The state of nature is a counterfactual or hypothetical situation that can be conceived of before political or civil society came into being. In the state of nature, human beings enjoyed complete freedom and there existed equality amongst all of them. They could distinguish between right and wrong.

Initially, in the state of nature, property was common to all. However, as people began to own private property, disputes became common and there was no impartial system of law that could be employed to resolve such conflicts. So, for redressing this issue, civil society came into being with laws, judges and a coercive apparatus.

The intervention of Georg Hegel (1770-1831), a German philosopher, is significant in the conceptual history of this idea. Civil society, for Hegel, was constituted by social relations standing between family and the State. However, Hegel believed that the problem of social antagonism could be solved only by the state.

According to the Hegelian conception of civil society, individuals acted with their own interests in mind. Hegel made the first systematic effort to theorize a competitive sphere of self-interest which is in radical distinction from the state.

Antonio Gramsci was an Italian Marxist, who was imprisoned by the Fascist government in 1921. He spent the rest of his life in jail until his death in 1937. During those years, he wrote more than one thousand pages on a variety of subjects related to politics, society and economy. This work has been published as *Prison Notebooks*. His analysis on the functioning of the state, political democracy and the bourgeois domination of the State were extremely insightful.

For Gramsci, the state was the sum of dictatorship and hegemony. He argued that the ruling classes ran the state not only through coercion but also by gaining consent over the ruled. Consent was gained through the ideological hegemony that the bourgeoisie exercised over the masses through a variety of institutions of civil society like schools, churches and private associations.

[There are] two major superstructural 'levels': the one that can be called 'civil society', that is the ensemble of organisms commonly called 'private', and that of 'political society' or 'the State'. These two levels correspond on the one hand to the function of 'hegemony', which the dominant group exercises throughout society and on the other hand to that of 'direct domination' or command exercised through the State and 'juridical government'.

Today, civil society is important because of a pervasive skepticism concerning the role of the State and the institutions of the State. According to Ehrenberg, civil society has the ability to revive local communities, train citizens effectively, cultivate values essential to social life and limit the power of intrusive bureaucracies.

ACTIVITY

Browse through some of the prominent political weekly on the Internet and write a short note on the Indian political structure and process.

DID YOU KNOW

In all political cultures, concepts about power and authority have strong psychological aspects as a result of the important role of parental authority in the early socialization process. The skills that children develop in coping with family authority tend to provide a lasting basis for adult ways in dealing with authority.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Political sociology highlights the problems of state and society relations and constructs empirical studies regarding the exercise of power, both within and between states. It also tries to understand the process of interaction between government and society, decision-making authorities, and conflicting social faces and interests.
- The main objective of political sociology is to study and examine interaction between social and political structures.
- Lasswell explains that politics permeates every social group, association, class and profession because the whole society is characterized by the political interaction permeating throughout the society.
- Political cleavage and consensus are the important parts of the political system; and are primarily derived from the social stratification theory of politics.
- Political culture analysis investigates the implications of ethnicity, religion and value orientations for government, polity and governance.
- A nation's political culture comprises its citizen's orientations towards three levels: (i) the political system, (ii) the political process, and (iii) policy outputs and outcomes.
- The stability of a political system totally depends upon the adequacy of political socialization; and has two forms: (i) direct or manifest and (ii) indirect or latent.
- The family, as the first socialization source, can provide skills for political interaction and encourages children for active participation in the political system as an adult.
- A peer group socializes its members by motivating or pressuring them to conform to the attitudes or behaviour accepted by the group.
- Political participation establishes links from the mass public to the political elites; therefore it is an essential means of making elite rule acceptable to modern society.
- In a pluralistic society, the equal validation is given to different subcultures. A pluralist approach regards ethnic minority groups as equal stakeholders in society, meaning that they enjoy the same rights as the majority population.

- When applied to social phenomena in general, 'alienation' possesses various possible dimensions including powerlessness, meaninglessness, normlessness, self-estrangement and isolation.
- Dimensions of political alienation include: (i) political powerlessness, (ii) political meaninglessness, (iii) political normlessness, and (iv) political isolation.

KEY TERMS

- **Political sociology:** Political sociology is the study of power and domination in social relationships.
- **Political culture:** Political culture is an important link between political events and people's reactions to those events, which studies the fundamental political beliefs of the people because these are particularly relevant to understanding social change as well as political stability.
- **Political alienation:** *Political alienation* refers to an individual citizen's relatively enduring sense of estrangement from or rejection of the prevailing political system.
- **Political normlessness:** It means the belief that the rules planned to govern political relations have broken down.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The three components of 'political culture' are: (i) cognitive orientation, (ii) affective orientation, and (iii) evaluative orientation.
2. Elite theory of the state attempts to describe and explain the power relationships in a contemporary society. This theory posits that a small minority, comprising members of the economic elite and policy-planning networks, holds the maximum power which is independent of a state's democratic election process.
3. Dimensions of political alienation include: (i) political powerlessness, (ii) political meaninglessness, (iii) political normlessness, and (iv) political isolation.
4. Political sociology is the study of interactions and linkages between politics and society; between a political system and its social, economic and cultural environment. It also tries to understand the process of interaction between government and society, decision-making authorities, and conflicting social forces and interests.
5. Four agents of 'political socialization' include (i) family, (ii) peer group, (iii) religious institutions, and (iv) mass media.
6. The three important levels of 'political participation' are: (i) very active level, (ii) occasionally active, and (iii) inactive level.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is political culture? Give some definitions.
2. What are the determinants of political culture?

3. What is the significance of political sociology?
4. Write a short note on agents of political socialization.
5. What are the levels of political participation?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Give a detailed account on the nature and scope of political sociology.
2. 'The determining factors of political participation are: (i) social environment, (ii) psychological environment, and (iii) political environment.' Elaborate.
3. Explain the significance of political culture'.
4. Write a short note on the concept of 'political socialization'.
5. Explain the concept of 'culture of alienation' in detail.

FURTHER READING

- Ashraf, Ali and Sharma, L.N. 1983. *Political Sociology: A New Grammar of Politics*. Hyderabad: Orient Longman.
- Horowitz, I.L. 1972. *Foundations of Political Sociology*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Nash, K. 1999. *Contemporary Political Sociology: Globalization, Politics and Power*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

UNIT 2 POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Political Development

Liberal Approaches to Political Development

Marxist Approach: Meaning and Determinants

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading Introduction

Unit Objectives

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The concept of political development is derived from the liberal tradition of the West. It projects Western liberal democracy as the model of developed society. Since it is also regarded as modern society, development is sometimes described as modernization, and political development is conceived as political modernization. In short, modernization -stands for the process of transition of a society from traditional values and institutions to modern ways of life. Generally, traditional values and institutions are regarded as fit for an agrarian economy and society whereas modern ways of life are regarded as fit for industrial and technology-based society. It is believed that only the modern system is capable of fulfilling the needs and aspirations of the modern man.

This unit discusses the concept of political development from the perspectives of the liberal approach and marxist approach.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Recall the liberal approach to political development
- Explain Marxist approach to political development

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

Sharing the concern of other social scientists with the great dichotomy of modernity and tradition and the grand process of modernization, political scientists in the 1910s began to pursue more actively their interests in what was variously called political modernization or political development. Their starting point was the concepts of tradition and modernity; eventually this essentially comparative and static focus gave way to a more dynamic and development oriented set of concerns. This shift can be clearly seen in the work of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Committee on Comparative Politics and Particularly of Gabriel Almond, its chairman and intellectual leader during the 1950s and early 1910s.

The volume which undoubtedly played the major role in first focusing the attention of political scientists on developmental problems was *The Politics of the Developing Areas*, edited by Almond and James S. Coleman and published in 1910 under the sponsorship of the Comparative Politics Committee and the Princeton Center for International Studies.

The bulk of the book consisted of descriptions and analyses in terms of a common format of politics in five developing

areas. The principal intellectual impact of the book, however, came from the introduction by Almond and, to a lesser degree, the conclusion by Coleman. This impact was very largely the result of their application to the politics of non-Western countries of a general concept of the political system. Almond used this framework to distinguish between developed and under-developed or developing political systems. Developed political systems are characteristic of modern societies and underdeveloped ones of traditional societies.

Almond's concepts of traditionalist and of modernity or, as he seemed to prefer, rationality are described in Parson as the terms derived from the central stream of sociological analysis. Almond's distinctive contribution in this respect, however, was the insistence that all political systems are culturally mixed, combining elements of modernity and tradition. All political systems, the developed Western ones as well as the less developed non-Western ones, are transitional systems. He was appropriately critical of some sociological theorists for promoting an unfortunate theoretical polarization in not recognizing this dualistic quality of political systems.

This unit is concerned with the analysis of the political systems of societies which are presumed to be developing (or modernizing) and the comparison of those systems with the political systems presumed to exist in modern societies. Its key categories are system, role, culture, structure, function and socialization. With the possible exception of socialization, no one of these refers to a dynamic process. They are categories essential to the comparative analysis of political systems; they are not oriented to the change and development of political systems. Almond posited a number of functions which must be performed in any political system and then compared systems in terms of the structures which perform those functions. What we have done, he said, is to separate political function from political structure. Almond also argued, we need dualistic models rather than monistic ones, and developmental as well as equilibrium models if we are to understand differences precisely and grapple effectively with the processes of political change.

In this work, Almond and his associates presented the elements of a dualistic model of the political system, but they did not attempt to present a developmental model which would contribute to the understanding of the processes of political change. For Almond that task came six years later with another major theoretical work co-authored with C. Bingham Powell. Unlike the earlier volume, this book was concerned with political dynamics and focused explicitly on political development as a subject and as a concept. Almond and Powell argued that political development is the response of the political system to changes in its societal or international environments and, in particular, the response of the system to the challenges of state building, nation building, participation and distribution.

Political development itself was thought of primarily in terms of political modernization. The three criteria of political development were held to be, structural differentiation, subsystem autonomy, and cultural secularizing factor. Almond thus came

face to face with the problem which was gripping many other political scientists at that time, What is political development?

In 1915, Lucian W. Pye compiled a fairly comprehensive listing of meanings that had been attributed to the concept of political development:

- Political prerequisite of economic development
- The politics typical of industrial societies
- Political modernization
- The operation of a nation state
- Administrative and legal development
- Mass mobilization and participation

- The building of democracy
- Stability and orderly change
- Mobilization and power
- One aspect of a multidimensional process of social change

In a noble effort at synthesis, Pye attempted to summarize the most prevalent common themes on political development as involving movement toward: increasing equality among individuals in relation to the political system; increasing capacity of the political system in relation to its environments; and increasing differentiation of institutions and structures within the political system. These three dimensions, he argued, are to be found lying at the heart of the development process. In a similar vein, another effort to generalize about definitions of political development found four of recurring concepts: rationalization, national integration, democratization, and mobilization or participation.

This quest for political development, in John Montgomery's phrase, necessarily led political scientists to grapple with three more general issues. First, what was the relationship between political development and political modernization? The tendency was to think of political development as virtually identical with political modernization. Political development was one element of the modernization syndrome. Political scientists might disagree as to what types of change constituted political development, but whatever they did choose was almost invariably thought of as a part of the more general process of modernization. The principal dissent from this point of view came in 1915 from Samuel P. Huntington, who argued that it was highly desirable to distinguish between political development and modernization. The identification of the two, he said, limited too drastically the applicability of the concept of political development in both time and space: It became restricted to a particular phase of historical evolution, and hence, it was impossible to talk about the political development of the Greek City-State or of the Roman Empire. In addition, political development as political modernization made the former a rather confusing complex concept, tended to reduce its empirical relevance, and made it difficult if not impossible to conceive of its reversibility, i.e., to talk about political decay.

A second issue which political scientists had to deal with in their definitional efforts was whether political development was a unitary or a complex concept. Since so many people had so many ideas as to what constituted political development, the prevalent tendency was to think of it as a complex concept. This tendency was explained or, perhaps, rationalized by Pye on the grounds that the multifunction character of politics means that no single scale can be used for measuring the degree of political development.

Hence, most scholars used several dimensions: Pye himself, as indicated above, suggested three; Almond also had three; Ward and Rustow, eight; Emerson, five; Eisenstadt, four. This all seems very reasonable, since political development clearly would appear to be a complex process. Yet, obviously also, this approach can lead to difficulties. What are the relationships among the component elements of political development? Thus, although Pye argued that equality, capacity and differentiation constitute the development syndrome, he also had to admit that these do not necessarily fit easily together. On the contrary, historically the tendency has usually been that there are acute tensions between the demands for equality, the requirements for capacity, and the processes of greater differentiation. In a similar vein, Almond argued that there is a tendency for role differentiation, subsystem autonomy and secularization to vary together, but that the relation between each pair of these three variables is not a necessary and invariant one. Almond, indeed, presented a two-way matrix with secularization and differentiation on one axis and subsystem autonomy on the other. He found some type of political system to occupy each of the nine boxes in his matrix. The question thus necessarily arises: What does political development mean if it can mean everything? On the other hand, if political development is defined as a unitary concept, the tendency is either to define it narrowly as Huntington, for instance, did in identifying it exclusively with institutionalization and thus to rob it of many of the connotations and the richness

usually associated with it, or to define it very generally, as for instance Alfred Diamant did which in effect, masks a complex concept under a unitary label.

A third problem in the definitional quest concerned the extent to which political development was a descriptive concept or a teleological one. If it was the former, it presumably referred either to a single process or to a group of processes which could be defined, in terms of their inherent characteristics, as processes. If it was a teleological concept, on the other hand, it was conceived as movement towards a particular goal. It was defined not in terms of its content but in terms of its direction. As in the more general case of modernization, the goals of political development were, of course, valued positively.

The definition of political development in terms of goals would not have created difficulties if there were clear-cut criteria and reasonably accurate indices (e.g., the political equivalent of per capita Gross National Product) to measure progress toward those goals. In the absence of these, however, there was a strong tendency to assume that, since both scholarly analyst and, presumably, the political actors he was analysing, wanted political development, it was therefore occurring. The result was that almost anything that happens in the developing countries coups, ethnic struggles, revolutionary wars becomes part of the process of development, however contradictory or retrogressive this may appear on the surface. These definitional problems raised very real questions about the usefulness of political development as a concept. Referring to Pye's list of often definitions, Rustow argued that this is obviously at least 'nine'. In truth, however, one should go one step further. If there are ten definitions of political development, there are ten too many, and the concept is, in all likelihood, superfluous and dysfunctional.

In the social sciences, concepts are useful if they perform an aggregating function, that is, if they provide an umbrella for a number of sub-concepts which do share something in common. Modernization is, in this sense, an umbrella concept. Or, concepts are useful because they perform a distinguishing function, that is, because they help to separate out two or more forms of something which would otherwise be thought of as undifferentiated. In this sense, manifest functions and latent functions are distinguishing concepts.

Political development in general is of dubious usefulness in either of these ways. To the extent that political development is thought of as an umbrella concept encompassing a multiplicity of different processes, as in the Almond and Pye cases discussed earlier, these processes often turn out to have little in common except the label which is attached to them. No one has yet been able to say of the various elements subsumed under the label political development what Lerner, at a different level, was able to say about the broader processes subsumed under the label modernization: that they went together because in some historical sense, they had to go together. Instead, it is clear that the elements included in most complex definitions of political development do not have to go together and, in fact, often do not. In addition, if political development involves differentiation, subsystem autonomy, and secularization, as Almond suggests, do not the really interesting and important questions concern the relations among these three, as Almond himself implies in his conclusion? The use of the term political development may thus foster a misleading sense of coherence and compatibility among other processes and obscure crucial questions from discussion. To the extent, on the other hand, that political development is identified with a single, specific process, e.g., political institutionalization, its redundancy is all the more obvious. What is to be gained analytically by calling something which has a good name by a second name? As either an aggregating concept or a distinguishing concept, in short, political

development is superfluous.

The popularity of the concept of political development among political scientists stems perhaps from the feeling that they should have a political equivalent to economic development. In this respect, political science finds itself in a familiar ambiguous methodological position between its two neighbouring disciplines. In terms of the scope of its subject matter, political science is narrower than sociology but broader than economics. In terms of the agreement within the discipline on goals, political scientists have more shared values than sociologists, but fewer than economists. Sociology is comprehensive in scope, economics is focused in its goals; political science is not quite one or the other. The eclecticism and diffuseness of sociological theory are excused by the extent of its subject. The narrowness and parochialism of economics are excused by the precision and elegance of its theory.

In this situation, it is quite natural for political scientists to borrow concepts from sociologists and to imitate concepts of economists. The sociological concept of modernization is, quite properly, extended and applied to political analysis. The concept of political development is created in the image of economic development. In terms of choosing its models, one might generalize, a discipline will usually tend to copy the more structured and scientific of its neighbouring disciplines. This leads to difficulties comparable to those normally associated with the phrase misplaced concreteness. Economists, it will be said, do differ over what they mean by economic development and how one measures it. These differences, however, shrink to insignificance in comparison to the difficulties which political scientists have with the term political development. If, on the other hand, political scientists had modelled themselves on the sociologists and talked about political change in imitation of social change rather than political development in imitation of economic development, they might have avoided many of the definitional and teleological problems in which they found themselves.

Characteristics

Different writers have advanced different models of political development. Of these, two are particularly important which are based on similar thinking. The first model advanced by James S. Coleman and Lucian Pye conceived of political development as

political modernization. In its view a modern political system is more efficient than a traditional political system in the same way as the modern industrial system is more efficient than traditional non-mechanized agriculture. The traditional political system was primarily concerned with the collection of taxes, law and order and defence but modern political system also plays an active role in improving the quality of life of its citizens apart from performing its traditional functions. Under the traditional political system, people were not involved in politics; government simply exercised power over them. But under the modern political system, people are closely associated with politics. They do convey their demands and opinions to the government. They do express their support or opposition to government policies and decisions. Government broadly relies on legitimacy of its acts in order to secure the support and cooperation of the people. This model identifies three characteristics of political modernization:

- Differentiation
- Equality
- Capacity

Taken together they comprise development syndrome. Differentiation refers to the process of progressive separation and specialization of roles, institutional spheres and associations within the political system, e.g., the separation of occupational roles from kinship, of legal norms from religion, of administration from politics. Equality is regarded as the ethos of modernity. It implies the notion of universal adult citizenship, legal equality of all citizens and the psychic equality of opportunity for all to gain excellence according to their respective talents and efforts. The subjects of traditional society become citizens of modern society. Modern political system encourages people's participation in the process of governance. This results in the greater respect for law. Capacity in this sense denotes the increased capacity of political system for the management of public affairs, control of disputes and coping up with the new demands of the people.

The second model of political development was advanced by Gabriel Almond and G.B. Powell. Based on the structural

functional analysis of political system, this model identifies three characteristics of political development:

1. Structural differentiation
2. Secularization of culture
3. Expansion of capabilities

Structural differentiation implies the evolution of distinct structures and organs or institutions for the performance of different functions of political system. It operates at two levels:

1. At input level, it envisages the emergence of suitable nongovernmental structures for performing the functions of political socialization (family, school, peer groups, etc.), interest articulation (interest groups), interest aggregation (political parties) and political communication (media of mass communication)
2. At output level, it stipulates separation of powers between different governmental organs for performing the functions of rule making (legislature), rule application (executive) and rule adjudication (judiciary). Secularization of culture denotes the process by which people gradually adopt more rational, empirical and analytical outlook in their political thinking and action. In particular, it requires transition from lower to higher levels of political culture, i.e., from parochial to subject, and from subject to participant political culture.

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

1. Regulative capability (the capability of legitimate coercion to control the behaviour of individuals and groups)
2. Extractive capability (the capability to appropriate the natural and human resources of society and international environment)
3. Distributive capability (the capability to distribute various benefits of individuals and groups)
4. Responsive capability (the capability to respond to the demands coming from society and international environment)

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

If developing societies are able to develop these characteristics in their political systems, they are likely to prove more efficient in their political functioning. But each of these countries must combine these requisites with its own genius. Because of their large size, complex and multicultural character combined with the heritage of communitarian sentiment, they should, not be reduced to competitive market societies in the name of their political development.

7.2.1 Liberal Approaches to Political Development

The study of political development is not the study of politics in societies at some given level of development. If this were the case, there would be few if any studies of politics which were not studies in political development, since those polities which are usually assumed to be developed are also presumably still developing. Yet not infrequently studies in the politics of less developed societies are treated as if they were studies in political development. Tunisia, it is said, is a developing society; therefore, its polity is developing polity. Hence, a study in Tunisian politics is a study in political development. The fallacy here is to look at the subject of the study rather than at the concepts with which that

subject is studied. Depending on the concepts which were used and hence, the questions which were asked, for instance, a study of John F. Kennedy's presidency might be a study in the uses of power, the institutionalization of an office, legislative executive relations, consensus building, the psychology of leadership, the role of intellectuals in politics. Or it could, conceivably, be a study in political development or political change. Exactly the same possibilities would exist for a study of Habib Bourguiba's presidency. There is nothing in the latter which makes it inherently more developmental than the former. Precisely the same is true for the innumerable studies of the role of the military, bureaucracy and political parties in developing societies. More likely than not, these are simply studies of particular institutions in particular types of societies rather than studies in change or development. Depending upon the conceptual framework with which these subjects were approached, they could just as easily be studies in civil military relations, organizational behaviour, and political behaviour, as studies in political development. They are the latter only if the categories employed are formulated in terms of change.

It could, of course, be argued that change is so all pervasive that it is virtually synonymous with politics itself, and hence it cannot be studied as a separate subject. The rejoinder is that, to be sure, politics is change, but politics is also ideas, values, institutions, groups, power, structures, conflict, communication, influence, interaction, law and organization. Politics can be studied, and has been studied, in terms of each of these concepts. Each sheds a different light on the subject, illuminates different areas, and suggests different relationships and generalizations. Why not also analyse politics in terms of change or development? In fact during the 1950s and 1960s a variety of scholars did just that. Many different approaches were employed. Without making any claim to inclusiveness or to systematic rigour, it is perhaps useful to focus on the three of these approaches: system function, social process and comparative history.

System Function

In the analysis of political development, a close relation existed between systems theory, in the strict sense and structural functional theory. It is, indeed, impossible to apply a functional approach without employing some concept of the political system. The varieties of theory encompassed in this general category are reflected in the names: Talcott Parsons, Marion Levy, David Easton, Gabriel Almond, David Apter, Leonard Binder, Fred Riggs. The principal contribution of these scholars has been to develop a set of concepts and categories, central to which are those of system and function, for the analysis and comparison of types of political systems. Among their other key concepts are: structure, legitimacy, input and output, feedback, environment, equilibrium. These concepts and the theories associated with them provide an overall model of the political system and the basis for distinguishing types of political systems in terms of the structures which perform the functions which must be performed in all political systems.

The advantages of the system function approach clearly rest in the generality of the concepts which it deploys on the plains of analysis. One problem of the approach for the study of political change is the defect of this great virtue. It is primarily a conceptual framework. Scholars using the framework may come up with such hypotheses or generalizations, but it is an open question whether the conceptual framework is not more of a hindrance than a help in this respect. The approach itself provides little incentive for scholars to dig into empirical data. Indeed, the tendency is in just the opposite direction. The theory becomes an end in itself. It is striking how few facts there are not only in general works, such as Levy's two volumes, but even in case studies attempting to apply the system function approach to a specific society, such as Binder's study of Iran.

A more fundamental problem is that this approach does not inherently focus on the problem of change. It is possible to employ the concept of system in a dynamic context, focusing on lags, leads and feedback. In actuality, however, much of the theorizing on political development which started from a systems approach did not primarily employ these dynamic elements in that approach. The stress was on the elaboration of models of different types of political systems, not different types of change from one system to another. In his two volume opus, *Modernization and the Structure of Societies*, Levy, for instance, is overwhelmingly concerned with the second element in his two component title. The bulk of his work is devoted to discussing the characteristics of societies in general and then distinguishing between those of relatively modernized societies and of relatively non-modernized societies.

As we noted earlier, Almond himself saw somewhat comparable limitations in the framework which he used in *The Politics of Developing Areas*. The elaborate and change-oriented scheme which he and Powell present in *Comparative Politics, A Developmental Approach* does not entirely escape from this difficulty. Among the works in the system function tradition, directly concerned with political development, David Apter's *The Politics of Modernization* has probably been most successful in bringing to the fore dynamic concerns with the rate, forms and sources of change. Yet to the extent that he has done this, it has in large part flowed from his independent concerns with normative questions and ideologies, which are derived from sources other than the system function framework which he also employs. The structural functional approach, as Kalman Silvert has pointed out, was initially employed by social scientists interested in studying either very primitive societies (the anthropologists) or very complex societies (Parsons). It is an approach peculiarly limited in what it can contribute to the understanding of societies undergoing fundamental change. It is, moreover, rather ironic that political scientists should have seized upon this approach in order to study political change at the same time that the approach was coming under serious criticism within sociology because of its insensitivity to, and limited usefulness in, the study of change. As has often been pointed out, a related difficulty in attempting to deal with change in this intellectual context is the extent to which the concept equilibrium also tends to be implicitly or explicitly linked to the system function approach. The equilibrium concept presupposes the existence of a system composed of two or more functionally related variables. Changes in one variable produce changes in others. The concept, as Easton has pointed out, is closely linked with the ideas of multiple causation and pluralism. In addition, however, equilibrium also means that the variables in the system tend to maintain a particular pattern of interaction. In its pure form the theory conceives of equilibrium as a state of rest. In all forms it presupposes tendencies towards the restoration of an original condition or a theoretically defined condition of equilibrium.

Equilibrium theory has obvious limitations as a framework for exploring political change. As one sociologist observed, the theory does not attend to intrinsic sources of change, does not predict changes that have persistent directional (but only those that restore balance if that is disturbed), and thus does not readily handle past changes that clearly affect the current state of the system. In effect, change is viewed as an extraneous abnormality. It is held to be the result of strain or tension, which gives rise to compensating movements that tend to reduce the strain or tension and thus restore the original state. Change is unnatural; stability or rest is natural. Some thinkers have attempted to reconcile equilibrium and change through the concept of moving equilibrium. By itself, however, this concept is inadequate to account for change. If the equilibrium remains the same but is itself moving as a whole, the concept does not explain the cause or direction of its movement. If the equilibrium is itself changing, then moving equilibrium really means multiple equilibrium, and again some theory is necessary to explain the succession of one equilibrium by another.

Social Process

The social process approach to political development starts not with concepts of the social system and the political system but rather with a focus on social processes such as industrialization, urbanization, commercialization, literacy expansion, occupational mobility which are presumed to be part of modernization and to have implications for political change. The emphasis is on the process, not the system. The approach is more behaviourally and empirically oriented than the system function approach, and it typically leads to the accumulation of substantial amounts of data, often quantitative in nature (surveys or aggregate ecological data), about these social processes which it then tries to relate to political changes. While the scholar working with the system function approach typically attempts to impute functions, the scholar employing the social process approach attempts to correlate processes. He may be tempted to move beyond correlation to causation and to shed light on the latter through various techniques of causal or path analysis.

The scholars most prominently associated with this, type of approach to political development and related questions in the 1950s and 1960s included Daniel Lerner, Karl Deutsch, Raymond Tanter, Hayward Alker, Phillips Cutright and Michael Hudson. The two most important early works,

which stimulated much of what followed, were Lerner's *The Passing of Traditional Society* (1958) and Deutsch's 1911 article, 'Social Mobilization and Political Development'. The system function scholar begins with a concept of the political system, then differentiates different types or models of political systems, and attempts to spell out the consequences and implications of these distinctions. His approach is typically concerned with linking a pattern of action to the system as a whole, i.e., identifying its function within the system, while the social process scholar is concerned with relating one pattern of action to another pattern of action.

The great virtue of the social process approach is its effort to establish relationships between variables and particularly between changes in one set of variables and changes in another. In this respect, it does focus directly on change. Its limitations in dealing with change are threefold. First, more often than not, the variables which have been used concern levels of development rather than rates of development. Since it is empirically oriented, the variables employed are shaped by the availability of data. Data on levels of literacy in different societies at the same time (i.e., now) are easier to come by than data on levels of literacy in the same society over time. The latter, however, are necessary for longitudinal analysis and the use of rates of change in literacy. While cross-sectional analyses may be useful and appropriate in studying some types of relationships, they are also frequently inferior to longitudinal analyses in studying other types of relationships. The difficulty of getting data on the changes in variables over time in most modernizing societies in Asia, Africa and even Latin America has consequently led many social process analysts back to the study of Western European and North American societies. Here is a clear case where knowledge of political change or political development is advanced by studying developed rather than developing societies. A related difficulty is the extent to which the social process approach has been applied primarily to the comparison of national societies, which are often units too large and complex to be useful for comparative generalization for many purposes.

A second problem in the social process approach concerns the links between the usually social, economic, and demographic independent variable and the political-dependent ones. The problem here is the general methodological one of the causal relationship between an economic or social change (which is in some sense objective) to political changes which are normally the result of conscious human effort and will. If the problem is, for instance, to explain voting participation in elections or the frequency of coups, how meaningful is it to correlate these phenomena with rates of economic growth, fluctuations in price levels, or literacy levels? The relation between the macro socioeconomic changes and macro political changes has to be mediated through micro changes in the attitudes, values and behaviour of individuals. The explanation of the latter is the weak link in the causal chain which is assumed to exist in most social process analysis. To date, the most prevalent and effective means of dealing with this problem has been the various forms of the relative deprivation and frustration aggression hypotheses utilized to relate socioeconomic changes to political instability. At the dependent end of the causal chain, social process analysts often have trouble in defining political variables, identifying indices for measuring those variables, and securing the data required for the index.

One more general criticism that can be raised about the social process approach concerns the extent to which it makes politics dependent upon economic and social forces. That the latter are a major influence on politics is obvious, and this influence is

perhaps particularly important in societies at middle levels of social economic modernization. In its pure form, which, to be fair, most of its practitioners rarely use, the social process approach would leave little room for social structure and even less for political culture, political institutions, and political leadership. One of the great problems of the social process approach to political change has been to overcome this initial deficiency and to find ways for assigning independent roles to cultural, institutional and leadership factors.

Comparative History

A third approach to political development is somewhat more diverse and eclectic than the two just considered. Its practitioners share enough in common, however, to be loosely grouped together. They start neither with a theoretical model nor with a focus on the relationship between two or more variables, but rather with a comparison of the evolution of two or more societies. What the system is to the system functions man and process is to the social process man, society is to the comparative history man. He is, however, interested not just in the history of one society but rather in

the comparison of two or more societies. The system functions man conceptualizes; the social process man correlates; the comparative history man, naturally, compares. Among social scientists concerned with political development who would fit primarily into this school are Cyril Black, S.N. Lisenstadt, Dankwart Rustow, Seymour Martin Lipset, Barrington Moore, Jr., Reinhard Bendix, and, in some measure, Lucian W. Pye and the members of the SSRC Committee on Comparative Politics.

The work of these people tends to be highly empirical but not highly quantitative. They are, indeed, concerned with precisely those factors with which the social process analysts have difficulty: institutions, culture and leadership. Their approach is to categorize patterns of political development either by general stages or phases through which all societies must pass or by distinctive channels through which different societies may pass, or by some combination of these *vertical* and *horizontal* types of categories. Moore, for instance, distinguishes three patterns of modernization, under bourgeois (England, United States), aristocratic (Germany, Japan), and peasant (Russia, China) auspices. While he admits there may conceivably be a fourth way (India?), he is very dubious that this possibility will materialize. Consequently, every modernizing society will presumably have to find its way to modernity by the way of liberal capitalism, reactionary fascism, or revolutionary communism. Cyril Black, on the other hand, starts by identifying four phases of modernization through which all societies pass: the initial challenge to modernity; the consolidation of modernizing leadership; economic and social transformation from a rural, agrarian to an urban, industrial society; and the integration of society, involving the fundamental reordering of social structure. He then specifies five criteria for distinguishing among societies in terms of how they have evolved through these phases and proceeds to classify all contemporary societies into seven patterns of political modernization on the basis of these criteria. He thus combines vertical and horizontal categories into a truly all encompassing scheme of comparative history, and he very appropriately subtitles his book, *A Study in Comparative History*.

In a slightly different vein, Dankwart Rustow and the SSRC Committee on Comparative Politics have attempted to identify the types of problems which confront modernizing societies and to compare the evolution of these societies in terms of the sequences with which they have dealt with these problems. Rustow argues that there are three key requirements of political modernization: identity is essential to the nation, authority to the State, equality to modernity. The three together form the political basis on modern nation state. The critical differences among societies concern the extent to which they had to deal with these problems simultaneously or sequentially, and, if the latter, the order in which these problems were dealt with. On the basis of comparative analysis, Rustow suggests that the identity authority equality sequence leads to the most successful and least traumatic modernization. In a somewhat similar spirit and parallel endeavour, the SSRC Committee identified five crises which societies would have to deal with in the process of political modernization: identity, legitimacy, penetration, participation and distribution. A rough equivalence presumably exists between these two efforts as well as that of Almond.

The great virtue of the comparative history approach is that it starts by looking at the actual evolutions of societies, attempts to classify those evolutions into patterns, and then attempts to generate hypotheses about what factors are responsible for the differences in patterns. It starts, in short, with the real stuff of history, at the opposite end of the methodological scale from the systemfunction approach with its abstract model of the system. Nor does it, like the social

process approach, assume that certain variables, such as urbanization and instability, can be lifted out and generalized about independently of their context. This approach thus clearly lacks generality. In effect, it comes back to a focus on the historically discrete phenomenon of modernization, and it deals with particular phases in the evolution of particular societies. Like most developmental analyses, its concepts are less generalized than those of equilibrium analysis. In comparison to the system function man with his conceptual complexity and the social process man with his high-powered quantitative analyses, the comparative history fellow often seems like a rather pedestrian, traditional plodder, whose findings lack theoretical and scientific precision. On the other hand, he is, unlike his competitors, usually able to communicate those findings to readers who will not read jargon and cannot read numbers.

Each of these three approaches has obviously contributed much to the study of political development. At the same time each has the defect of its virtues. From the viewpoint of a theory of political change, the system function approach is weak in change, the social process approach is weak in politics, and the comparative history approach is weak in theory. By building upon and combining the strengths of all three approaches, however, it may be possible to overcome the deficiencies of each.

2.2.2 Marxist Approach: Meaning and Determinants

The political economy approach of Karl Marx has been dwelt upon in his famous work, *Das Kapital*. The book comprises a wide-ranging discourse on political economy which has been penned in German by Marx and edited in part by Friedrich Engels. Marx also wrote *Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* wherein he gave an in-depth explanation of capitalism. According to Marx, the political economy concept was not a moral exposition. On the other hand, he argued, it was an attempt to explore those processes which form the capitalist system as a whole and also its origins and future. Studying the workings of a capitalist economy, Marx tried to explore both the causes and the dynamics of addition to the capital, growth of the system of wage labour, the changes it brought to the workplace, the concentration of capital, competition, the banking and credit system, the tendency of the rate of profit to decline and rent of land, among others. Marx argued that capitalism was strong because it had the power to misuse and alienate the labour. He said that the ultimate source of the profit of capitalists and their surplus lay in this misuse and alienation of labour. Furthermore, the ultimate source of the profits of capitalists and their surplus was also in the unpaid labour of the daily wagers. Marx said that it was possible for employers to claim value of the new output because they owned the productive capital assets which in turn were protected by the state in the form of property rights.

According to Marx, it was possible for political economists to objectively explore the scientific laws of capitalism because the markets were expanding which in turn had led to the objectification of most economic relations. The illusions brought in by all previous religions and political associations had been stripped away by the cash nexus.

Marx also argued that 'the economic formation of society was a process of natural history'. It was not possible for any individual to control or direct the process of the growth of commerce, which in turn had created an enormous complex web of global social interconnections. Therefore, said Marx, that a society was economically formed even before its people started to consciously master their productive capacity and use the global interconnections that they had made in order to maximize their profits by putting them to a collective best use. The theory of revolution (which Marx views as being led by the working class and their representatives) is not proposed by the concept of capital. Instead, it suggests a theory of crisis since the condition for a revolution in the making or what Marx refers to in the *Communist Manifesto* as a potential 'weapon', is "forged" by those who own the capital and have 'turned against

the bourgeoisie itself for the welfare of the working class.

According to Marx, these crises were rooted in the most fundamental and significant social form of capitalist society which was the contradictory nature of the commodity. As per Marx, development of technology and the growth in the levels of production during the period of capitalism lead to the increase in the gain of material wealth (or use values) in a given society even though it diminishes the economic value of this wealth at the same time. The rate of profit thus gets lowered. A paradox is created by this tendency, which is close to the characteristics of crisis in capitalism, of "poverty in the midst of plenty" or, more succinctly, in the middle of under-consumption a crisis of overproduction.

As per Marx, the term 'political economy' most commonly referred to interdisciplinary studies which drew upon principles of economics, law and political science in order to explain the workings of political institutions, the political environment as well as the economic system whether capitalist, socialist, mixed and how they influenced each other. Political economy was used originally in studying production, the laws of buying and selling and their relationship with laws, custom and government. It also included the study of the distribution of national income and wealth, including the use of the budget process.

Social Production of Existence

The theory of social production of existence is of the view that men will most likely enter those defined relations which are independent of their will. These will include the relations of production which are most appropriate at a given stage in their development of their material forces of production. The economic structure of society is constituted of the totality of these relations of production. A legal and political superstructure arises based on their real foundation; and it is with this superstructure that the concrete forms of social consciousness correspond. The general process of social, political and intellectual life is conditioned by the mode of production of material life. The existence of men is not determined by their own consciousness but by their social existence which is key to their consciousness. The material and productive forces of society will come into conflict at every particular stage of development with the then popular relations of production or with the property relations within the framework in which they operated in the past. These relations turn into their bindings from forms of development of the productive forces. Therefore, the whole superstructure will be transformed as these changes will alter the social economic foundations of the society.

While exploring such transformations in society, Marx said that it was significant to understand the material transformation of the economic conditions of production. The way to determine these lay in the precision of ideological forms, which is a stage where men become aware of the conflict and begin the fight. In the same way that an individual cannot be judged on the basis of his opinions about himself, a period of transformation cannot be judged by its consciousness. Instead, this consciousness is required to be explained on the basis of contradictions of material life and from the conflict that exists between the social forces and the relations of production. No social order is ever completely destroyed beforehand because the productive forces for which it is needed have been developed and in the same vein, the old relations of production are not replaced by new, superior ones before because the material conditions required for their existence have matured within the framework of the old society.

Therefore, mankind only gives itself those tasks to solve for which it has the potential. A close examination of such events reveals that conflicts arise only when the material conditions for its solution exist beforehand or are made in the course of its formation. The Asiatic, feudal, ancient and modern bourgeois modes of production can be broadly categorized as epochs which mark the progress in the economic development of society. The last antagonistic form of the social process of production is the bourgeois mode of production. However, those productive forces that develop within the bourgeois society also create such material conditions which prove as solutions for this antagonism as well.

Historical Materialism

The concept of history according to Karl Marx is known as dialectical or historical materialism. 'To Marx', explains Larson 'matter is not a product of mind: on the contrary, mind is simply the most advanced product of matter.' Though Marx rejected Hegel's content orientation, he retained the dialectical structure. 'Historical materialism is the Marxist theory of society. This is clear in a detailed passage in the Preface to *'A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*.

Stages of Human History

One of the primary themes contained in Karl Marx's *'The Communist Manifesto'* is the stages of human history. He differentiated the stages of human history on the basis of their economic regimes and categorized them into four modes of production which he called the asiatic, the ancient, the feudal and the bourgeois.

Being a materialist, Karl Marx looks believes thoughts to be based on facts. According to Marx, 'It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but on the contrary, it is their social existence that determines their consciousness.'

In this way, social laws change along with the history of social and economic evolution. There have always been conflicting classes in society. From historical evidence, these conflicting classes have three major forms, which are as follows:

- Society of slave tradition
- Aristocratic society
- Capitalist society

According to Marx, only a Communist society can resolve the conflict.

Even the economic basis of social evolution has two parts:

- Means of production
- Economic relations

The first comprises machines and second, ownership and ways of distribution, etc.

The order of society underwent a change with the development of the classes. With the development of agricultural implements, it entered into a state of agriculture.

The industrial age was conceived with the discovery of industrial machinery. In the same way, society underwent

important changes with the entry of banks and currency into the medium of distribution.

Modes of Production and Practical Aspects of Historical Materialism

Therefore, the history of society is reflected in the history of development and the law governed during the successive modes of production. This succession passes through six consecutive modes of production and you will learn about them ahead in detail.

- **Primitive society:** This was the first and the lowest form of organization of people. It existed for thousands of years. In this stage, men made use of primitive implements. The relations of production and the productive forces were not very developed. Everything was done on a communal basis. The people tilled the communal land together with common tools and lived in a common dwelling, sharing products equally. The productive forces developed slowly. With the growth of productivity, the clan began to break into families. The family became the owner of the means of production. Thus, private property arose and with it, social inequality. This resulted in the first antagonistic classes—masters and slaves.

- **Slave society:** In the earlier stages of human society, called primitive communism by Marx, the community was a society. People did not have the need of accumulation. However, when man started using the result of one day's labour over a number of days, the tendency to accumulate increased. This was the beginning of the convention of wealth.

Ownership of objects spread to ownership of men because slaves helped to increase the inflow of objects. In this way, the slave and master classes came into being in society and consequently, master and slave morality grew. This increased dissatisfaction which, in its turn, led to class conflict. Slaves revolted against masters for equal rights.

- **Feudal society:** As time passed, the masters did concede some rights to slaves. Though the slaves possessed some ownership over land, a major portion of the yield still went to the master. It was the inception of 'lordship society'. In this society, too, there were two conflicting classes—serfs and lords. Lords were superseded by kings or emperors. The serfs laboured and the lords or kings benefited. In order to give sanction to the authority of kings and lords, religion was resorted to.

In this way, religious ethics were born and the concepts of Heaven and Hell came into being. God was recognized as the religious emperor under whom lay many gods and goddesses. The serf was taught to pray to this God and to rest satisfied with his lot, which was allocated to him by God. It was God who had vested authority in the king. Also, there were lords authorized by the king. Thus, to obey their orders was the duty of the public. There was a vast difference in the status of the ruler and the ruled.

- **Capitalist society:** In this age, conflicts in the lordship system became more intense. On the other side, steam was discovered in the forces of production and factories derived power from steam engines. The lords abandoned their dukedoms and entered the industrial field. They created the capitalist or owner class. They joined hands with businessmen and white-collared middle-class people. The serfs went on to become the labour class. Thus, society was again stratified into two layers or classes—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. In the bourgeois and proletariat morality too, there is a tremendous conflict as in all conflicting classes. The policy of the bourgeois is one of exploitation. They have nothing to do with the problems of the proletariat. Resorting to secular orders, laws of action and religion, they preach lessons of humbleness and patience to the labourers.

- **Socialist society:** After the working class has been exploited to the hilt, it looks for an escape. Class consciousness is built up that leads to revolution against the capitalists and if it is successful, socialism is gained. In socialism, production is directed by the elected councils of the workers. The means of production are transferred from the

hands of capitalists to that of the workers. He called this change the 'dictatorship of the proletariat'. Economically, each worker is paid according to the amount of labour he contributes to society.

• **Communist society:** The Communist society, according to Marx, is the future society aimed at by all form of development and revolution in society. This is best defined by the Party Programme in USSR as, 'Communism is a classless social system with one form of public ownership of the means of production and full social equality of all members of society under it, the all-round development of people will be accompanied by the growth of the, productive forces through continuous progress in science and technology; all the springs of cooperative wealth will flow more abundantly, and the great principle, "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" will be implemented. Communism is a highly organized society of free, socially conscious working people in which public self-government will be established, a society in which labour for the good of society will become life's prime want of everyone, a necessity recognized by one and all, and the ability of each person will be employed to the greatest benefit of the people.'

In the Communist state, the class struggle will come to an end. The disparity between mental and physical labour will lose recognition and the government and religion will be destroyed. Only then will true morality be conceived.

Assessment of Historical Materialism

Historical materialism or the materialist conception of history is the direct application of the principles of dialectical materialism to the development of society. Karl Marx made it the cornerstone of his social and political philosophy. Even though Marx does not explain what he means by his theory of historical materialism it is based on the economic interpretation of history. Marx probably used the word 'materialistic' to contrast his theory with that of Hegel as sharply as he could,

The theory of the materialistic conception of history starts with the belief that economic activities are the basis of political, legal, cultural and religious institutions and beliefs. Various forms of state or varieties of legal system cannot be taken as results of the development of human mind but have their origin in the material conditions of human life. The theory starts with the simple truth that man must eat to live and in order to eat, he must produce. Thus, his survival depends upon the success with which he can fulfil his needs.

Production is the most important of all human activities. Society is the result of these necessities of man. Marx grouped the efforts of man in this regard into four main stages:

- Primitive or Asiatic stage
- Ancient stage
- Feudal stage
- Capitalist stage

In all these stages, the class which controls the means of production controls the rest. It is this fact of domination which creates a perpetual state of tension and conflict. In all stages of human life, the forces or conditions of production determine the structure of society.

Marx's theory of materialistic conception of history contains a greater amount of truth than his dialectical materialism. According to Marxist thinker Carew Hunt, all modern writers on social sciences are indebted to Marx, even if they do not admit it. In this sense, Marx's historical materialism or economism represents a very valuable advance in the methods of social sciences.

However, it is impossible to explain all historical movements exclusively in economic terms. Marx's theory ignores the fact that human passions, sentiments, emotions and religion also influence human behaviour. As a philosophical doctrine, the economic interpretation of history is incapable of universal application.

We may see reason in the emphasis laid down by Marx on economic factors though history cannot be explained in terms of decisions made by politicians and kings acting in a vacuum. The major problem arises when the views of Marx are offered as a complete explanation of extremely complex phenomena. Many ideals which, according to Marx, were only reflections of material interests of one's place in the economic order, actually attain independent status. It is possible that Karl Marx and his colleague Engels recognized the overemphasis that was laid on the economic factors. The excessive zeal of some of his admirers to make his ideas rigid led Marx on one occasion to say that he was not a Marxist. By this, he seems to have meant that he was rigid when they were applying the materialist conception of history.

Rational Choice

The rational choice theory provides a framework for not just understanding but also modelling behaviour, both social and economic. Not only is it important in the school of microeconomics that is presently dominant but it is also of great significance in modern political science, sociology and philosophy. It is the same as instrumental rationality, which involves the identification of the most cost-effective method for achieving a specific goal without affecting the worthiness of that goal.

Individual Preferences

The rational choice theory is based on the idea that behavioural patterns in societies represent the choices made by individuals during their attempt to maximize benefits and

minimize their costs. In other words, the decisions of people regarding the way they act are made by comparing the costs of different actions with their benefits. As a result, patterns of behaviour will develop within the society the results from those choices. The concept of rational choice, wherein comparison of costs and benefits of certain actions are made by people is quite evident in economic theory. Since people want to get as many useful goods as possible at the lowest price, they will consider/weigh the benefits they get from a certain product (for example, how useful or appealing it is) compared to similar objects. They will then compare prices. Simply put, most consumers will select the object which will give them the maximum reward at the minimum price or cost. It is claimed that rational choice theory makes certain unrealistic assumptions to generate predictions that are tractable and testable. These include: An individual possesses complete information regarding what exactly will result from a certain choice. Models that are complicated depend on the probability of describing the outcomes. An individual possesses the cognitive ability and time to consider and weigh each against every other choice. Studies about the drawbacks or constraints related to this assumption are included in theories of bounded rationality.

Proponent of Rational Choice Theory

The application of rational choice theory was supported by Gary Becker, recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences, in 1992, for his studies on crime, discrimination and human capital, in the late 20th century, the rational choice theory was the school of thought that dominated the study of political science. Rational choice is more self-consciously theoretical than other research programmes. History and culture are irrelevant for rational choice theorists, who wish to understand political behaviour. All they need to know is the interest of the actors and the assumption that these interests are pursued in a rational manner. While the decision-making approach in the past chose to explain the decisions of elite groups (usually in foreign policy-related issues), rational choice theorists chose to apply their formal theory (at times requiring mathematical notations also) to all aspects of political life.

Rational Choice Theory: Practical Applications

The main feature that defines the rational choice theory is that people attempt to always maximize their interests in situations where their vote is required or where they are required to volunteer politically. There are many variants to the approach. Decision theory, for instance, is based on cost-benefit analysis done by individuals without reference to anyone else's plans. The game theory, on the other hand, examines how people make choices on the basis of how they expect others to act.

The primary idea of the rational choice, economic and public choice (although these variants differ in important particulars) is that behaviour is purposive. Political behaviour is not just an outcome of psychological drives, socialization or organizational norms: In fact, individuals possess goals which they attempt to achieve, acting as rationally as possible given the level of knowledge, available resources and the situation.

Rational Choice Theory in Political Economy

The rational choice theory refers to the interaction between the society, state and markets. It makes use of sophisticated analytic tools and techniques in its investigations. Rational choice theorists examine individual behaviour as well as the state policies in terms of benefit maximization and cost minimization. The rational choice theory has become more and more involved in social sciences other than economics, such as sociology and political science in recent times. It has had far-reaching effects on the study of political science, especially in fields like the study of interest groups, elections, behaviour in legislatures, coalitions, and bureaucracy. Models that depend on rational choice theory often adopt methodological individualism, and assume that social situations or collective behaviours are solely the outcome of individual actions; that larger institutions play no role. The mismatch between this and sociological conceptions of social situations is responsible for the limited use of the theory in sociology. Among other things, sociology focuses on the determination of individual tastes and perspectives by social institutions, conflicts with rational choice theory's assumption that our tastes and perspectives are given and inexplicable.

Rational choice theory defines 'rationality' more narrowly and specifically so as to simply mean that an individual tries to balance costs against benefits to decide on an action that gives maximum personal benefits. In general, the rational choice theory does not take into account or address the role played by an individual in terms of morals or ethical decision-making. Thus, economist and Nobel Prize winner Amartya Sen refers to those who follow the rational choice

model as 'rational fools'. This is because the rational choice theory is bereft of the understanding of consumer motivation. Some economists restrict the use of theory to understanding business behaviour where there is more clarity of goals.

ACTIVITY

If you are asked for ways to expand our democracy how would you suggest direct inclusion of citizens in the decision-making process?

DID YOU KNOW

Karl Marx and Friedrich Nietzsche shared similar views on society. Marx invented Communism and Nietzsche coined Fascism. Marx believed that Britain would be the first to adopt communist ideas and thought that Russia was too backward in this regard. However, just the reverse happened in 1917.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- On a broad scale, political development is the development of institutions, attitudes and values that form the political power system of a society. Many definitions have been used for the term political development. The common factor in all definitions is the reflection of societies and preoccupations of analysts.
- Political modernization refers to the assembly of changes, in terms of structure and culture, within the political system of societies moving towards modernization.
- All theories of modernization attempt to classify the social variables which contribute to social advancement and well-being of certain societies.

- Interest articulation is the manner in which people and social groups communicate their needs and demands to the government.
- Groups that are linked to politics, economy or the society and represent a set of people are known as interest groups.
- Karl Marx's approach on the subject of political economy is contained in his book *Das Kapital*.
- Marx said that political economists could study the scientific laws of capitalism in an 'objective' way because the expansion of markets had objectified most economic relations—the cash nexus stripped away all previous religious and political illusions.
- Men enter into definite relations by the force of economic circumstances such as the forces and relations of production. Thus, historical processes are determined by economic forces.
- One of the primary themes contained in Karl Marx's *The Communist Manifesto* is the stages of human history.

- The modes of production in society, according to Marx, evolved through six stages—primitive, slave, feudal, capitalist, socialist and capitalist societies.
- The rational choice theory provides a framework for not just understanding but also modelling behaviour, both social and economic.
- The application of rational choice theory was supported by Gary Becker, recipient of the Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences, in 1992, for his studies on crime, discrimination and human capital.
- The main feature that defines the rational choice theory is that people always attempt to maximize their interests in situations where their vote is required or where they are required to volunteer politically.

KEYTERMS

- **Political economy:** It is a marxist terminology that refers to interdisciplinary studies drawing upon economics, law and political science in explaining how political institutions, the political environment, and the economic system—capitalist, socialist, mixed—influence each other.
- **Historical materialism:** It is a methodological approach to the study of society, economics and history that was propounded by Karl Marx.
- **Rational choice theory:** It is a framework for not just understanding but also modelling behaviour, both social and economic.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The concept of political development projects Western liberal democracy as the model of a developed society.
2. The three characteristics of political modernization identified by the first model that was advanced by James S. Coleman and Lucian Pye were:
 - (i) Differentiation
 - (ii) Equality
 - (iii) Capacity
3. Structural differentiation implies the evolution of distinct structures and organs or institutions for the performance of different functions of a political system.
4. According to Samuel R Huntington 'modernization is a multifaceted process involving change in all areas of human thought and activity'.
5. Social mobilization, as defined by Karl Deutsch is 'the process by which major clusters of social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded and broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behaviour'.
6. *The Communist Manifesto*
7. True

.1 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. List ten meanings that Lucian W. Pye had attributed to the concept of political development.
2. What are the two levels of operation of structural differentiation?
3. Expansion of capabilities implies an increase in four types of capabilities of a political system. Which are these four capabilities?
4. What does the liberal approach to political development state?
5. What is Marx's view on political development.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Explain the concept of political development. What are the different issues that political scientists had to deal with in their definitional efforts?
2. Discuss the various approaches to political development.
3. Assess the liberal approach to political development.
4. Critically analyse the Marxist's approach to political development.

2.7 FURTHERREADING

Dahl, Robert A. and Bruce Stinebrickner. 2005. *Modern Political Analysis*. New Delhi: PHI Learning.

Johari, J.C. 1987. *Contemporary Political Theory—New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

Rathod, P.B. 2001. *Political Analysis—Historical and Modern Perspective*. Jaipur: ABD Publishers.

Verma, S.L. 2008. *Advanced Modern Political Theory—Analysis and Techniques*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

UNIT 3 CENTRE-PERIPHERY AND DEPENDENCY MODEL

Structure

Introduction

 nUnit Objectives

 Genesis of the Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

 Application of the Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

 Relevance of the Centre-Periphery and Dependency Model

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

 Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

There is general agreement among scholars that persons with high social status are likely to be active in politics. These persons are well- educated, engaged in good occupations, earn substantial income and belong to respectable families. They have easy access to communication media and they are physically mobile. They are exposed to industrialization and urbanization. All these make them mentally mobile and strong. Their political awareness and sense of political efficacy are generally high. Their privileged social connections and occupational links enable them to occupy key positions in different social and political networks or significantly influence those who are placed in these positions. It is thus obvious that persons with high social status are located at the political centre, and those who are less privileged have little chance of reaching the political centre. The latter are farther away from the centre and nearer to periphery where political communication is scarce and people have little inclination for political communication.

This unit deals with the genesis, application and relevance of the centre-periphery and dependency model.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss the genesis of the centre-periphery and dependency model
- Describe the application of the centre-periphery and dependency model
- Explain the relevance of the centre-periphery and dependency model

GENESIS OF THE CENTRE-PERIPHERY AND DEPENDENCY MODEL

The centre-periphery dichotomy in respect of political participation, though largely true, fails to explain some important cases of political activism. There are many examples of people located at the social periphery, but involved in high-pitch political activities.

Mobility: Political participation is facilitated by mental mobility. A mobile mind is capable of responding to external stimuli and disengaging itself from prejudices, superstitions, outdated attitudes and values. And the level of the mental mobility of a person is, to a great extent, determined by his physical and social mobility. The nature of the residential location of a person would have some bearing on his participation in politics. Is he an old resident or a stranger? If he is an old resident, how long has he stayed in the community? The members of a community are unlikely to trust a stranger for any leadership position? He would take time to establish rapport with them. But an old resident does not suffer from this handicap. Being known to them for long, he is likely to enjoy their trust and understanding and receive their help and cooperation.

But in respect of the political participation of a community, the presence of strangers is not totally negative. Strangers come with fresh ideas. As a result, by slowly disseminating these ideas, they may help in enriching the quality of the political beliefs and ideas of the community. Further, a newcomer starts with a clean slate, and his past, even if bad, may escape the attention of the community. On the other hand, an old member of the community, with a bad record, is unlikely to win the support of the people.

Another aspect of physical mobility is urbanization. It has been argued that as an individual moves from a village to a town or a city, the possibility of his participation in politics increases. Urbanization has some advantages like higher rate of education, better transport facilities, higher exposure to mass media, the presence of large number of groups, networks and organizations, a climate of politicization, and, above all, different political parties which stimulate political activism. This view of urbanization as a positive factor of political participation has been articulated in what is known as the mobilization model.

Karl Deutsch of Harvard University is one of the well-known proponents of the mobilization model. However, some scholars have argued just the opposite. According to them, rural life fosters community feeling marked by a sense of solidarity, understanding and a sense of boundedness. In such an atmosphere an individual feels encouraged to be involved in the political process. On the contrary in a big town or a city where a sense of belonging is largely conspicuous by absence, the individual gets lost. He fails to discover his own identity in an ocean of vastness of city life. City life, being largely broken and fragmented, militates against the community feeling of solidarity. As a result, a town- or a city-dweller feels inhibited from taking an active part in politics.

Like physical mobility, social mobility has also some influence on political participation. Social mobility means change in the status of an individual in the society. While upward mobility refers to improvement in his status, deterioration in his status is known as downward mobility. As important components of social status like education, occupation and income have positive correlation with political participation, upward social mobility would stimulate political participation. For the same reason, downward mobility would slow down political participation.

However, from another angle the relation between social mobility and political participation may be examined. Whether it is upward or downward mobility, the concerned person is likely to be subjected to cross-pressure. While living in the present, he may have weakness for the past. Even if he has a better status now, it would not be easy for him to throw away his old associations and values. This tendency to cling to both the present and the past will place him in an uncertain frame of mind and a lot of tensions. A man, in such a state of mind, is unlikely to take active part in politics. Thus, it is worthwhile to further study the hypothesis that upward social mobility stimulates political participation.

In some developed countries like the United States of America, and Britain, both upward and downward mobility have been found to have association with conservatism. In other words, whether a person goes up or goes down in the social hierarchy, he is inclined to embrace conservative attitudes and indulge in conservative politics. While in Britain such a man will join the Conservative Party, in the US his counterpart will support conservative issues and perhaps join the Republican Party which is relatively more conservative than the Democratic Party. In case of upward mobility the concerned person would be tempted to internalize the values and attitudes of the upper class to which he has been promoted, because he thinks that it is in his interest to identify himself with those values and political groups which benefit his present class. This may also happen due to the social pressure of the new environment or anticipatory socialization. In case of demotion in the status of a person, he tends to stick to the values of his old class as a mechanism of compensating for the loss in his social position. In spite of decline in his status he is not prepared to delink himself from the symbols of his old status. However, in a few other developed countries like Italy downward mobility seems to have contrary effect on political participation. A person with decline in social status tends to be attracted

towards political radicalism. In other words, he identifies himself with the values and politics of the people belonging to the class to which he has been denoted.

Some of the centre-periphery factors are outlined below.

1. Psychological factors: Some psychological impulses may drive an individual to politics. Politics may be a means of overcoming one's loneliness. Politics creates new bonds of association, and an individual can get rid of his fear of being isolated by joining politics. He gets new opportunities to establish fresh links with others. Man, being a curious animal, is keen on understanding the meaning and essence of his environment. He wants to know the people and world around him. He is tempted to unravel the mystery of a political environment which has a special appeal for him.

An individual may be guided by his psychological motives consciously or unconsciously. When he wants to overcome his loneliness or understand the meaning of his political environment by involvement in politics, he is conscious of what he is among. But sometimes he may be unconsciously dragged to politics by one psychological motive or another. A man, afflicted by psychic tension, may enter politics and may consequently get rid of this tension, though, while joining politics, he is not conscious of the fact that it will stop the flow of tension within him or help him in releasing his tension. Andrew Bonar Law, who suffered from intense pain as a result of the death of his wife in 1909, felt driven to very active politics. Eventually he became the leader of the Conservative Party, and then the Prime Minister of Britain. Woodrow Wilson, as a child, passed through severe psychological tension due to an agonizing conflict between his devotion to his parents, and his sharp differences with them in some important values of life. It has been argued that his vigorous search for power in later life was an unconscious response to his psychological need of overcoming this inner conflict.

Power-hankering is almost a universal phenomenon. For an individual, power may be a means as well as an end. Power is a potent instrument at the hand of man. It can be used to gain material benefits; it may also win social esteem. Further, one may derive pleasure from the exercise of power. And one of the surest and most direct ways of gaining power is politics. Political posts, party posts as well as governmental posts are repositories of power. One may consciously plunge into politics because he seeks power and prestige. Sometimes, he is unconsciously drawn to politics because of his psychological need of these valued objectives.

Another psychological explanation of political participation is status inconsistency. The main components of social status are education, occupation, income, religion, race and caste and it is argued that discrepancy between or among these components will create psychic tension in the concerned individual. For example, a person of high caste and low occupation or a person of low caste and high education is vulnerable to status inconsistency, and such a person is likely to be actively involved in social or political movements with a view to changing or breaking those structures or arrangements which, in his opinion, are responsible for his frustration and tension. He considers his participation in such movements as tension-reducing.

The theory of status inconsistency, which is relatively weak, suffers from a few but serious limitations. One, in complex and differentiated industrial societies, status inconsistency is likely to be widespread and large, and there will be temptation to trace back the political participation of all or most individuals to status discrepancy. Two, determination of status inconsistency at the cross-national level is extremely difficult, because the relative importance of individual status elements varies from nation to nation, and culture to culture.

The psychological correlates of political participation include personality traits which are of two types, namely, basic personality traits, and socially derived or socially learnt personality traits. The first group of personality traits includes rigidity, guilt, intolerance of ambiguity, manic depression and manifest anxiety while the second group of personality traits comprises sense of efficacy, sense of civic responsibility, sociability, sense of alienation, and authoritarianism. There is a great deal of agreement among researchers that while there is little correlation between basic personality traits and political participation, there is significant correlation between socially learnt personality traits and political participation.

2. Political factors: Politics is played in a political system. Thus, the nature and form of the political system would affect political participation. Further, political participation is also influenced by the context and setting in which it takes place. The form and direction of political participation are significantly determined by the nature of the political environment.

(i) Democracy is superior to dictatorship primarily because in a democracy the people have freedom to express their views even against their government whereas in a dictatorship this freedom is denied to the people. In a democracy the people have rights and opportunities to influence the policies and actions of their government. They take different steps in this regard. Such steps include discussions and voting at one end and strike, and protest march at the other end. Political participation is one of the core elements of democracy, and the quality of democracy is known from the quality of participation of people in the political process.

(ii) Political parties are a sine qua non of democracy. As democracy provides competing choices to the people, it is bound to have more than one party. It

may be a two-party system or a multiparty one. Political party is a powerful reference group for people. It imparts political education. It not only inculcates in them political interest, but also mobilizes them on issues of their concern or on some general issues of national concern. As in a democracy the relationship between political parties and citizens is of much consequence, the nature of parties would influence the participation of people in politics. The followers of a secular party are unlikely to indulge in communal politics: On the other hand, the followers of a racist party would indulge in racist violence. Further, the members of a revolutionary party would abhor democratic politics and seek to overthrow the political system by intensified violent activities.

It has been established by several researchers that there is little correlation between the party system and voter turnout. In bi-party systems voter turnout may be high or low. Similar fluctuation in voter turnout has been found in multiparty systems. Further, the assumption that with more parties competing for political office, there will be more office-holders and activists in parties has proved to be wrong. This is due to the fact that in each country there are only a small number of people who are willing and able to take up activist roles in politics. Some scholars believe that ideological polarization between political parties may result in increased voter turnout in elections. But the realities on the ground do not support this belief. In Norway, there is ideological cleavage between political parties; in Britain there is not much of ideological difference between political parties. But the voter turnout in these two countries is more or less the same.

Election campaigning is not only politically educative, but also arouses voters to action. Electioneering has three aspects. The first is its vigour and intensity. The second is the issues which are raised in course of campaigning. The third is the personality of candidates plays a big role in this regard. If a candidate has charisma, he or she will be able to attract more people to his side. The effectiveness of campaigning depends upon the techniques adopted by parties and candidates. While there is general agreement on the efficacy of face-to-face campaigning, in developed countries electronic media - specially TV - has proved quite effective in winning the support of voters.

The simplicity of rules and organization encourages political participation and vice versa. If the governmental machinery and other political organizations are complex, and if the rules thereof are difficult to understand, the people will have less enthusiasm for taking part in politics or for influencing the policies of the government.

The nature of franchise has direct bearing on voter turnout. While universal franchise enables large number of people to cast their votes in elections, limited franchise does the reverse. Where franchise is limited on the basis of education, income, race, caste or religion, a large number of people are deprived of voting rights.

APPLICATION OF THE CENTRE-PERIPHERY AND DEPENDENCY MODEL

During the Cold War, there were mainly two choices for Third World countries. They had to choose between democracy and communism. Democracy gives political freedom to people, but with regard to economic development, it takes time. Democracy has largely failed to bridge the gap between the rich and the poor. While the rich become richer, the basic needs of the poor go unaddressed. On the other hand, communism looked promising to the poor. It was believed that communism would remove poverty in

a short time. However, in a communist country, political choice is absent. One is not free to choose any path. He cannot form another party; he has to join the Communist Party. Thus, for Third World countries, it was a difficult dilemma. It was a Hobson's choice: each system involved a cost. Even after the end of the Cold War, the developing countries are still caught by that dilemma. Apart from a few Communist countries like China, Cuba and North Korea, there are many countries without democratic governments. There are one-party governments, military juntas and monarchies which promise quick results in respect of meeting the needs of the people. Though it is true that democracy is a slow process and that it has, to a great extent, failed to ensure distributive justice, it is, by all means, preferable to any non-democratic system. What is required is not to reject or throw away democracy, but to find out solutions to its problems. When democracy succeeds in ensuring political freedom and economic freedom and growth as well as justice, it is the best form of government. Taking into account the condition of the people, the structure of the society and problems and compulsions of the state the right 'tradeoffs' between growth and justice, and between political freedoms and economic freedoms need to be determined. Democracy is the central element of political development, and political development is inconceivable without it. Political development blossoms when democracy becomes effective and productive in meeting the needs of people, needs of the society and needs of the state.

The centre periphery model says that political development has been used in four different ways.

1. **Geographical** - Political development has been studied in the context of the politics of developing countries.
2. **Derivative** - It refers to the political aspects and consequences of the broader process of modernization.
3. **Teleological** - It is identified with movement toward one particular goal such as democracy, stability, legitimacy, participation, mobilization, welfare, justice, liberty, equality, capability, and differentiation.
4. **Functional** - It is thought of as a movement toward the politics characteristic of a modern, industrial society.

A deeper study of the case of political development in the context of the colonial and semi-colonial countries at the hands of A.G Frank, Paul A. Baran and F.B. Cardoso has led to the emergence of the idea of political underdevelopment. It seeks to reexamine the situation obtaining in a semi-advanced country in the light of the 'exploitation' of the proletariat by the native bourgeois (and also feudal) elements in collaboration with foreign capitalists operating through 'multi-national organizations'. In other words, it may be taken as a study of 'neo-colonialism' that covers not only the poor and backward countries of the Third World but also a number of semi-advanced capitalist organizations of the world. In realistic terms, it implies a condition of double exploitation' of the people of these countries- exploitation of the native working class directly by the native capitalists and indirectly by the foreign capitalists through the network of multi-national corporations.

This theory of political underdevelopment derives from Marx who argued that in the long run it would have a detrimental effect on the industrial metropole as well as on the underdeveloped periphery. In his thesis of 'imperialism as the final stage of capitalism', Lenin also stresses the point that the capitalist countries 'export' to their colonies not only innovation but their own internal crises as well. Therefore, capitalism creates gross social inequalities at home as well as in other areas under its control. As Paul A. Baran argues: 'Far from serving as an engine of economic expansion of technological progress

and of social change, the capitalist order in these countries has represented a framework for economic stagnation, for archaic technology, and for social backwardness'. Thus, to the extent to which it depends on the volume of aggregate output and income, the economic surplus in backward capitalist countries has necessarily been small. Not that it has constituted a small proportion of the total income.

On the contrary, the consumption of the productive population has been depressed to the lowest possible level, with 'lowest possible' corresponding in this case close to a subsistence minimum or to what in many underdeveloped countries falls notably below that benchmark. The economic surplus, therefore, while by comparison with the advanced countries small in absolute terms, has accounted for a large share of total output-as large as, if not larger than, in advanced capitalist countries.

It follows that the case of underdevelopment may be studied in the new role of native bourgeoisie working in alliance with multinational corporations. The capitalist class of a backward country aligns itself with the capitalist class of big and advanced countries and, as such, the consequent situation of 'double exploitation' places an independent country in the position of a semi-dependency. Underdevelopment goes hand-in-hand with economic dependency. On this basis Fernando Henrique Cardoso presents the model of associated-development that combines the idea of development with that of dependence. Changes in international capitalist organization have produced a new international division of labour, the key to which is the multinational corporation. The interests of the foreign corporations become essential to the internal prosperity and growth of dependent countries. On the one hand, they help to produce growth of dependent countries. On the other hand, countries hosting multinational corporations are dependent for their development on their decisions and activities. In the words of Cardoso the consequence of imperialism with respect to dependent countries and nations (or colonies) was the integration of the latter into the international market. Inequalities among nations and economies resulted from imperialism's development to the extent that the input of raw materials and export of manufactured goods were the bases of the imperialist-colonial relationship. The reproduction and amplification of inequality between advanced economies developed as a by-product of the very process of capitalist growth.

According to Andre Gunder Frank, the pioneer of the dependency theory, what is important for the purposes of development and underdevelopment is not the sacrifice of the nation in terms of its actual loss of income wealth or the absolute gain of the recipient country but the contribution of economic surplus accruing to the imperialist country. While the colonies and semi-colonies are denied the developmental possibilities of this capital, the metropolitan country can use it for its own economic development. The most unfortunate part of this phenomenon is that while the imperialist class may gain just a pound of flesh, the colonies or semi-colonies may lose a hundred times more in terms of their potential resources, their economic assets and their physical capacities. The reason behind it may be discovered in the control of the advanced capitalist countries over the sensitive and strategic areas of the colonial and semi-colonial countries. It may be seen in the case of the economies of the Third World countries like Guinea and Nigeria as well as in those of the so-called advanced states of Europe like Spain and Portugal. The difference of a big degree may, however, be marked out between the exploitation of the poor and backward countries of the Third World and of the semi-developed states of the Western World.

In this regard, another great theorist is Immanuel Wallerstein whose 'world capitalist system' frankly asserts that there are today no socialist systems in the world economy

any more than there are feudal systems, because there is one world system. It is world economy and it is by definition capitalist in form. This unified world economy system is three-tiered: the core, semi-periphery and periphery, (a) Core economies are the location for advanced economic activities such as manufacturing, banking and the processing of primary products, (b) Semi-peripheral areas trade with both core and periphery and occupy a kind of half-way position in terms of such features as profit margins and wage levels, (c) The activities of the peripheral economies are more or less restricted to the production of primary products. In this system of three circles, the semi-periphery plays a very important role in the operation of the world system as a whole. Prarik and Wallerstein joined hands with other writers of the same view.

We believe that there is a social whole that may be called a capitalist world economy. We believe that we cannot make an intelligent analysis of the various states taken seriously without placing their so-called internal life in the context of the world division of labour, located in the world economy. Nor can we make a coherent analysis that segregates economic, political and social variables.

We believe that throughout the history of the capitalist world economy, there has been increasing organization of oppressed groups within the world system and increasing opposition to its continuance. We believe that the hegemony of the US is declining owing to the 'increasing competitiveness' of West European and Japanese products, emergence of Washington-Tokyo-Beijing axis and wars among the states in the periphery. Thus, the cases of political underdevelopment and the world economic system are interrelated. The whole analysis is constructed on the basis of the centre-periphery relationship. Centre and periphery are distinguished in terms of the market relations that integrate them into the world capitalist system, whose expansion has brought about such differentiation. The centre develops on the basis of the expansion of its home market and in it the capitalist mode of production becomes the only mode of production. The capitalist mode of production is imposed on the periphery from outside, but in such a way that its penetration is incomplete.

Dependency theory is just a corollary to the theory of underdevelopment. It was through a discreet historical process, according to Celso Furtado, that development and underdevelopment became parts of the same continuum. Dependency is a containing or a conditioning situation. So Santos says: We can now define very clearly what is meant by dependence. In the first place, dependence is a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others. The relationship of interdependency between such economies and the world trading system becomes a dependent relationship when some countries can expand through self-impulsion, while others being in a dependent position, can only expand as a reflection of the expansion of the dominant countries which may have positive or negative effects on their immediate development. In either case the basic situation of dependency causes these countries to be both backward and exploited. The dependency theorists or the, dependents' concede the point that some sort of capitalist industrialization has taken place in the Third World and it has created the model of 'new dependency'. Since this sort of development is a dependent development, Faletto and Cardoso call it associated-dependent-development'. For them the structural dependency perspective focuses on inter-relationship at three levels: the international economy, the nation-state and the alliance of social classes within the state. They are very clear that the state in Latin America is in no sense a passive agency 'mechanically conditioned by external dominance. The state is a system of domination which relates dialectically to external factors and one of

the tasks they set themselves is to develop concepts which will enable them to explain how internal and external processes of political domination relate one to the other.

Like Huntington, Rajni Kothari also attaches primacy to politics in political development, but he does it from a different angle. He argues that economic development is influenced by the policy made for the purpose, and policy reflects ideology and political dynamics. He advocates a model of political development which should be 'directly oriented to the specific political tasks of building viable states.' Elaborating his centre-periphery model, Kothari says that the centre should have the outward thrust of permeating the periphery and encourage democratic participation while not suppressing political conflict and intellectual dissent; and that the periphery, in response, should progressively mobilize its own social structure and move towards the centre through both struggle and coalition making. According to Kothari, technical and economic choices, though important, are to be treated as derivatives of larger institutional and ideological choices. He is convinced that politics, playing a 'creative role', can significantly contribute to a humane and viable political development.

RELEVANCE OF THE CENTRE-PERIPHERY AND DEPENDENCY MODEL

The process of economic expansion in the more developed countries of Latin-America (as Mexico, Brazil, Argentina and Chile) has posed the problem at the level of national politics of the incorporation of new social groups, the industrial and commercial bourgeoisie and elements of the popular sector. The quest for the stake in the system on the part of such groups, together with the need of the state to reconcile economic expansion with political stability, has led to the emergence of varying patterns of alliance. The variations from country to country depended upon their respective resource base before the period of ISI (import - substitution-industrialization), the nature and degree of foreign involvement and the consequent balance of social forces.

The chief cause of political underdevelopment should be traced not only in the fact of 'satellite colonization' of the poor and the backward countries of the world but also in the existence of feudal and bourgeois classes at whose hands the native proletariat suffers exploitation. It may be described as a case of double exploitation. While the feudal aristocracy exploits the rural peasantry, the bourgeoisie exploits the urban working class. Thus, the feudal and bourgeois elements are combined and they acquire political power to perpetuate their hold. But contradictions develop within their ranks and, in order to remove them, the exploiters adopt tactics that leading to the vulgarization and criminalization of politics. It also happens that the disgruntled sections of the community take to the ways of violence as a result of which events of terrorism occur frequently to bring about structural changes in the social and economic system of the country.

Socialist development of a country may be described as a way out of this crucial difficulty. But we may take note of the fact that in most of the countries of the Third World, the clever leaders prefer to establish a kind of 'protosocialism' - a form of bureaucracy that elevates to power a new and essentially corrupt and repressive class. As a result of this, contradictions develop within the so-called socialist forces that create a more baffling situation. Moreover, a critical student of political economy may take note of the fact that the super-socialist powers like former USSR and China have their own vested interests in installing a kind of their satellite colonization. Liberalization trends in a satellite country like Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Poland were suppressed by force. It

is also possible that an underdeveloped state like Chile or Guinea may become a 'proto-Stalinist' state in pursuit of its

development through the course of socialism.

Such theories failed to have a long life. They became unfashionable in the 1980s for the main reason that their empirical base was very weak. It appeared that the sociopolitical consequences of underdevelopment and dependency had been worked out without much precision and evidence. Hurnza Alvi says that in post-colonial societies, the state is over-developed vis-a-vis the indigenous society and subservient to the metropolis. The neoliberals question the efficacy of structuralist or nationalist economic strategies finding vindication in the increasing economic difficulties and ultimate collapse of the communist system in the countries of East Europe. Todaro comments: Contrary to the claims of the dependency theorists, the neoclassical counter-revolutionaries argue that the Third World is under-developed not because of the predatory activities of the First World and the international agencies that it controls but rather because of the heavy hands of the state and the corruption, inefficiency and lack of economic incentives that permeate the economies of developing nations.

The story of underdevelopment is an account of exploitation of the backward and semi-backward peoples at the hands of the highly advanced countries of the world. The native bourgeois plays its own part in the nefarious drama of political economy. It becomes the exploited force at the hands of multinational corporations in one respect and a partner with them in exploiting the 'proletariat' of its own country for the sake of economic interests. It all occurs due to the existence of an imitated bourgeois state in the underdeveloped countries where the ruling party as a mass movement is only a shell within which compradors, or local bourgeois, manipulate power, inequality and unemployment flourish, with the result being agricultural stagnation, urban immigration, food shortages, inflation, balance of payments crises, further dependence on foreign finance, and a non-competitive domestic industrial sector.

This model sees development as a result of different forces interacting with one another on a continuous basis. It assumes that the various components of development are quantifiable and that these components include gross/national product and per capita income, literacy and education, employment, industrialization, political participation.

Development takes place in three stages. These three stages are the traditional stage, the transitional stage, and the modern stage. In the traditional stage, there is agrarian economy and local concentration of power with practically no fruitful interaction between the centre and the periphery. In the transitional stage, industrialization makes a beginning and people begin to be involved in the political process. This stage also marks the efforts of the centre to reach the periphery. The modern stage is characterized by high industrialization and urbanization, and the involvement of the individual in national endeavour through available official means of participation.

Political development will pass through (i) political unification, (ii) industrialization, (iii) national welfare and (iv) abundances. Political unification would help in making the state strong with enough powers in its hands while industrialization will lead to economic development. National welfare means that the state makes use of its political and economic powers to meet the basic needs of the people. In a highly developed stage the people get abundance: considerable material affluence becomes available to them.

Political conception of political development/political modernity was largely influenced by structural functional analysis, borrowed from Sociology/Anthropology.

He said, a political system performs input and output functions. While the input functions are political socialization and recruitment, interest articulation, interest aggregation and political communication, the output functions are rule-making, rule-application, and rule-adjudication. Having suggested that political modernity can be defined in terms of structural

differentiation and functional specialization and prevalence of modern styles' within the political culture, he said that political development is characterized by rational styles of specificity, universality, achievement and affective neutrality in contrast to traditional styles of diffuseness, particularity, ascriptiveness and affectivity.

Huntington says that political development or political modernization has been defined broadly in two ways. First, political modernization is a movement from a traditional to a modern polity. Second, it is defined as the political aspects and political effects of social, economic and cultural modernization. Huntington agrees with the first view, and not with the second one. The first view indicates the direction in which political change should take place. The second view does not indicate the direction of political change. It involves disintegration of the traditional political system which is not necessarily a significant movement towards a modern political system.

The relevance of the centre-periphery model in the traditional societies reflects that social mobilization and political participation would increase the aspirations of people. If the government, having developed required political institutionalization, is able to adequately meet the rising aspirations of people, there will be political order and development. If the government fails to do it, there will be political disaster, instability and decay. Huntington says that economic development and social mobility lag behind political participation causing a fast rise in the aspirations of people. This 'gap' between the rising aspiration of people caused by social mobilization and political participation, and the ability of the government to adequately meet these aspirations causes social frustration, political instability and political decay. Modernization encourages political participation, but it is the degree of institutionalization which would determine whether the system would experience development or decay. If political institutions are deficient or non-existent, there will be disorder and violence. A state, thus, may be modern without being politically developed.

The centre-periphery model of political development comprises the following three elements:

- 1. Authority rationalization** - There should be a rational authority structure. In the traditional system, there are a large number of traditional, religious, familial and ethnic political authorities. They would be replaced by a single, secular, rational political authority.
- 2. Differentiation** - As differentiation of political functions has taken place, there should be specialized structures to perform these functions.
- 3. Political Participation** - The social groups throughout the society should increasingly participate in the political process.

ACTIVITY

Write a report on the use of political development from geographical, derivative, technological and functional perspectives.

DID YOU KNOW

The centre-periphery model has two associated debates- the first concerns the elaborated of a theory of modes of

production. The other tries leasing out the links between particular areas of the centre and periphery through examining the articulation of different modes of production.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Political participation is facilitated by mental mobility. A mobile mind is capable of responding to external stimuli and disengaging itself from prejudices, superstitions, outdated attitudes and values. And the level of the mental mobility of a person is, to a great extent, determined by his physical and social mobility.
- Some psychological impulses may drive an individual to politics. Politics may be a means of overcoming one's loneliness. Politics creates new bonds of association. And an individual can get rid of his fear of being isolated by joining politics. He gets new opportunities to establish fresh links with others.
- Politics is played in a political system. Thus, the nature and form of the political system would affect political participation. Further, political participation is also influenced by the context and setting in which it takes place. The form and direction of political participation are significantly determined by the nature of the political environment.
- During the Cold War, there were mainly two choices for Third World countries. They had to choose between democracy and communism.
- The periphery model says that political development has been used in four different ways:
 1. **Geographical** - Political development has been studied in the context of the politics of developing countries.
 2. **Derivative** - It refers to the political aspects and consequences of the broader process of modernization.
 3. **Teleological** - It is identified with movement toward one particular goal such as democracy, stability, legitimacy, participation, mobilization, welfare, justice, liberty, equality, capability, differentiation.
 4. **Functional** - It is thought of as a movement toward the politics characteristic of a modern, industrial society.
- Dependence is a conditioning situation in which the economies of one group of countries are conditioned by the development and expansion of others.
- Development takes place in three stages. These three stages are the traditional stage, the transitional stage, and the modern stage.
- Political development will pass through (i) political unification, (ii) industrialization, (iii) national welfare and (iv) abundance. Political unification would help in making the state strong with enough powers in its hands while industrialization will lead to economic development.
- Huntington says that political development or political modernization has been defined broadly in two ways. First, political modernization is a movement from a traditional to a modern polity. Second, it is defined as the political aspects and political effects of social, economic and cultural modernization.

KEYTERMS

- **Bi-party system:** A system where two major political parties dominate voting in nearly all elections at every level of government and, as a result, all or nearly all elected offices are members of one of the two major parties.
- **Franchise:** A privilege or right officially granted a person or a group by a government.
- **Mobility:** The movement of people, as from one social group, class, or level to another.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The main components of social status are education, occupation, income, religion, race and caste.
2. Electioneering has three aspects. The first is its vigour and intensity. The second is the issues which are raised in course of campaigning. The third is that the personality of candidates plays a big role in this regard.
3. Democracy
4. Core, semi-periphery and periphery, (a) Core economies are the location for advanced economic activities such as manufacturing, banking and the processing of primary products, (b) Semi-peripheral areas trade with both core and periphery and occupy a kind of half-way position in terms of such features as profit margins and wage levels, (c) The activities of the peripheral economies are more or less restricted to the production of primary products.
5. Development takes place in three stages. These three stages are the traditional . stage, the transitional stage, and the modern stage.
6. Gross national product and per capita income.
7. Political socialization and recruitment, interest articulation.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What are the advantages of urbanization?
2. What do you understand by social mobility?
3. According to the central-periphery model, in what ways can political development be divided?
4. The centre-periphery model of political development comprises three elements—what are they?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss the genesis of the centre-periphery and dependency model.
2. Describe the application of the centre-periphery and dependency model

3. Explain the relevance of the centre-periphery and dependency model.

FURTHER READING

- Ahuja, Ram. 1999. *Society in India: Concepts, Theories, and Changing Trends*. Jaipur: Rawat Publication.
- Berger, Peter. 1973. *The Social Reality of Religion*. London: Allen Lane.
- Hasnain, Nadeem. 2001. *Indian Society and Culture: Continuity and Change*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers.
- Jena, D. and U. Mohapatra. 2001. *Social Change: Themes and Perspectives*. Kalayani: University of Kalyani.
- Kendall, Diana. 2007. *Sociology in Our Times*. GA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Lerner, Daniel. 1958. *Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Sharma, Rajendra, K. 2004. *Indian Society: Institutions and Change*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.

UNIT 4 SOCIAL CHANGE

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

 Social Change - Concept

 Social Change - Revolutionary Approach

4.3.1 Patterns of Social Change

 Structural Approach to Social Change

Nature of Social Change

4.4.2 Forms of Social Change

Interrelationship between Change and Development

Change in Structure and Change of Structure

 Summary

 Key Terms

 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

 Questions and Exercises

 Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Sociologists have given different models through which they trace the trends of social change. With the development of sociology as a discipline, sociologists, including the founding fathers, have borrowed heavily from other disciplines to interpret social change and make an outline of the direction with which societies change.

This unit discusses the concept of social change from the perspectives of the revolutionary approach and structural approach.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Discuss the concept of social change
- Explain the revolutionary approach in relation to social change
- Describe the structural approach to social change

SOCIAL CHANGE - CONCEPT

In the 19th century, evolution became the predominant model for interpreting change in biology and sociologists interpreted social phenomena in the same direction, emphasizing that change in society is gradual and continuous and it occurs in a sequence. Evolutionary theorists have traced the trends of social change in two different ways: unilinear and universal. Unilinear evolutionists claim that changes occur in society in a single direction. For them evolution is an irreversible and unidirectional process. Societies pass through different stages and every stage is a higher and improved one over the previous stage. Auguste Comte and Karl Marx are the proponents of this view. Comte, the father of the

discipline, viewed evolution in three successive stages: theological, metaphysical and positive stages, most commonly known as the 'law of three stages'. Human thought and knowledge are the bases through which societies change from one stage to the other. In the theological stage, people believed in the supernatural forces. In the metaphysical stage, human intelligence was the product of abstract forces. The last stage was the positive stage. In this stage of evolution, reasoning and scientific observation dominated all social phenomena. People started thinking about reason rather than superstition. According to Comte, all the societies pass through these three successive stages and each stage is more progressive than the earlier stage. Karl Marx also talked about evolution of societies in a unilinear manner. He believed that the Western societies have developed through four main phases, i.e., Asiatic, Ancient, Feudal and Capitalist. Through the path of change and development, societies progress in a unilinear way and the basis of change is conflict between the classes of those who own the mode of production and those who do not. There is a conflict between the thesis and antithesis and as a result, the synthesis comes into existence. As to Marx, the Asiatic mode of production was the characteristic of primitive societies where ownership of land was communal and therefore there didn't exist any class. The next stage was the Ancient mode of production when slavery prevailed extensively. The master had the right of ownership over the slaves. Two types of classes existed during this phase as Marx propounded: the slave-masters and slaves. Following this, there was the Feudal mode of production which consisted of again two different classes namely, feudal lords and serfs. Serfs were deprived of property and were obliged to surrender their labour to the lords who on the other hand were the owners of private property. This stage laid the foundation for the next phase, i.e., the capitalist mode of production.

In this stage, capital is the dominant means of production. Capital can be money or credit. The capitalists own all means of production like land, machines and the bourgeoisie only own their labour power which they provide to the capitalists for their means of subsistence. As in other stages, the superior class exploits the inferior class in this phase of mode of production too. The bourgeoisie get exploited by the capitalists who pocket all profit and surplus value which leads to estrangement and alienation by the labourers or bourgeoisie class. This leads to a situation where the bourgeoisie world over will unite and raise their voice against their exploitation by the capitalists. Marx predicts, a conflict will erupt between the capitalists and the bourgeoisie following this. It will lead to a classless socialist mode of production.

Marx says that class struggle or conflict is the basis on which society changes from one mode of production to another. In his own words, 'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle.' So, his theory is

based on the assumption that each society passes through four stages of development and each stage is progressive than the preceding one.

The second category of evolutionists is known as universal evolutionists who focused on the evolution of societies from one typical social structure to another. Emile Durkheim, Herbert Spencer and Ferdinand Tonnies are the proponents of this theory. Emile Durkheim has explained his theory of evolution in his book *'The Division of Labour'* (1893). He has discussed evolution of society from 'mechanical solidarity' to 'organic solidarity'. The ancient society has been identified by him as representing the 'mechanical solidarity' and the modern industrial society with 'organic solidarity'. In the ancient period, societies were united with the solidarity of sameness, likeness and resemblance. Such solidarity was possible because collective consciousness among the

people was strong. Individual behaviour was regulated by the collectivity. Law was 'repressive' in nature. On the other hand, 'organic solidarity', Durkheim explains, is the solidarity based on differences. This is the characteristic feature of industrial societies marked by high degree of division of labour and specialization. Collective consciousness in this type of society is relatively less effective and law therefore becomes 'restitutive'. In the transition from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity, division of labour plays an important role.

Herbert Spencer also traced the change in society in an evolutionary way. As he said, 'Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion during which matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to definite, coherent heterogeneity.' Spencer for the first time introduced systematically the laws of 'natural selection' and the 'survival of the fittest' hypothesis into sociology. In his *"The Principles of Sociology"* he emphasized that human society had progressed from small groups to larger ones and from simple to compound and later doubly compound ones, i.e., from a homogenous to heterogeneous form. Similarly, Ferdinand Tonnies believed that societies evolved from 'Gemeinschaft' to 'Gesellschaft'. To him 'Gemeinschaft' represents the type of society characterized by community feeling and intimate face-to-face relationships.

All the members of community know each other personally and, therefore, cooperation among them binds the whole community. The individual members are controlled by informal means such as morals, values, gossips and gestures. Tonnies said that the rural societies represented the 'Gemeinschaft' kind of society. On the other hand, 'Gesellschaft' represents the modern urban life. Such type of society is characterized by impersonal relationships among the members and social control is maintained by formal means like laws and legally defined punishments.

Apart from the evolutionists, there are other theorists who trace the trends of social change in a cyclical manner. Sorokin and Vilfredo Pareto are two such sociologists. According to Sorokin, a particular society or culture progresses to a certain point reaching its peak and then reverses back to its original position. He states that society moves from 'ideational culture' to 'sensate culture' and vice versa. While moving in a cyclical manner these two types of cultures make space for a third type of culture, i.e. 'idealistic culture'. The 'ideational culture' is characterized by spiritualism and otherworldliness. The 'sensate culture' is fundamentally opposite to the 'ideational culture'. Here people give importance to their material sense and not to their spiritual senses. The 'idealistic culture' on the other hand is a mixture of the other two types where both materialism and spiritualism elements are present. Human knowledge is based on both supernatural and spiritual intuition and sensory experiences.

Vilfredo Pareto also analysed change in a cyclical method. His theory is known as the 'circulation of elites'. According to Pareto, any society consists of elites and masses and it is the elites who bring change in the society. There can be two types of elites in a society according to Pareto: the governing and non-governing elites. The governing elites are those who play a role in government and hold power. The non-governing elites are those who don't enjoy power and are out of the government. To Pareto, elites can be 'foxes' type and 'lions' type. The former type of elites rule the society by cunning, fraud and manipulation; whereas the latter type of elites control power through direct use of force. Pareto says that major changes occur in society when one type of elites replaces another, i.e. the process of circulation of elites. The elites fall and lose their control over government as they decay in quality and lose dynamism. There are also couple of sociological models that created analogies between

social change and the technological advancement of the Western societies. In the mid-20th century, sociologists and anthropologists borrowed a theoretical model from linguistics and analysed social change. This approach is called 'structural functionalism'. The theory propounds that social institutions are all interrelated and a change in one institution brings change in other institutions.

SOCIAL CHANGE - REVOLUTIONARY APPROACH

In the first unit, you have learned about the dynamics of change and the meaning and nature of social change. As you have understood, social change is the alteration or modification of the structure and function of any societal system. It can be the change in interpersonal relationships, social organizations, social patterns and values, inter-caste and inter-community marriage, and change in family type from joint-living to nuclear households.

Sociologists have given different models through which they trace the trends of social change. With the development of sociology as a discipline, sociologists including the founding fathers have borrowed heavily from other disciplines to interpret social change and make an outline of the direction with which societies change. In the 19th century, evolution became the predominant model for interpreting change in biology and sociologists interpreted social phenomena in the same direction, emphasizing that change in society is gradual and continuous and it occurs in a sequence. The evolutionary theorists have traced the trends of social change in two different ways: unilinear and universal. The unilinear evolutionists claim that changes occur in society in a single direction. For them evolution is an irreversible and unidirectional process. Societies pass through different stages and every stage is a higher and improved one than the previous stage. Auguste Comte and Karl Marx are the proponents of this view. Comte, the father of the discipline, viewed evolution in three successive stages: theological, metaphysical and positive stages, most commonly known as the 'law of three stages'. Human thought and knowledge are the bases through which societies change from one stage to the other. In the theological stage, people believed in the supernatural forces. In the metaphysical stage, human intelligence was the product of abstract forces. The last stage was the positive stage. In this stage of evolution, reasoning and scientific observation dominated all social phenomena. People started thinking about reason rather than superstition. According to Comte, all societies pass through these three successive stages and each stage is more progressive than the earlier stage.

Karl Marx also talked about evolution of societies in a unilinear manner. He believed that the Western societies have developed through four main phases, i.e., Asiatic, Ancient, Feudal and Capitalist. Through the path of change and development, societies progress in a unilinear way and the basis of change is conflict between the classes of those who own the mode of production and those who do not. There is a conflict between the thesis and antithesis and as a result, the synthesis comes into existence. As to Marx, the Asiatic mode of production was the characteristic of primitive societies where ownership of land was communal and therefore there didn't exist any class. The next stage was the Ancient mode of production when slavery prevailed extensively. The master had the right of ownership over the slaves. Two types of classes existed during this phase as Marx propounded: the slave-masters and slaves. Following this, there was the feudal mode of production which consisted of again two different classes namely, feudal lords

and serfs. Serfs were deprived of property and were obliged to surrender their labour to the lords who on the other hand were the owners of private property. This stage laid the foundation for the next phase, i.e., the capitalist mode of production.

In this stage, capital is the dominant means of production. Capital can be money or credit. The capitalists own all means of production like land, machines and the bourgeoisie only own their labour power which they provide to the capitalists for their means of subsistence. As in other stages, the superior class exploits the inferior class in this phase of mode of production too. The bourgeoisie get exploited by the capitalists who pocket all profit and surplus value which leads to estrangement and alienation by the labourers or bourgeoisie class. This leads to a situation where the bourgeoisie world over will unite and raise voice against their exploitation by the capitalists. Marx predicts, a conflict will erupt between the capitalists and the bourgeoisie following this. It will lead to a classless socialist mode of production.

Marx says that class struggle or conflict is the basis on which society changes from one mode of production to another. In his own words, 'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle.' So, his theory is based on the assumption that each society passes through four stages of development and each stage is more progressive than the preceding one.

The second category of evolutionists is known as universal evolutionists who focused on the evolution of societies from one typical social structure to another. Emile Durkheim, Herbert Spencer and Ferdinand Tönnies are the proponents of this theory. Emile Durkheim has explained his theory of evolution in his book '*The Division of Labour*' (1893). He has discussed evolution of society from 'mechanical solidarity' to 'organic solidarity'. The ancient society has been identified by him as representing the 'mechanical solidarity' and the modern industrial society with 'organic solidarity'. In the ancient period, societies were united with the solidarity of sameness, likeness and resemblance. Such solidarity was possible because collective consciousness among the people was strong. Individual behaviour was regulated by the collectivity. Law was 'repressive' in nature. On the other hand, 'organic solidarity', Durkheim explains, is the solidarity based on differences. This is the characteristic feature of industrial societies marked by high degree of division of labour and specialization. Collective consciousness in this type of society is relatively less effective and law therefore becomes 'restitutive'. In the transition from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity, division of labour plays an important role.

Herbert Spencer also traced the change in society in an evolutionary way. As he said, 'Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion during which matter passes from an indefinite, incoherent homogeneity to definite, coherent heterogeneity.' Spencer for the first time introduced systematically the laws of natural selection and the 'survival of the fittest' hypothesis into sociology. In his '*The Principles of Sociology*' he emphasized that human society had progressed from small groups to larger ones and from simple to compound and later doubly compound ones, i.e., from a homogenous to heterogeneous form.

Similarly, Ferdinand Tönnies believed that societies evolved from 'Gemeinschaft' to 'Gesellschaft'. To him 'Gemeinschaft' represents the type of society characterized by community feeling and intimate face to face relationships. All the members of community know each other personally and, therefore, cooperation among them binds the whole community. The individual members are controlled by informal means such as morals, values, gossips and gestures. Tönnies said that the rural societies represented the 'Gemeinschaft' kind of society. On the other hand, 'Gesellschaft' represents the

modern urban life. Such type of society is characterized by impersonal relationships among the members and social control is maintained by formal means like laws and legally defined punishments.

Apart from the evolutionists, there are other theorists who trace the trends of social change in a cyclical manner. Sorokin and Vilfredo Pareto are two such sociologists. According to Sorokin, a particular society or culture progresses to a certain point reaching at its peak and then reverses back to its original position. He states that society moves from 'ideational culture' to 'sensate culture' and vice versa. While moving in a cyclical fashion these two types of cultures make space for a third type of culture, i.e. 'idealistic culture'. The 'ideational culture' is characterized by spiritualism and otherworldliness. The 'sensate culture' is fundamentally opposite to the 'ideational culture'. Here people give importance to their material sense and not to their spiritual senses. The 'idealistic culture' on the other hand is a mixture of the other two types where both materialism and spiritualism elements are present. Human knowledge is based on both supernatural and spiritual intuition and sensory experiences.

Vilfredo Pareto also analysed change in a cyclical method. His theory is known as the 'circulation of elites'. According to Pareto, any society consists of elites and masses and it is the elites who bring change in the society. There can be two types of elites in a society according to Pareto: the governing and non-governing elites. The governing elites are those who play a role in government and hold power. The non-governing elites are those who don't enjoy power and are out of the government. To Pareto, elites can be of 'foxes' type and 'lions' type. The former type of elites rule the society by cunning, fraud and manipulation; whereas the latter type of elites control power through direct use of force. Pareto says that major changes occur in society when one type of elite replaces another, i.e. the process of circulation of elites. The elites fall and lose their control over government as they decay in quality and lose dynamism.

There are also couple of sociological models that created analogies between social change and the technological advancement of the Western societies. In the mid-20th century, sociologists and anthropologists borrowed a theoretical model from linguistics and analysed social change. This approach is called 'structural functionalism'. This theory postulated that the existence of social institutions like kinship determines human behaviour. The theory propounds that social institutions are all interrelated and a change in one institution brings change in other institutions.

Patterns of Social Change

In this section, you will learn about the patterns of change with special reference to the process of Sanskritization. While analysing the process of social change, and in particular in the context of Indian society, the process of Sanskritization, Westernization, modernization and secularization serve as important conceptual tools.

Sanskritization

Noted Indian sociologist M.N. Srinivas had made a sincere effort to analyse the process of social change in Indian society through his significant work, *Religion and society among the Coorgs of South India* (1952). This book was probably the first such attempt to study change in Indian context in a systematic manner. The term Sanskritization which was coined by Srinivas, during his study on the Coorgs, was primarily meant to analyse the process of cultural mobility. According to him, it is a process which has been occurring throughout the Indian history and still continues to occur. Srinivas (1911) defines

Sanskritization as 'the process by which a low Hindu caste, or tribal or other group, changes its customs, ritual, ideology and way of life in the direction of a high and frequently "twice-born" caste'. As he says, such changes are initiated by a claim to higher positions in the caste hierarchy than that the particular caste traditionally conceded to the claimant caste by the local community. The claim is made over a generation or two. Srinivas (1911) said that occasionally a caste claims a position in the caste hierarchy which its neighbours are not willing to concede. To illustrate this, he says the Harijan castes in Mysore will not accept cooked or 'pucca' food and water from the Smiths who are certainly one of the touchable castes and therefore superior to Harijans even if their claim to be Vishwakarma Brahmins is not accepted. Similarly, the peasants or the 'Okkaligas' and others such as Shepherds or the 'Rumbas' do not accept 'pucca' food and water from *Marka Brahmins*, who are certainly included among the *Brahmins*.

Srinivas further maintained that Sanskritization is usually accompanied by and often results in upward mobility for the concerned caste. However, as you have learned in the first unit the mobility associated with Sanskritization is only *positional* change in the system of caste hierarchy and doesn't lead to any *structural* change, i.e., a particular caste moves up in the local caste hierarchy and the neighbour caste comes down, but this takes place in the broader caste hierarchy as a whole. There is no change to the caste structure as such.

Sanskritization, moreover, as a process is not confined to the Hindu system but also happens to the tribal groups as well, such as the *Bhils* of western India, the *Gonds* and *Oraons* of central India, and the *Pahadis* of the Himalayas. This usually results in the tribe undergoing Sanskritization claiming to be a caste and, therefore, Hindu. In the traditional system, the only way to become a Hindu was to belong to a caste, and

the unit of mobility was usually a group and not an individual or a family. So the main argument that Srinivas wants to place is that contrary to the theoretical and book view of the caste system, there is scope for mobility inside the caste structure. As he said (1952,32):

The caste system is far from a rigid system in which the position of each component caste is fixed for all time. Movement has always been possible, and especially in the middle regions of the hierarchy. A caste was able, in a generation or two, to rise to a higher position in the hierarchy by adopting vegetarianism and teetotalism, and by Sanskritizing its ritual and pantheon. In short, it took over, as far as possible, the customs, rites and beliefs of the Brahmins, and adoption of the Brahminic way of life by a low caste seems to have been frequent, though theoretically forbidden. This process has been called as Sanskritization.

Originally, Srinivas used the term 'Brahminization' to describe the process of mobility inside the Hindu caste system. However, later looking at the broader nature of the process, he used the term Sanskritization to denote the inter-caste mobility. The term 'Sanskritization' is a much broader concept than 'Brahminization' because not only it encompasses non-Brahmin models like Kshatriyas model, Jat model, Vaishya model and models of other 'twice-born' castes but also denotes a wide spectrum of values and lifestyles (Hasnain 2001,101). Srinivas said that Sanskritization was no doubt an awkward term, but it was preferred to Brahminization for several reasons: Brahminization is subsumed in the wider process of Sanskritization though at some points Brahminization and Sanskritization are at variance with each other. For instance, the Brahmins of the Vedic period drank '*Soma*', an alcoholic drink, ate beef and offered blood sacrifices.

Both were given up in the post-Vedic times. It has been suggested that this was the result of Jain and Buddhist influence. Today, Brahmins are by and large vegetarians; only the *Saraswat*, *Kashmiri* and *Bengali* eat non-vegetarian food. All these Brahmins are, however, traditionally teetotalers. In brief, the customs and habits of the Brahmins changed after they had settled in India. Had the term Brahminization been used, it would have been necessary to specify which particular Brahmin group was meant, and at which period of its recorded history. Again the agents of Sanskritization are not always Brahmins (Srinivas 1912[2002], 42-43). It is not only the Brahmins, but also local 'dominant castes' who have been the models of imitation. Srinivas (1911) defines 'dominant caste' as one that 'yields economic or political power and occupies a fairly high position in the hierarchy'. Traditionally, the castes having high ritual status were enjoying high political and economic power. However, later new factors affected dominance and Western education, jobs in the administration and urban source of income became significant in contributing to the power and position of a particular caste. The dominant castes were thus enjoying high status in the local hierarchy. The people belonging to lower castes looked at them as their reference groups and imitated their life-styles and rituals and, therefore, the dominant castes gradually became a source of socio-cultural change in the local caste system and a different model of Sanskritization.

Different castes have been found changing their traditional cultural practices while aspiring for higher positions in the local hierarchy. The process of Sanskritization has many consequences. As Hasnain (2001,101-2) remarked, it may result in the erosion of cultural autonomy of the women folk which includes erosion in the freedom to choose life-partner and prevalence of a rigid sexual morality. Changes in family structure include a movement towards the orthodox Hindu joint family and the concomitant stronger authority of father, monogamy and a stronger caste organization with increased tendency of ostracism. Also a rigid commensality prevails along with changed food habits prohibiting beef and pork and

consumption of liquor while giving importance to higher education and adopting dowry practice instead of token 'bride-price'. Besides, in the sphere of religion, it frequently results in the donning of sacred thread, giving up animal sacrifice at the time of wedding and increased emphasis on pilgrimage.

According to Srinivas, Sanskritization means not only the adoption of new customs and habits, but also exposure to new ideas and values which have found frequent expression in the vast body of Sanskritic literature, sacred as well as secular. *Karma, Dharma, Papa, Maya, Samsara* and *Moksha* are some of the most common Sanskritic theological ideas, and when a group becomes Sanskritized, these words occur frequently in their talk (1912,48). As he stated, the spread of Sanskritic theological ideas increased during the British period. The advancement in science and technology and especially communication technology carried Sanskritization to areas which were inaccessible earlier and also the spread of literacy in the country carried it to lower caste groups who were mostly illiterate before. Besides, the introduction of Western political institutions like the parliamentary democracy has also played a phenomenal role in increasing the instances of Sanskritization in the country.

It is pertinent to mention that there are several other processes which are technically different from Sanskritization but have often been confused with it. For example, S.L. Kalia discussed about the process of 'tribalization' that occurred in Jaunsar-Bawar of Uttar Pradesh and in Bastar region of Madhya Pradesh in which high-caste Hindus temporarily resident among tribal-people take over the latter's mores, rituals and beliefs which are in many respects antithetical to their own (Srinivas 1911). Besides, a

study by D.N. Mazumdar gives evidences of an opposite process that shows the members of higher castes abandon their rituals, dressing pattern and traditional mode of life and even taking up the professions traditionally practiced by the lower castes. He called this process 'de-Sanskritization'. According to Mazumdar, the shrinkage of distances between castes is not due to Sanskritization but its reverse. The lower castes are not moving towards the higher but the higher castes are abandoning their lifestyles (Sharma 2004).

Y. Singh (1977) observed that the process of Sanskritization, though apparently cultural, reflects many complex motivational urges for social mobility. An important element in this process is the manifest rejection of the norms of institutionalized inequality fostered by the traditional caste-stratified system. It leads, however, to a paradox: Sanskritization reinforces the normative system which is represented by caste stratification, but it also, at least in principle, violates its basic tenet, i.e., the acceptance of the principle of hierarchy. For this reason, many sociologists have seen in the process of Sanskritization a latent form of class conflict which results because of the peculiar structural constraints of Indian society (Gould 1911; Leach 1910; Singh 1977[1999], 35). Srinivas made this point indirectly while analysing his concept of 'dominant caste'.

Westernization

Westernization is another concept and a process of social change that has been discussed by Srinivas at length. It is a process whereby societies increasingly adopt Western cultures, lifestyles, technology, food pattern, language, alphabet, religion, ideas, philosophy and value systems. Srinivas used the term 'Westernization' particularly to indicate the change that took place in Indian society during the British rule in the 19th and early 20th centuries. Westernization as a process started having its impact substantially on the elites of the country since they had access to modern and British education especially English. The Brahmins and other higher castes, who were enjoying power and position in the society with the tradition of learning, eagerly took to secular education system that the Britishers imparted with English as the medium.

Srinivas (1911,41) wrote that British rule produced radical and lasting changes in Indian society and culture. It was unlike any previous period in Indian history as the British brought with them new technology, institutions, knowledge, beliefs and values. The new technology and the revolution in communication technology which this brought about enabled the Britishers to integrate the country as never before in its history. During the 19th century, the Britishers slowly laid the foundations of a modern state by surveying land, settling the revenue, creating a modern bureaucracy, army, police, instituting law courts, codifying the law, developing the communications like railways, post and telegraph, roads, canals, establishing schools, colleges and so on. They also brought with them the printing press that made a

significant impact on Indian society since publication of books and journals transmitted modern and traditional knowledge to a large number of people. As Srinivas (1912) defined the term, 'Westernization refers to the changes brought about in Indian society and culture as a result of over 150 years of British rule, and the term subsumes changes occurring at different levels—technology, institutions, ideology, values.'

Srinivas (1911,47-48) made distinctions between Westernization and two other related processes: industrialization and urbanization. As he mentioned, on the one hand, there were cities in the pre-industrial world, though they differed from post-industrial revolution cities. For one thing, they needed large rural population for their support, so that ancient and medieval countries remained dominantly agricultural in spite of a few big cities. Again, while the Industrial Revolution resulted in an increase in the rate of urbanization and highly urbanized areas are generally highly industrialized areas, urbanization is not a simple function of industrialization. As he stated, while most of the Westernized people are usually found in big cities, it will be wrong to equate Westernization with urbanization. Even in a country like India, there are people in rural areas who are as much and may be more Westernized than many of their urban counterparts.

Westernization resulted not only in the introduction of new institutions like press newspapers, journals, and elections but also in fundamental changes in the old institutions. So, although India had schools long before the Britishers came to India, they were fundamentally different from the schools introduced by the British in that they were restricted to only upper-caste elites and transmitted mostly traditional knowledge. Besides, there were certain value preferences implicit to the process of Westernization as well. One of the important values is 'humanitarianism'. This meant an active concern for the welfare of humanity irrespective of caste, class, religion, age and sex. It encompassed both equalitarianism and secularization. Humanitarianism resulted in many administrative measures taken by the British to fight epidemics, famines, and building schools and hospitals and also brought in several civil and procedural laws that put an end to certain inequalities that existed in Hindu and Islamic personal laws. Also, Christian missionary activities were remarkable in making humanitarian efforts especially in the form of providing education and health facilities. As mentioned by Srinivas (1911), the missionaries were the bitter critics of Hindu social institutions like caste, untouchability, low status of women and child marriage. This led to reinterpretation of Hinduism at both ideological and institutional levels and the conversion of the lower castes like '*Harijans*' to Islam and Christianity. Such factors were instrumental in producing a changed attitude among the Hindu elites towards the traditional caste system and untouchability.

According to Srinivas, the increase in Westernization does not retard the process of Sanskritization; rather both go on hand in hand and to some extent, increase in Westernization accelerates the process of Sanskritization. For instance, the postal facilities, railways, buses, and media which are the fruits of Western impact on India rendered more organized religious pilgrimages, meetings and caste solidarities (Singh 1973 [2001],9). As mentioned before, Sanskritization and Westernization are concepts that analyse the process of cultural change and have no scope for systematic explanation of changes in the social structure, (ibid). Srinivas pointed out that to describe the social changes occurring in modern India in terms of Sanskritization and Westernization, we need to describe it primarily in cultural and not in structural terms. An analysis in terms of structure is much more difficult than an analysis in terms of culture (Srinivas 1911; also in Singh 1973[2001], 9-10).

As observed by Singh (1973[2001], 25 and Jena and Mohapatra ([1993] 2001, 150-58), the process of Westernization has had its impact on both the 'little' and 'great traditions'. Its influence on 'little traditions' is termed by Singh as 'primary westernization' and on 'great tradition' as 'secondary westernization.'

(i) **Primary Westernization:** By primary Westernization Singh meant changes induced by the Western impact on the Indian traditions. At the initial phases, Western culture made its impact on peripheral aspects of Indian culture. It created a sub-cultural pattern limited to a very specific group of people within a particular geographical area. That means, during the early periods of British rule, the Western impact was localized and peripheral. To illustrate the primary Westernization, Singh remarks that in the British trade centres,

like Bombay, Madras and Calcutta there emerged a new commercial middle-class, the social composition of which differed from place to place. In Calcutta they were '*Baniyas*' (Merchants) in Madras, it was the Brahmins, whereas in Bombay they were mostly *Parsis*. These commercial middle-classes served as the middle-men between the native Indians and the British traders. This class was not Westernized to any significant extent though they adopted Western dress, language and way of living. In their basic psychological disposition, they were quite Indian. Singh called them 'quasi-westernized middle men'. Towards the early part of the 19th century, another group emerged: a group of English-educated professionals who played a major role in the process of Westernization. These English-educated people took up the values and ideologies of Western culture like humanism and equality. Different socio-cultural reform movements grew during this period, which were spearheaded by these English-educated classes to campaign against 'sati-system', untouchability, child marriage, etc. The role of the movements like the *Brahmo Samaja*, the *Prarthana Samaja*, etc., was very important in this context. Such reformist movements though local in spread influenced the British administration and many progressive laws were passed as a result, e.g., prohibiting 'sari', child marriage, introducing widow-remarriage and so on. The expansion of modern education, transportation and communication served as a prelude to the greater Westernization in the basic structural pattern of Indian society. The Western cultural traits of humanism, rationality and equality started stimulating Indian minds which later on brought about changes in the 'great tradition' of Indian society, (ii) **Secondary Westernization:** Towards the end of 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century, the process of Westernization started taking firm roots in the Indian social structure. Western culture emerged as the basic ideology. Many social reformers justified the adoption of Western cultural spirit in order to make the Indians feel the necessity of liberty, freedom and equality. Besides, the cumulative effects on the changes in 'little tradition' and many other economic, political as well as administrative policies also affected the 'great traditions' of the country. Gradually, a new structural pattern with many new institutions started replacing many of its old institutions. Some such changes in the 'great tradition' of the country included introduction of the universalistic legal system, expansion of modern, scientific and universal education, urbanization and industrialization, development in transport and communication, growth of the sense of unity and nationalism, etc.

Modernization

During the fifties and the sixties of the 19th century, modernization became one of the dominant themes of research. In fact, it is one of the important concepts of the sociology of development. Modernization studies deal with the effects of economic development on traditional social structure and values. The process of modernization is related to industrialization, urbanization, high standard of living, development of civilization and broadness of view point. According to Eisenstadt, 'From a historical point of view modernization is a process of change towards those type of social, economic and political systems which were developed in Western Europe and North America from the 17th to 19th century, and after that spread over to South America, Asia and Africa during the

19th and 20th century' (Hasnain2001,109). In social science disciplines, modernization refers to the transition from a 'pre-modern' or 'traditional' type of society to a 'modern' society. Many sociologists associate modernization with the spread of education, urbanization and industrialization. As to Kendall (2007), urbanization is a process which has accompanied modernization and the rapid process of industrialization. In sociology, modernization is also linked to the process of rationalization. In modernized society, the individual becomes much more important, gradually replacing the family or community as the primary unit of society. As societies experience the process of modernization, the importance of religion and traditional values becomes less important and people start thinking more about reason and rationality. As Hasnain (2001) mentions, the term modernization is less value-loaded than its predecessor—Westernization. Most countries in the Third World region were proud of their cultural heritage and deeply attached to it. While they were attracted to Western culture, they had no plans to abandon their own lifestyles and value systems. The concept of modernization recognized the strength of roots; it didn't pose any overt threat to the cultural diversity of the people aspiring for rapid change. To the elite of the Third World, the ideal of Westernization was difficult to swallow; they accepted modernization readily because it didn't appear to offend their own cultural dignity. According to Lerner (1958), there are three features of modernization which are core to a modernized personality—empathy, mobility and high participation. Empathy is the capacity to see things as others see them. All societies possess this capacity in some measure, but to sharpen and strengthen, it can make a qualitative change in human interaction. The second attribute, mobility, doesn't only imply geographical mobility; rather it is used in a more comprehensive sense. Unlike the traditional societies which had ascribed status, the modernized societies have open status system and largely give emphasis to achievement rather than birth. The third attribute—high participation—refers to the increased role of individuals in realizing social goals and objectives in more active ways (Hasnain, 2001,109-10). The character of modern society is rational in cognitive aspects, universalistic in membership aspects, functionally specific in substantive definitional aspects, neutral in affective aspects, individualistic in goal orientation aspect and hierarchical in stratification aspects. Units of society tend to be more specialized and self-sufficient in modern society and there is increasing evidence of role differentiation, solidarity and integration (Jena and Mohapatra [1993] 2001,133).

Singh 1973[2001], 11) remarked that modernization symbolizes a rational attitude towards issues, and their evaluation from a universalistic and not a particularistic view point, (when it involves an emotional response to problems), orientation is empathic and not constrictive. Modernization is rooted in the scientific worldview. It has deeper and positive association with levels of diffusion of scientific knowledge, technological skill and technological resources in a particular society. However, what may be essential to modernization is the commitment to scientific worldview, the internalization of humanistic and philosophical viewpoint of science or contemporary problems and not merely the volume of technological advancement. It is possible that a society as also an individual might command a maximum of scientific skills and resources but a minimum of its necessary psychic and emotional requisites. It is otherwise possible that a successful scientist may be a failure as a 'modern' human, and a most affluent or technologically advanced society may also be the one which is most tyrannical. He further mentioned that the distinction between modern values and traditional values may be maintained on grounds that modern values, like science, being evolutionary universal, might not be typical to any one particular cultural tradition, whereas traditional cultural values may be

particularistic and typical. Modernization in its essential attributes or in ideal-typical forms is a universal-cultural phenomenon. Like science, modernity is not an exclusive possession of any one ethnic or cultural group, but it belongs to humanity as a

whole.

Singh (ibid) analysed modernization in the Indian context of change in a very systematic manner. According to him, the sources of change can be endogenous or exogenous. Endogenous sources of change are the sources within the social system and exogenous sources are those coming from outside. Besides, change takes place in 'tradition' and 'social structure'. Tradition according to Singh is characterized by hierarchy, holism, continuity and transcendence and is divided into 'Great tradition' and 'Little tradition'. The former is the cultural belief and value systems that are practiced throughout the country, while the latter comprises the folk cultural beliefs and oral traditions and localized adoption of the 'Great tradition'. Both Hinduism and Islam in India featured holism, hierarchy, continuity and transcendence. Modernization of 'Great tradition' in both these cases referred to a pattern of change from hierarchy to equality, from holism to individualism, from continuity to historicity and from transcendence to rationalism and secularism. In India, following the process of Westernization, there was educational modernization, emergence of universal legal system, advancement in communication systems and transportation, expansion of urban centres and modern political institutions. Similarly, in the sphere of little tradition, two forces of change, Sanskritization and Islamization (conversion to Islam) came through.

Further, he analysed change in social structure which he divided into macro and micro-structure. The change in macro-structure referred to change in the political, industrial and urban structures. For example, the elite structure in the country indicated that they came from homogenous backgrounds. However, the post-independence era saw the change in such macro-structure and elites came from different socio-cultural backgrounds. Change in the micro-structure referred to the change in caste, family and communities. The modernization of caste for example was seen in its association with politics without losing its social functions. Voting behaviour is largely influenced by the caste of the candidate contesting the election. So, Singh claimed that India's modernization process is very unique and it is being instituted through the adaptive changes in the traditional structures rather than structural breakdown.

For a clear understanding, Jena and Mohapatra ([1993] 2001, 133⁴) gives the following indicators of modernity.

- (1) A degree of self-sustaining growth in the economy or at least growth sufficient to increase both production and consumption regularly;
- (2) Increasing use of inanimate sources of power to meet human requirement and to solve human problems;
- (3) A noticeable degree of both individual and collective effort to achieve technological advancement;
- (4) A measure to mass participation in the political affairs or at least a sort of democratic representation in defining and choosing policy alternatives;
- (5) A diffusion of secular-rational norms in the culture;
- (6) An increment of mobility in the society—understood as personal freedom of physical, social and psychic movement;
- (7) The emergence and growth of specific functional organizations and attendant changes in social structures and values;
- (8) A corresponding transformation in the model personality that equips the individuals to function effectively in social order.

Ram Ahuja (1999, 485-1) cites the following problems of modernization.

- (1) The first paradox of modernization is that modern society must change in all ways at once but such a regular, coordinated pattern of growth cannot be conceivably planned. A certain amount of social unrest is, therefore, inevitably created. For example, mass educational system demands that trained individuals must be absorbed in occupational roles commensurate with their training and knowledge. However, it is not always possible to provide jobs to all educated people. This leads to unrest among educated unemployed people.
- (2) The social problem is that structural change is uneven during periods of modernization. For example, industries may be modernized but family system, religious system, etc. remain conservative. These discontinuities

and patterns of change affect the established social and other structures and produce lags and bottlenecks.

(3) Modernization of social and economic institutions creates conflicts with the traditional ways of life. For example, trained doctors pose a threat to traditional medicine men. Similarly, machine-made finished products pose a threat to traditional hand-made crafts and the livelihood of the artisan communities.

(4) Most often, roles adopted by people are modern but values continue to be traditional.

(5) There is a lack of cooperation among agencies which modernize and among institutions and systems which are modernized. This often leads to cultural lag as well as institutional conflicts.

(6) Modernization raises the aspiration of people but many times social systems fail to provide opportunities to them to achieve those aspirations. This creates frustrations, deprivations and social unrest.

Secularization

Secularization is another important process of social change in the modern Indian context. It refers to the transformation of a society identified with religious values, ideas and institutions towards non-religious ideas, values and institutions. As societies progress and modernize, the people follow values of reason and rationality; while religion, religious scriptures and institutions lose their influence on people and their social life. So secularization is a process where societies lose their religious significance. Max Weber opined that the scientific and technological advancement would weaken peoples' belief on religion and supernatural powers. Rationality will also overpower superstitious beliefs and dogmas. Weber called this process as the 'disenchantment of the world'. The term 'secularization' was first used in Europe in 1148. It was then understood as the process of transferring of Church properties to the control of the rulers. Bryan Wilson (1911) defined secularization as 'a process where religious thinking, practice and institutions lose social significance'. Similarly, Peter Berger (1973) defined secularization as 'the process by which sections of society and culture are removed from the domination of religious institutions and symbols'. Further, M. N. Srinivas (1911) wrote that 'the term secularization implies that what was previously regarded as religious is now ceasing to be such and it also implies the process of differentiation which results in the various aspects of socio-economic, political, legal and moral becoming

increasingly discrete to each other.' Singh (1973[2001]) remarked that secularism is a sub-process of modernization.

M.N. Srinivas (1911, 118-119) wrote elaborately on the process of secularization in his analysis of social change in Indian society. According to him, British rule brought with it a process of secularization of Indian social life and culture, a tendency that gradually became stronger with the development of communications, growth of towns and cities, increased spatial mobility and the spread of education. The two World Wars and Gandhiji's Civil Disobedience campaigns, both of which socially and politically mobilized the masses, also contributed to increased secularization. Following independence, the Constitution also recognized India as a secular state and maintained that all citizens are equal before law. Comparing both Sanskritization and secularization, Srinivas opined that of the two, secularization is the more general process, affecting all Indians; while Sanskritization affects only Hindus and tribals. As he mentioned, broadly, it would be true to say that secularization is more marked among the urban and

educated sections of society and Sanskritization among the lower Hindu castes and tribes. Quoting the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, he elaborated that one of the essential elements of secularization is rationalism, a comprehensive expression applied to various theoretical and practical tendencies which aim to interpret the universe purely in terms of thought, or which aim to regulate individual and social life in accordance with the principles of reason and to eliminate as far as possible or to relegate to the background everything irrational.

Following the analysis made above, as outlined by Jena and Mohapatra ([1993] 2001, 159-10), the main ingredients of secularization can be discussed below.

(1) **Decline in religiosity:** Religion is based on a distinction between sacred and profane in which the term 'sacred' is associated with a faith in a mythical or supernatural power. However, the process of secularization in contrast implies a gradual decline of religious feelings. In a perfectly secularized society, religious considerations are replaced by rationalistic considerations. Thus, as the process of secularization proceeds, the social institutions and individual actions become increasingly free from the influence of religion.

(2) **Rationality:** With the gradual decline of religious controls, there takes place a corresponding increase in rationalism in the process of secularization. People start thinking about the problems of their day-to-day lives. Reason takes the place of faith. Instead of taking everything for granted, people try to find out the cause of happenings in their individual as well social life. A tendency towards establishment of cause and effect relationship becomes increasingly popular.

(3) **Empiricism and commitment to scientific world views:** The process of secularization results in growth in empiricism and scientific world view. Human knowledge is based on observation, experimentation and verification. Experience and experimentation governs the human consciousness. Beliefs, faiths and mythical orientation are increasingly replaced by the scientific knowledge derived from empirical observation.

(4) **Process of differentiation:** The growth of empiricism and rationalism necessarily results in a corresponding differentiation in the social structure. Different aspects of social life come to be differentiated from each other. Each such aspect for example, economic, legal, political and moral sub-systems becomes increasingly distinct. Each sub-system gets further differentiated which results in the increasing specialization and professionalization.

So, to sum up it can be said that secularization is a process which brings change in the approach of people towards things where rationality and reason increasingly influence their attitude and orientations and where religious and superstitious beliefs have less control on human behaviour.

As has been discussed in brief in the earlier paragraphs, the process of secularization in India started with British contact. However, there is a difference between the Western model of secularization and the Indian model of secularization. The Indian experience of secularization is unique. In the West, especially in Europe, secularization meant isolating the Church/religion from public life/control. So, the Western model is without religion. However, the Indian model of secularization is with religion. The Indian Constitution mentions in its 'Preamble' that it is a 'secular' country where each and every religion will be treated by state equally and that there wouldn't be any state religion. The Constitution also defines that every individual has freedom to practice, profess and propagate any

religion. It has been instituted as one of the Fundamental Rights of Indian citizens. The Right to Freedom of Religion is guaranteed under Article 25 of the Constitution of India. As it reads, Article 25(1) says, 'Subject to public order, morality and health and to the other provisions of this Part, all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion.' Again, Article 25 (2) says, 'Nothing in this article shall affect the operation of any existing law or prevent the State from making any law: (a) Regulating or restricting any economic financial, political or other secular activity which may be associated with religious practice; (b) Providing for social welfare and reform or the throwing open of Hindu religious institutions of a public character to all classes and sections of Hindus.' So this Article in the Constitution of India guarantees that every person in India shall have the freedom of conscience and shall have the right to profess, practise and propagate religion, subject to the restrictions that may be imposed by the state on the following grounds, namely: (1) Public order, morality and health; (2) Other provisions of the Constitution; (3) Regulation of non-religious activity associated with religious practice; (4) Social welfare and reform; (5) throwing open of Hindu religious institutions of a public character to all classes of Hindus.

9.4 STRUCTURAL APPROACH TO SOCIAL CHANGE

Change and continuity are the inevitable facts of life. Not only do people themselves undergo the process of change, but also the habitat they live in. That's why 'change' is often called as the unchangeable or inescapable law of nature. Change is the only reality. Looking at the inevitability of change, the Greek Philosopher Heraclitus pointed out that a person cannot step into the same river twice since in between the first and the second occasion, both the water in the river and the person concerned get changed (Giddens 2001,42). History reveals that man's life has been transformed from the caves and jungles to the palatial buildings. People, family, religion and value system will not remain same forever. Societies grow, decay and modify to changing conditions. Every society, from primitive to industrial and post-industrial, has witnessed continuous state of transformation. Change is permanent, although the intensity or degree of change is different in different societies. As to Giddens (2001), in human societies, to decide how far and in what ways a particular system is in a process of change or transformation, we have to show to what degree there is any modification of basic institutions during a specific time period. There are social systems which change very fast, whereas there

are others which have ties with the remote past. World religions like Christianity and Islam maintain their ties with ideas and value systems pioneered thousands of years ago. Primitive societies considered change as external and problematic phenomena. However, in modern times, change is seen as natural and necessary. Every new generation faces different and new socio-economic challenges and yet they forge ahead with new possibilities of life keeping continuity with the past.

Like natural scientists study different aspects of change in the nature, social scientists study change in the social life of man. Change and continuity have long been the subjects of research and study for social scientists and philosophers. Scholars like Aristotle, Plato, Hegel and others have written at length on various aspects of change during their times. In fact, sociology as a separate discipline emerged in the middle of the 19th century as an effort to explain the socio-cultural and economic changes that erupted in Europe following the industrialization and democratization processes. It will not be wrong to state that major classical sociologists were preoccupied with explaining

change, more precisely articulating on the change that followed the rise of capitalism in the West. Considering change as an important aspect of study, the father of sociology, August Comte, even remarked that the role of this discipline is to analyse both the **Social Statics** (the laws governing social order) and **Social Dynamics** (laws governing social change) (Slattery 2003,57). Similarly, Herbert Spencer also talked about change in his analysis of 'Structure' and 'Function'. 'Structure' indicated the internal build-up, shape or form of societal wholes, whereas 'function' signifies their operation or transformation (Sztompka 1993,3). He has measured change or progress taking into consideration the degree of complexity in society. According to Spencer, society passes from simple, undifferentiated, homogeneity to complex, differentiated, heterogeneity. Another classical sociological thinker, and one of the founders of the discipline, Emile Durkheim talks about evolutionary change in his famous work *"The Division of Labour"* and observes that society passes from 'mechanical solidarity' to 'organic solidarity'. Karl Marx explains societal change with his economic deterministic model and describes change of society from primitive communism to socialism. Max Weber's analysis of religious codes and its impact on economic development in his *'The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism'* examines the major aspects of change.

Before going into details about social change, it is pertinent to discuss the meaning of the term 'change'. 'Change' refers to any alteration or transformation in any object, situation or phenomena over a certain period of time. As Strasser and Randall (1981,11) have said, 'If we speak of change, we have in mind something that comes into being after some time; that is to say, we are dealing with a difference between what can be observed before and after that point in time.' Similarly, the *Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology* defines change as a 'succession of events which produce over time a modification or replacement of particular patterns or units by other novel ones' (Sekulic 2007,4318). Time is an important factor in the context of change.

'Social change' on the other hand indicates the changes that take place in human interactions or interrelationships. Society is regarded as a 'web of social relationships' and in that sense social change refers to change in the system of social relationships (Shankar Rao 2000,484). It is the alteration or modification of the structure and function of any system. For example, change in interpersonal relationships, inter-caste and intercommunity marriage, change in family type from joint-living to nuclear households, etc. can be called as social change.

Different scholars have defined social change in different ways. A glance at some of them can make understanding clear. According to Morris Ginsberg (1981,129),

'Social change is the change in social structure, i.e. the size of a society, the composition or balance of its parts or the type of its organization. The term social change must also include changes in attitudes or beliefs, in so far as they sustain institutions and change with them.' Here, he talks about two types of changes: changes in the structure of society and changes in the values system of society. However, these two types of changes should not be treated separately because a change in one brings on changes in the other, as a change in the attitude of people may bring about changes in the social structure and vice versa (Kar 1994,500). Describing it as apart of 'cultural change', Kingsley Davis says, 'Social change is meant only such alterations as occur in social organizations, i.e. the structure and function of society' (Kar 1994,501). Macionis (1987,138) defines social change as the 'transformation in the organization of society and in patterns of thought and behaviour overtime'. Again, according to Ritzer et al. (1987,510), 'Social change refers to variations over time in die relationships among individuals, groups, organizations, cultures and societies.' So, it can be summarized from the above definitions that almost all the authors while defining social change, give emphasis on social relationships, social organizations, social patterns and values. Social change, therefore, is change in the societal system as a whole.

Different scholars debate over if 'change' is a revolutionary process or it happens gradually. However, they settle with the fact that it is both an evolutionary and a revolutionary process. Every change has an effect over different aspects of life and different components of the societal system. The development of the Internet for example in

contemporary society has enormous implications for other institutions and ideas—it affects psychology, ideology, the political system, industry, education and the media. It is a revolutionary force but it builds upon previous developments so that it is both gradual and insurrectionary (Hoffman 2001,511).

4.4.1 Nature of Social Change

Following the meaning and definitional analysis of the concept, the features of social change can be discussed as given below:

(i) **Social change is universal:** As discussed in the above section, social change is inevitable. It is not only inevitable, but is also universal. It is found in every society. From primitive society to the post-industrial one, change is found everywhere. No society or culture remains static forever. Human beings changed themselves from nomads, food gatherers to agriculturists and later modern, industrial beings.

(ii) **Social change is continuous:** Right from the time mother earth came into being to the present times, society/life has been in a continuously changing mode. No society or people can be stopped from the influences of change. It is a never-ending process.

(iii) **Social change may produce chain reactions:** Change in one aspect of a system may lead to changes of varying degrees in other aspects of that system. As to Biesanz and Biesanz (1914,13), the change from hunting and food gathering to agriculture was a revolution in technology that led eventually to the development of civilization by making large and diversified societies possible. Similarly, the Protestant emphasis on Bible reading as a road to salvation led to a great rise in literacy. Further, introduction of the system of reservation for backward communities in Government institutions and offices in India has brought changes in their socioeconomic status, interpersonal relationships and also in the social and economic structure of the country. Similarly, improvement in literacy in the country leads to economic independence of women which in turn brings changes in the whole notion of family, marriage and husband-wife ties.

(iv) **Social change may be planned or unplanned:** Change may occur with or without proper planning. People, government or any other agent may initiate change through plans or programmes and may determine the degree and direction of change. The Government of India after Independence devised several socioeconomic developmental programmes to bring the country out of poverty and unemployment through the broader provision of Five Year Plans. In the 10 years of Independence, the country has seen phenomenal improvement in literacy, health, infrastructure and industry, and considerably managed to overcome poverty, hunger and unemployment problems. Apart from the planned social change, there can be changes which are unplanned and happen accidentally. Changes due to natural calamities like earthquakes, tsunamis, and volcanic eruptions belong to this category.

(v) **Social change is temporal and directional:** Change can be directional. It occurs in a particular direction. In several instances, such direction is planned, predetermined and is fixed ideally. Such changes are called progress. However, change in general may take place in any direction. Similarly, the rate or tempo of change varies from time to time and place to place. Some changes may take months and years while some may occur rapidly.

Social change is temporal in the sense that it involves the factor of time. It denotes time sequence. It can be temporary or permanent. Time is an important component in the process of change.

(vi) **Social change is value-neutral:** The concept of social change is not value-laden or judgemental. It doesn't advocate any good or desirable and bad or undesirable turn of events. It is an objective term which is neither moral nor immoral. It is ethically neutral.

Forms of Social Change

There are different types of social change. The term 'social' is so vast in scope that different forms of change which carry several names of their own can actually be brought under the broader concept of social change. However, different types of change are discussed below for better understanding of the concept.

(i) **Social change and cultural change:** Social and cultural changes are often regarded as the same and denote similar kind of change. However, there are differences between the two. 'Social' refers to interactions and interrelationship between people. 'Culture' on the other hand refers to the customs, beliefs, symbols, value systems and in general the set of rules that are created by people in society. It can be both material and non-material. Material culture consists of manufacturing objects and tools like automobiles, furniture, buildings, roads, bridges, books, mobiles, TV sets and anything of that sort which is tangible and is used by the people. Non-material culture includes belief systems, values, mores, norms, habits, and language. The concept of culture relates to the body of knowledge and techniques and values through which a society directs and expresses its life as an interacting entity (Mohanty 1997,13). So, the change in social relationships, human interactions, modifications in role expectations and role performance are regarded as social change, whereas changes in human artefacts, beliefs, values and body of knowledge are called cultural change. Culture changes through time and it spreads from place to place and group to group. As Biesanz and Biesanz (1914, 11-12) put it, in the span of time since World War II began, immense changes

have taken place. Television, since the experimental stage before the war, has entered almost every living room in the world. From the first atomic reaction in the early decades of the 20th century, we have progressed to space capsules and satellites and in a few short post-war years, plastics and synthetic fabrics, wash-and-wear clothes, stretch socks, automatic washers, dishwashers, clothes driers, food freezers and packaged mixes have changed the housewife's fate.

It is important to mention here that sometimes changes that occur in a cultural system don't go smooth and face maladjustment with other parts of the system. Such a situation is termed as 'cultural lag'. Defining the concept, Ogburn (1957), wrote, 'A cultural lag occurs when one of the two parts of culture which are correlated changes before or in greater degree than the other parts does, thereby causing less adjustment between the two parts than existed previously.'

However, any cultural change has its impact on human relationships and, therefore, influences social changes too. The advent of mobile telephony and internet has far-reaching consequences on interpersonal relationships. Thus, cultural change positively affects social change and change in a society comes through both social and cultural changes. As Kingsley Davis stated, cultural change is broader than social change and social change is only a part of it (Shankar Rao 2000,485). All social changes are cultural changes, but not vice versa. Those cultural changes that affect social organizations and human interpersonal relations can be called social changes.

(ii) **Social change and social progress:** Progress is a change in a desirable direction. It can also refer to change for the better. It involves value judgement because it implies betterment or improvement. Progress involves change that leads to certain well-defined goals. It is also a type of social change. However, there are differences between the two. Every change is not progress, but every progress can be called a change. Moreover, change is a value-free concept, while progress always denotes change for the better. In that sense, progress is a value-laden concept. It has been discussed before that change can be planned and un-planned. Nonetheless, progress is always planned and ideally fixed. Besides, change is obvious and certain. Small or big, slow or fast, change takes place in every society, but progress is uncertain (Mohanty 1997,21).

(iii) **Social change and social evolution:** The use of word evolution or 'social evolution' in sociology is borrowed from biology. Biology studies 'organic evolution' which denotes the evolution of all kinds of organisms. Social evolution on the other hand refers to the process of evolution of human society, human social relationships, societal values, norms and the way of life. It involves the idea that every society passes through different phases, from simple to complex. Sociologists and social anthropologists were impressed by the idea of organic evolution which could convincingly explain how one species evolves into another, and wanted to apply the same to the social world (Shankar Rao 2000,491). As put forward by Maclver and Page (2005,522), evolution means more than growth. Growth does connote a direction of change, but it is quantitative in character. Evolution involves something more intrinsic, a change not merely in size, but at least in structure also. Social evolution is also a type of social change. Both of them are natural and inevitable facts of life. However, there are differences between the two. First, every change is not evolutionary in nature, whereas, evolution always implies change. Second, evolution, unlike change is a continuous process. Third, the cause

of social change may be both internal and external, whereas evolution is mostly affected through the operation of internal factors. Fourth, social change can be planned or unplanned but evolution is an automatic process. Fifth, social change is a value-neutral concept, whereas evolution is value-loaded. Sixth, there can be slow or fast social change, but evolution is always a slow process (Mohanty, 1997,27).

As discussed in the beginning of this sub-section, any kind of change that we witness in society can come under the broader definition of either social or cultural change. However, some specific variety of change can also be discussed here, although they come under the umbrella term of social or cultural change.

(iv) **Demographic change:** Demography deals with the size, distribution and growth of population over a period of time. Demographic change is change in the patterns of fertility, mortality, age structure and migration. High fertility or high mortality can have important implications in any society. The same can happen if the rate of such indicators are too slow. High fertility might lead to large-scale instances of poverty and unemployment, and might affect the developmental efforts of a state. Over-population also leads to greater use of natural resources and affects environmental sustainability. High birth and death rates bring about change in the attitude of people towards family and marriage. In India, demographic change in the form of high fertility led to the adoption of family planning programmes and following which there was a decrease in the population growth rate. The small family norm has introduced

change in social relationships between husband and wife, parents and children, the status of women and so on.

(v) **Technological change:** Human civilization is moving from the most rudimentary technology of bow and arrow to the modern and highly sophisticated instruments of the present day. The invention of computers, Internet, mobile phones, jet planes, atomic bomb and discoveries of men like Vasco da Gama and Columbus have changed the socio-cultural space of the modern man dramatically. Ancient man walked on bare feet. Then came the bullock cart which made movement comparatively faster. Subsequent technological innovations brought about bicycles, automobiles, jet planes and so on. These have helped the movement of people faster than ever before. These technological changes have enormous societal implications. The introduction of high-yield seeds in the form of Green Revolution in India that ensured massive increase in foodgrains like rice and wheat managed the hunger situation in the country quite well. Dramatizing the fact that technological change may lead to social change, sociologist William F. Ogburn once attributed the emancipation of women to the invention of the automobile self-starter, which enabled women to drive cars, freed them from their homes and permitted them to invade the world of business (Biesanz and Biesanz 1914,14). The modern means of entertainment and communication like TV, Radio, Internet and cell phones have drastically changed the family life in India and substantially affected the role of women in society. Not only they are empowered and emancipated but also the husband-wife ties are now being seen as that of co-partners rather than that of superiors and inferiors. Although technological changes have not spread equally everywhere in the country, still phenomenal improvement in this respect cannot be ignored.

(vi) **Economic change:** Economy plays a cardinal role in man's daily life. Noted sociologist and philosopher, Karl Marx, pointed out the significance of economy

as a factor in social change. He propounded that economy which constitutes the means of production like labour and instruments and the relations of production is the infrastructure and all others like family, legal system, education, religion and polity are the superstructure. As he says, a conflict between the oppressor and the oppressed, haves and the have-nots brings change in society and the society transforms to a new mode of production. In this manner, Marx says, society gets transformed from primitive communism to slavery, slavery to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism and from capitalism, Marx predicted, socialism, a classless society will emerge (Morrison, 2001). In Indian society, industrial economy brought enormous change in the lives of people. Not only did it change the occupation structure in society but also affected inter-personal relationships. People from rural areas migrated to cities to work in factories. This drastically reduced the effect of caste/untouchability and also transformed joint families to nuclear households. India, once an agricultural economy, is now manufacturing industrial products to emerge a world leader in producing software, making it a service economy. The software giants like Infosys, Wipro and TCS are renowned world over. So economic change is one of the important forms of social change.

Development is a process that makes the human society a better place to live in. It brings social well-being. The nature of development is analysed below (Jena and Mohapatra 2001; Mohanty 1997).

(i) Development is a revolutionary process. In many cases, it involves sudden and rapid change of the social

structure. In its technological and cultural dimensions, it is comparable to Neolithic revolutions which had turned food-gatherers and nomads into settled agriculturists. Now, during the development revolution, society is getting transformed from rural agricultural one to urban and industrial.

(ii) Development is a complex and multi-dimensional process. It involves a lot of economic, behavioural and institutional rearrangements. It involves equity, socioeconomic and political participation.

(iii) Development is a systematic process. Change in one aspect brings chain reaction and corresponding changes in other aspects also.

(iv) Development is a lengthy process. The process of development needs substantial level of efforts over a long period of time.

(v) Development is an irreversible process. It always moves forward. Although some aspects of the process might have some occasional downfalls, but the whole process of development is irreversible.

(vi) Development is a universal process. Developmental ideas and know-how are diffused from centre of origin to other parts of the world. There are transformations of ideas and techniques between nations world over.

(vii) Development is directional. It is a process that moves in a direction. In that sense, development is also called an evolutionary process. As stated by Spencer, it can be from simple to complex. As stated by Marx, it can be from class-less primitive communism to capitalistic mode of production and finally to socialism. As discussed by Durkheim, it can be from mechanical solidarity to organic solidarity and so on.

(viii) Development is a value-loaded concept. Qualitatively, it talks about improvement of something over something else. It talks about improvement in lifestyle,

infrastructure, education, health system and so on. Quantitatively, it always advocates for more (of anything) in number. So it is a process that involves value judgement.

Interrelationship between Change and Development

Development is a form of change. However, there are differences between the two. Change is a value-neutral concept while development, as discussed in the previous sections, is value-loaded one. Change is ethically neutral and suggests alterations or modifications in the structure and functioning of society over a period of time. Development on the other hand, advocates change for good. It is a process of desired change. Although development leads to change, all forms of change don't indicate development. Those changes which are planned are termed as development. A change to be defined as development must occur continuously in a desired direction. These desired goals are set looking at the values, norms and needs of any society. Any change in society must get absorbed in the system and must be felt by the people to make it more effective. Such change can then be regarded as development. Advancement in education and modern means of transport and communication has resulted in high female literacy in modern societies. This has led to women joining in various jobs in both government and non-government establishments, changing the family relationship as a whole. Such a move leads to a situation like role

conflict where the modern women are confused whether to perform the role of a traditional family woman, a mother, a daughter, a wife or to play the role of a teacher, an administrator or an engineer. Such a phenomenon is an example of social change. However, such change can be regarded as development only when proper institutional arrangements and social adjustments are made so that a working woman doesn't face the situation like role-conflict and manages both her roles well. Such institutional arrangements and social adjustments will then be called development (Jena and Mohapatra 2001; Mohanty 1997).

As discussed in previous sections, development is a multi-faceted term and there are lots of confusions over its meaning and definition. Questions are often raised on how should one count the development parameters. How can a society be called developed and underdeveloped? What should be the basis? To understand the concept clearly, the indicators of development are discussed as follows.

(i) **Literacy or education:** Education is the medium through which the members of society are socialized and the modern means of knowledge, skill and technique are imparted to them. Formal education and training expands opportunities for people and increase their capacities. Availability of educated labour force in a country is a pre-requisite for development, better governance system and healthy functioning of democracy. In India, to eradicate illiteracy, the successive governments have come out with policies like 'Sarva Shiksha Abhiyan' (SSA), 'Mid-day Meal Scheme', 'Mahila Samakhya Scheme', and 'Teacher Education Scheme'. Following the National Literacy Mission (NLM), set up in 1988, the 'Total Literacy Campaign' was initiated to eliminate illiteracy. India's soaring literacy helped the country to become a knowledge economy. From a mere 12 per cent during independence, India's literacy has reached 15 per cent (2001 census) now. This is a strong indicator of development.

(ii) **Health:** Health is as the World Health Organisation (WHO) defines it 'a state of complete physical, mental, and social well-being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity'. Good physical health is the basic requirement for a stable

society. Low maternal and infant mortality, good quality of life and availability of proper health facilities to all sections of a society are necessary conditions for a healthy and developed society. In India although phenomenal improvements in various health indicators have been witnessed in post-independence period, still several facts need wide attention. Year 2007 data show, in India, the infant mortality rate (IMR)—the probability of a child dying before the first birthday—is still high, i.e., 55 per one thousand live births, although it has shown continuous decline over the years. Again 43 per cent of children in India under age five are underweight (India 2010, 519 - 522). According to UN World Food Programme report released in 2009, more than 27 per cent of the world's under-nourished population lives in India. Besides, 40 per cent of women are found with chronic energy deficiency and around 30 per cent of babies in India are born underweight (Bhattacharya 2010). Development of any country with such bad health indicators will be difficult.

(iii) **Income:** Adequate level of employment generation is essential for a country to raise income level of its populace. High income per capita and increased Gross National Product (GNP) make a country economically healthy. When a country has enough economic resources and its per capita income is high, it can invest in social sectors like health and education. Therefore, income and economic welfare are most important indicators of the development process.

(iv) **Democratic participation:** Participation in the political process of a state is a rational thing every citizen would want to carry out. The political process can enable or hamper developmental process. The participation of people in every developmental activity makes it more effective and serves developmental goals. Right to choose one's

representative and the right to choose one's government are important for the people in polity. The introduction of adult franchise in India soon after independence is a significant step in this context. However, only right to vote is not enough for a country to be called as developed. People must also have the right to choose the development that is meant for them. This makes a state democratic and people friendly. It is an important indication for development when people enjoy such freedom.

(v) **Scientific and technological advancement:** Technological prowess makes a country advanced and that enables the creation of better facilities for its citizens. When a country is technologically advanced, its people have larger choices for scientific and technological knowhow. There are very few countries who can afford substantial amount of resources devoted for Research and Development (R&D) since it is very expensive and involves complicated processes. However, a country with adequate and latest technology can manage its various needs well and make facilities available for its masses.

(vi) **Strong and sustained cultural civilization:** A country for its true development needs not only scientific tools and economic growth but also a strong urge to sustain its traditional heritage and cultural civilization. The very notion of Human Development Index (HDI) devised by UNDP is that progress and development is no longer to be measured just in terms of GDP or per capita income but also in terms of human well-being which includes a number of factors like cultural identity, a sense of security, of both one's personal safety as well as safety of one's culture and one's place in this world. In that sense, Bhutan has very high indicators of human happiness. This is due to Bhutan's flourishing craft activities, linking craft to Bhutan sense of identity (Chatterjee and Ashoke 2005). So traditional

cultural ethos and values are major parts of a country's development. In India, it is the traditional skill (local knowledge) of the handicrafts artisans that is a major basis of their identity and in post-liberalization India that identity is either getting vanished or diluted and the skill/local knowledge is very much influenced by the market forces (Jena 2008, 22). Sustaining one's own cultural heritage of any form in modern globalized times is one of the greatest challenges for any country. Without this, true development of the nation and humanity is impossible.

Change in Structure and Change of Structure

To Kingsley Davis, social change refers to alterations in the 'structure' and 'function' of a society. This was discussed while dealing with the definitional analysis of change. The notion of 'structure' is important in this context. 'Structure' refers to the ordered arrangements where various parts of a system or whole are organized and follow established rules and norms. Structure itself remains invisible to public eye, but it produces visible results. It controls the behaviour of fellow human beings in a society. The members of a societal system are controlled by the structure or established rules, values, norms, customs, laws and so on. There can be two types of change related to social structure— the change that is witnessed inside the structure and the change of the societal system or structure as a whole. Among these two types of changes, structural change or change of structure is most important and relevant. 'Perhaps the reason for emphasizing structural change is that more often it leads to change of, rather than merely change in society. Social structure makes up a sort of skeleton on which society and its operations are founded. When it changes, all else is apt to change as well' (Sztompka 1993, 1).

When there is change inside the structure of any societal system, the change takes place in parts, not to the whole. Here, the structure as a whole remains the same, but the internal arrangements experience alterations. Changes in this case are only partial and restricted and it doesn't have any repercussion for other aspects. The process of Sanskritization is a change in Indian social structure (not change of the structure).

The term Sanskritization was coined by M.N. Srinivas. In his study on the Coorgs, Srinivas tried to describe the process of cultural mobility in the traditional Indian caste system. He holds the view that caste system in traditional India has never been so rigid and there is always scope for different caste members to alter or raise their status. He defines Sanskritization as the 'process by which a low caste or tribe or other group takes over the custom, rituals, beliefs, ideology and life style of a higher caste and in particular "twice-born" (*dwija*) caste' (Srinivas, 1911). In this context, Srinivas maintained that a low caste or tribe may give up meat-eating and other non-vegetarian food and adopt vegetarian diet, quit liquor and animal sacrifice to embrace the lifestyle of higher castes. While following this for a generation or two, they may claim higher rank in their local caste hierarchy and achieve upward mobility in their status. This process of mobility is inside the system of caste. It doesn't lead to any structural change. The Indian caste system as a whole is not changing; rather the different ladders of it are getting altered. With the process of Sanskritization, there is no end to the system of inequality in the caste system. There are only few individuals who may claim higher status or improve their traditional social position within that unequal structure. So it is a process of change in the structure, rather than change of the structure. As to Srinivas, Sanskritization leads to *positional* change not *structural* change.

On the other hand, changes may occur in the core aspect of a structure. In this case, fundamental changes are found in the societal structure where the post-change or

new structure becomes different from the pre-change or old structure. Changes of the structure might lead to lack of equilibrium among different parts of the system and the strain might disturb the smooth running of the system. In this context, Ginsberg has illustrated about Europe. As he says, 'The domain economy was made impossible in Europe in the eleventh and twelfth centuries by the rise of the towns. The urban population couldn't feed itself and had therefore to obtain the means of subsistence by purchase from the rural areas. This meant that the domains no longer restricted their production to meet their own needs. As production became remunerative, the idea of working for profit began to exercise people's mind. On the other hand, the landowners, restricted to customary revenues, found it difficult to satisfy their growing needs. In this way the moral and economic foundations of the domainal system were shaken by the growth of cities and the change in the relationship between town and country.' (Ginsberg 1981, 140-141).

Similarly in India, colonialism brought two important structural changes in society: industrialization and urbanization. Industrialization is the process of socio-economic change that transforms a society from agricultural to industrial one. This is a process where socio-economic development is closely associated with scientific and technological innovation. It refers to the beginning of machine production by the use of inanimate energy. The biggest transformation that is experienced following industrialization process is the change in occupation structure of people. People start migrating from agriculture to factories. Industrialization started with the industrial revolution in the United Kingdom in the 18th century which later spread to other parts of Europe and later the world over. Being a colony of the

British, India witnessed sea change in its societal structure after the Industrial Revolution. Again, urbanization is a process where there is movement of people from rural or country areas to cities or urban areas. Industrialization in India led many people in villages to migrate to cities to work in factories. Therefore, industrialization and urbanization are always seen as associated facts. With industrialization and urbanization in India, the old Indian system of extended or joint families got disintegrated into nuclear households. Transition from joint to nuclear household, not only changed the size and type of residence but also the interpersonal relationships. With modern education and economic independence, the youths of modern times challenged the authority of traditional family and family head. Similarly, the role of women in society has greatly changed. Greater number of women are found working outside home and are economically independent. Due to industrialization, the earlier system of child marriages has seen a dramatic decline and nowadays has become almost non-existent. The earlier system of Hindu marriage as a sacred bond is giving way to 'live-in' relationships. The arranged marriage system where the parents played important role in selecting partners is disappearing and instances of love-marriage is spreading fast where young boys and girls prefer choosing their own soul-mates. In fact, marriage as an institution is also getting changed and becoming irrelevant with the prevalence of 'gay' and 'lesbian' marriages. The recent verdict of the Honourable Delhi High court treating Section 337 of the Indian Penal Code as unconstitutional is relevant in this context. The Court ruled that treating consensual gay sex between adults as a crime is a violation of Fundamental Rights. Such changes following industrialization and urbanization in India are significant and are structural changes in the societal system. The changes of the whole structure of family and marriage in rural and urban areas have enormous impact in the daily life of people. Hence, structural change has always been an important area of research among sociologists.

ACTIVITY

Write an essay on the forms of Social change that have taken place in India since 1947.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Social change refers to change in social relationships, social organizations, social patterns and values. It is change in the societal system as a whole. 'Change' refers to any alteration or transformation in any object, situation or phenomena over a certain period of time. Social change is a universal and continuous process.
- Social change is a universal and continuous process. Social change can be planned or unplanned. It is temporal and directional in nature. Social change is a value-neutral concept.
- Development refers to improvement in the quality of life of people and advancement in one's state or condition. It may refer to improvements in one's well-being, living-standards and socio-economic opportunities. You have learned about different forms of change and change in and of the social structure with different examples.
- Development means improvements in one's well-being, living-standards and socioeconomic opportunities.

Development is a revolutionary multi-dimensional, systematic and universal process. It is a value-loaded concept.

- Sanskritization is a process of cultural mobility, where the low Hindu caste or tribe or other group, changes its customs, ritual, ideology and way of life in the direction of a high and frequently 'twice-born' caste.
- Westernization is a process whereby societies increasingly adopt Western cultures, life-styles, technology, food pattern, language, alphabet, religion, ideas, philosophy, value systems, etc.
- Modernization refers to the transition from a 'pre-modern' or 'traditional' type of society to a 'modern' society; especially, it is associated with the spread of education, urbanization and industrialization.
- Secularization on the other hand refers to the transformation of a society identified with religious values, ideas and institutions towards non-religious ideas, values and institutions.

KEY TERMS

- **Social statistics:** It is the use of statistical measurement systems to study human behaviour in a social environment.
- **Culture:** The set of shared attitudes, values, goals and practices that characterizes an institution, organization or group.
- **Development:** Systematic use of scientific and technical knowledge to meet specific objectives or requirements.
- **Structural change:** Deep-reaching change that alters the way authority, capital, information and responsibility flows in an organization.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Human thought, knowledge
2. Unilinear
3. Noted Indian sociologist M.N. Srinivas had made a sincere effort to analyze the process of social change in Indian society and it was made in his significant work, *Religion and society among the Coorgs of South India* (1952). This book was probably the first such attempt to study change in Indian context in a systematic manner. The term Sanskritization which was coined by Srinivas, during his study on the Coorgs was primarily meant to analyse the process of cultural mobility.
4. The term 'Sanskritization' is a much broader concept than 'Brahminization' because not only it encompasses non-Brahmin models like Kshatriyas model, Jat model, Vaishya model and models of other 'twice-born' castes but also denotes a wide spectrum of values and life-styles. Brahminization is subsumed in the wider process of Sanskritization though at some points Brahminization and Sanskritization are at variance with each other. For instance, the Brahmins of

the Vedic period drank *Soma* an alcoholic drink, ate beef, and offered blood sacrifices. Both were given up in post-Vedic times.

5. Westernization resulted not only in the introduction of new institutions like press newspapers, journals and elections but also in fundamental changes in the old institutions. So, although India had schools long before the Britishers came to India, they were fundamentally different from the schools introduced by the British in that they were restricted to only upper-caste elites and transmitted mostly traditional knowledge.

6. By 'primary westernization' we mean the changes induced by the Western impact on Indian traditions. At the initial phases, Western culture made its impact on peripheral aspects of Indian culture. It created a sub-cultural pattern limited to a very specific group of people within a particular geographical area.

7. 'Secondary westernization' started towards the end of the 19th century and the beginning of 20th century. The process of Westernization started taking firm roots in Indian social structure. Western culture emerged as basic ideology. Many social reformers justified the adoption of Western cultural spirit in order to make Indians feel the necessity of liberty, freedom and equality.

8. Religion is based on a distinction between sacred and profane in which the term sacred is associated with a faith in a mythical or supernatural power. However, the process of secularization in contrast implies a gradual decline of religious feelings. In a perfectly secularized society, religious considerations are replaced by rationalistic considerations.

9. 'Cultural' lag occurs when one of the two parts of culture which are correlated changes before or in greater degree than the other part does, thereby causing less adjustment between the two parts than existed previously.

10. Progress is a change in a desirable direction. It can also refer to change for the better. It involves value-judgment because it implies betterment or improvement. Progress involves change that leads to certain well-defined goals. It is also a type of social change.

11. The use of the word 'evolution' or 'social evolution' in sociology is borrowed from biology. Biology studies 'organic evolution' which denotes the evolution of all kinds of organisms. Social evolution on the other hand refers to the process of evolution of human society, human social relationships, societal values, norms and the way of life.

12. Demographic change is change in the patterns of fertility, mortality, age structure, and migration. High fertility or high mortality can have important implications in any society. The same can happen if the rates of such indicators are too slow.

13. Karl Marx pointed out the significance of economy as a factor in social change. He propounded that the economy which constitutes the means of production like labour, instruments, etc. and the relations of production is the infrastructure and all others like family, legal system, education, religion, and polity constitute the superstructure.

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Define social change.
2. Give your opinion on whether 'change' is a revolutionary process or not.
3. What is cultural change?
4. What is the relation between social change and social progress?
5. How is social change responsible for social evolution?
6. Write a brief note on demographic change.
7. What do you mean by technological change?
8. How is 'development' 'directional' innature?

Long-Answer Questions

1. What is change and what is the difference between change and social change?
2. Discuss the meaning and the nature of the process of social change.
3. Discuss with examples different forms of social change.
4. What is development? Discuss its meaning and nature.
5. How can you define development and what are its indicators?
6. Discuss with suitable examples the difference between change in structure and structural change.
7. Critically evaluate different forms of social change.
8. Explain the difference between 'change in structure' and 'change of structure'.

FURTHER READING

- Ahuja, Ram. 1999. *Society in India: Concepts, Theories, and Changing Trends*. Jaipur: Rawat Publication.
- Berger, Peter. 1973. *The Social Reality of Religion*. London: Allen Lane.
- Hasnain, Nadeem. 2001. *Indian Society and Culture: Continuity and Change*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publishers.
- Jena, D. and U. Mohapatra. 2001. *Social Change: Themes and Perspectives*. Kalayani: University of Kalyani.
- Kendall, Diana. 2007. *Sociology in Our Times*. CA: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.
- Lerner, Daniel. 1958. *Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
- Sharma, Rajendra, K. 2004. *Indian Society: Institutions and Change*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers.
- Bhattacharya, Amit. 2010. 'Food Fight: When will we get freedom from Hunger?' *The Times of India*, August 14.
- Biesanz, John and Mavis Biesanz. 1914. *Modern Society: An Introduction to Social Sciences*. NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Chatterjee, Ashoke, 'Crafts in transition', April, 2005, [sited in www.craftsrevival.org](http://www.craftsrevival.org)
- Dube, S.C. 1988. *Modernisation and Development: The Search for Alternative Paradigms*, New Delhi: Vistaar.

Giddens, Anthony. 2001. *Sociology*. UK: Polity Press.

Ginsberg, Morris. 1981. *Essays in Sociology and Social Philosophy*. Williston, VT: Peregrine Books.

Hoffman, John. 2001. 'Social Change', in Bryan S. Turner (ed.) *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

India 2010: A Reference Annual. 2010. New Delhi: Gol.

Jena, D. and U. Mohapatra. 1993. *Social Change: Themes and Perspectives*. New Delhi: Kalayani.

Jena, Pradeep Kumar. 2008. 'Globalization of Indian handicrafts: A Human Development Approach', *Orissa Review*, Vol. LXV, No. 4, November, 2008.

Kar, Parimal B. 1994. *Society: A Study of Social Interaction*. New Delhi: Jawahar Publication.

UNIT 5 POLITICAL MODERNIZATION

Structure

Introduction

Unit Objectives

Political Modernization: Basic Concepts

David Apter's Analysis

Lucian Pye's Analysis

Sidney Verba's Analysis

Summary

Key Terms

Answers to 'Check Your Progress'

Questions and Exercises

Further Reading Introduction

INTRODUCTION

This unit deals with the concept of political modernization. It also studies the discussion put forward by David Apter,

Lucian Pye and Sidney Verba in relation to political analysis and development. David Ernest Apter, an American political scientist, is famous for his outstanding contribution to the field of political analysis. His books are: *The Politics of Modernization* (1915), *Political Change* (1973) and *Choice and Politics of Allocation*. His contribution to the field of development theory is much significant. Lucian Pye before presenting his own view of political development has tried to remove some misconceptions about it. According to Pye, it is wrong to equate political development with economic development, administrative development and legal development. American political scientist, Verba's interest lies in the study of comparison.

UNIT OBJECTIVES

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

- Examine political modernization from different perspectives
- Discuss David Apter's concepts associated with political analysis
- Explain Lucian Pye's views on political development
- Describe Sidney Verba's views on contrasts between political orientations of different cultures

POLITICAL MODERNIZATION: BASIC CONCEPTS

The political systems of modern societies have undergone some structural and cultural changes and the political aspects of modernization refer to these changes itself. All those activities, processes, institutions and beliefs, which go into the making and execution of policies of the state as well as the pursuit and attainment of collective goals, comprise a political system. On the other hand, a political structure comprises the patterns and interrelationships of political roles and processes. Political culture in contrast is contained of complex contemporary attitudes, beliefs and values about a political system.

The complete process of modernization indicates those changes in the institutional spheres of a society owing the expansion in man's knowledge as well as tightening of control over his/her environment. Political modernization is thus, about the process of differentiation of political structure and secularization of political culture, which in turn enhance its effectiveness and efficiency and help a society's political system perform better.

The framework within which political modernization works is found in the changing sources that legitimize authority and the process of its diffusion and centrality in the social structure. Since a society generally conceives its power from traditional sources, the authority is often found in traditionally established and institutionalized offices of kings or chiefs. However, in such a kind of system, authority retains a hierarchical character and is not consensual.

A democratic system and its framework challenge all traditional notions and structures of power. With democracy, power loses its hierarchical character and it also broadens the sphere of political action by allowing space for mass mobilization.

Perspectives on political modernization

Some of the perspectives from which political modernization can be analyzed are historical, typological and evolutionary. These are described below.

- **Historical political modernization:** This perspective takes inspiration from the changes in the political and cultural structures which are affected or were affected by some of the major periods in the transformative process in the society. This includes secularization, commercialization and industrialization, among others. These ideas first spread in western Europe in the sixteenth century and have spread subsequently, though unevenly and incompletely, throughout the world.
- **Typological political modernization:** The process where the pre-modern traditional polity is trans-mutated into a post-traditional modern polity is indicative of this process.
- **Evolutionary political modernization:** This perspective draws upon the growing yet an unprecedented increase in the capacity of a political man to develop those structures or institutions that can help him cope with or resolve problems to absorb and adapt to change which is a continuous process. It also helps man strive purposively and creatively towards attainment of new social goals. As against the historical and typological perspectives, political modernization is a process which helps develop some image of a modern polity.

Theoretical Approaches to Modern Polity

The three main approaches to explore modern polity, including its complex characteristics, are the following:

(i) The trait-list approach: This approach begins with the identification of some of the major structural and cultural features which are inherent and are regarded as modern by observers of contemporary politics.

(ii) The reductionist approach: This approach deals with a single preceding factor, a variable that explains it, a correlative or determinant which is treated as the prime index or the most distinguishing feature of modernization. By implication, this is thought of as determining political modernity. Some of the unique characteristics which have been included with the in this approach are the concepts of capacity, differentiation, institutionalization, national integration, participation, populism, political culture, social mobilization and socio-economic correlates. Multivariate causation is not denied with the usage of these reductive efforts. In fact, they are reflective of the timeless quest for a single and comprehensive concept of modernity or the desire to enrich the formerly neglected and an under emphasized variable.

(iii) The ideal-type approach: This approach is found either explicit or implicit in most analyses of a modern political system as well as the processes of political modernization. The ideal-typical approaches are usually found in the descriptive traits of a genetically modern polity. The fact that it is a modern polity is implicit of an ideal-typical traditional polity which is then opposite and a transitional polity. This becomes an intervening type on a continuum of political modernization.

Traditional polity is usually governed by predominantly descriptive, as well as particularistic and diffused. In comparison, a modern polity is mostly achievement-oriented, universalistic and specific. Therefore, political modernization should be understood as a movement or a process from the traditional pole to the modern pole of the continuum.

Characteristics

Differentiation has been one of the dominant empirical trends in the historic evolution of modern society. It is a process of progressive separation and role specialization and institutional spheres and associations in the process of development of political systems. Its universal characteristics are social stratification and the separation of occupational roles from kinship and domestic life; separation of religion from the universalistic legal norms; differentiation between religion and ideology as well as between administrative structure and public political competition. This differentiation is implicit of greater functional specialization, structural complexity and interdependence and heightened effectiveness of political organization in both administrative and political spheres.

The notion of equality is the second and the central characteristic of political modernization. It is the central ethos and an ethic that pervades all operative ideals of all features of modern life. Modernity has its ethos in equality. The quest for the same and its eventual realization form the basic crux of the discourse on modernization. It finds voice in the notions of universal adult citizenship, prevalence of universalistic legal norms and rule of law in the relationship of government with its citizens as well as importance given to the criteria of achievement in recruitment and allocation to political and administrative roles. It is a fact that these features of equality are only imperfectly realized in modern day politics. Yet, they form the central standards as well as imperatives of modernization and its achievement and the establishment of political legitimacy. In most definitions of political modernization, popular participation or involvement in political system is a central theme.

Capacity is the third characteristic of political modernization. It refers to the ever growing adaptive and creative potentials that man is capable of to manipulate his environment. Thus, acquiring increased capacity for political administration is the third major characteristic of political modernization. Its essential feature is the increase in the scope of polity functions, growth of the political community, increased efficiency of the implementation of various political and administrative decisions in the power processes of the institutions represented by the central government and the growth of assertions of various political associations. The process of political modernization can be analyzed as an endless process of differentiation, the imperatives and realizations of equality, as well as of some capacities of a political system like its integrative, adaptive and creative features. It is also a process of progressive acquisition of enhanced political capacity which is sought consciously. It is also qualitatively new as can be seen in the effective institutionalization of new patterns that create stimulus for integration as well as conflict and tensions that emerge out of various differentiation processes. It also involves new participation patterns as well as those of resource distribution which adequately respond to the new demands of equality as well as goal achievement.

Basic Features

When political modernization takes place, the old structures of authority like the feudal or religious institutions, begin to lose their ground. In their place, a singular, secular and a national political authority starts emerging. Authority is centralized in this democratic institution. To meet challenges of the growing political system, there start to grow a network of differentiated and specialized political and bureaucratic institutions. Not only are political and bureaucratic institutions become increasingly differentiated but also specialized. With this, people also become increasingly involved and participate in the modern political system. Some of the main agents that help to bring about a change and initiate the process of modernization in the political system are colonialism, elites, revolutionary leaders, political

parties, military and bureaucracy.

Political Modernization in India

All political systems undergo the process of modernization. India has been on the road to modernization of its own political system since Independence. These have been set into motion through a series of reconciliation processes with a number of regional interest groups. These can be seen in the political realm in the linguistic formation of states; the growing emphasis on mixed economy in the sphere of economic policy; the stress on secularism and neutrality in the domain of international relations. They are predominantly reconciliatory pattern of political modernization in the country. Even in case of role of traditional institutions in politics, the same pattern holds true.

It is important to mention here that caste associations, kin groups and ethnic groups have also successfully imbibed the needs of a modern democratic political culture. Modern forces have set into motion changes even in the political sphere of the society. These can be seen in the court laws regulation, formation of village panchayats as well as local autonomies, which have changed the fact of the traditional political system. Caste panchayats are dwindling in villages and their traditional functions have been taken over by the courts.

At the same time, however, the influence of caste in politics is increasing. Leadership patterns are changing. Low income groups are now actively participating in politics. Political unity has been firmly established and this can be seen in the active role being played by all-India parties. Political arena now actively discusses regional differences of culture and language. States have been delimited. Sources indicate that politics was dominated by intellectuals since Independence. The mass movements that the country saw during the time of the independence are being revived again as has been seen in the form of peasant movements etc. Students are also becoming active in the political life even though factionalism has increased within political parties. Studies have found that factionalism is closely associated with the culture of traditional villages itself. Reservation for the scheduled castes and tribes has also led to the formation of parties devoted to the interests of these sections. These parties have eaten into the voters' share of major political parties and their role has become significant in national politics. One can easily see the dichotomy, the conflict between traditional social arrangements, the caste system and religion and new relationships brought out by economic growth.

DAVID APTER'S ANALYSIS

David Apter coined the famous paradigm of development with democracy, the problem of innovation and marginality and the question of governability and violence. Apter himself developed an empirical study on comparison with the system of development of the outside world. He said that development will lead to democracy. Apter recommends an innovative comparative study of development. Apter has given many successful models of political socialization in order to learn the process of development of political socialization.

According to Apter, there are four models of political socialization. They are the accumulation model, the interpersonal transfer model, the identification model and the cognition-development model.

The accumulation model states that the more information is fed to a child, the more knowledge he gains. However, it is to be emphasized that information needs to be specific. In other words, to have better understanding of any

particular political organization, one must be in possession of large quantity of information related to that organization. Similarly, to have clear knowledge of the role of any political actor, one must have at the disposal sufficient information relating to that political actor. More the information, more the knowledge. But this information must be related to the object, one is interested to know.

The interpersonal transfer model talks about the diverse relationships that an individual forges with the figures of authority. For a child the most perceptible figure of authority is his father. He develops some image of authority, though this image is far from clear. As he grows, he comes across other figures of authority, and his images of these authority figures are, to a marked extent, based upon his earlier image of authority.

The identification model points out that the values, attitudes and behaviour pattern of a child are significantly influenced by much older persons like parents or teachers. For them, the child has a great deal of respect. He trusts them, and for him they are 'role-models'. As he observes them from a close angle, he is profoundly influenced by them. Having observed them for a long time, he creates an image for himself, and once this image is fixed, it offers the basis for his attachments and affiliations to different groups and organizations.

Last but not least, the cognitive development model says that as over the years the cognition of the child improves, he develops capacity to translate an understanding of the individual figure into an understanding of similar individuals and to their roles in a whole political system. With gradual increase in his conceptual understanding of an order or system, the child becomes able to grasp the role of any political actor in relation to other political actors. He slowly gains a comparative and theoretical perspective of the political system as the child passes through adolescence to enter adulthood. It is only during adulthood that an individual's cognitive map of the political order gains maturity.

Political development has several stages, and no single political system can cover all the stages. This is quite obvious, because the needs and problems of each stage are in a sense unique. The nature and degree of political control must, therefore, vary. Following Apter, we can broadly distinguish between two stages of development processes—pre-industrial and post-industrial. In a developing society, where there does not exist a broad-based industrial infrastructure, the political problem of controlling and integrating the process becomes increasingly crucial. Hence, the passage to industrialization needs an extra-ordinarily organized political system with in-built capability of maintaining a high-degree control and cohesion. In view of the magnitude of the problem, Apter suggests the adoption of high control system for a successful transition to industrialization, once the industrial phase of development is completed, the perspective is bound to change. The necessary focus of industrialized societies is increasing generation and use of new knowledge. Therefore, the need in post-industrial societies is for wider devolution of authority and greater decentralization of high control systems. If the industrial infrastructure can also carry with it certain organizing properties, they reduce the need for direct government control, a non-coercive, high information situation will result with government playing a mediating and coordinating role.

It is, however, difficult to fully accept Apter's analysis, particularly for a democratic society involved in a process of change and development. The transition to industrialization requires massive community mobilization, and naturally the problem is how to actively involve the citizens in the process in a meaningful way. Such associations are difficult to attain in a high control system. It is not high mechanism, but a wide measure of social justice and the appropriate patterns of popular participation which can integrate the people with the developmental process in a spirit of joy and spontaneity and bring about a desired level of mobilization. A simple high control system is bound to erode the popular enthusiasm, and fail to secure the necessary level of mass mobilization for development. In India, for instance, it is extremely doubtful if Apter's recommended high control political order alone can ensure the transition to industrialization. Perhaps, the model of Western development is in Apter's mind, and its appropriateness in the context of developmental needs is questionable. It is well known that the active role of human beings in early stages of development in the West was not recognized. But today in a democratic polity the role of man in development can

be ignored only at an enormous peril. Similarly, the Marxist model of political development has manifested limits in new states like India. Its acceptance of capitalist technology and of an extremely high political control system in the earlier stage of socialist development makes it largely unsuitable to the new, democratic states. After all for Marx the main frame of reference was Western experience.

Actually, the term 'political development' has an important element of imprecision, and has no fixed meaning. In view of divergent social and cultural conditions and variant organizations of political forces in different countries, there cannot be one but several roads to political development.

LUCIANPYE'S ANALYSIS

According to Pye, it is wrong to equate political development with economic development, administrative development and legal development. Economic development would contribute to political development, but the latter is not exclusively dependent upon it. The criteria of political development should be independently determined. Developing countries would take a long time to achieve economic development. It would be wrong to ask them to delay political development till the achievement of economic development. Political development in these countries should continue irrespective of progress on the economic front.

Weber and others have emphasized the role of bureaucracy in state-building. It has a role in rule-making and rule-application. Political development would include administrative and legal development, but it is much more than that.

Pye does not agree that the pace of industrialization determines political development and that political development is equated with the politics of industrialized countries. In his opinion, political development can also be achieved in non-industrialized societies. Similarly, he would not accept the equation of political development with democracy. He is against the imposition of the Western model of political development on non-Western countries.

Pye is in disagreement with the view that political development is mobilization of power. It is argued by some scholars that a developed state is capable of realizing its full potential and maximizing the utilization of its resources. While rejecting this view, Pye argues that mobilization of power is maximized only in democratic states, while it is deliberately limited in non-democratic systems. Therefore, it would be wrong to equate political development with mobilization of power.

Pye is equally opposed to the view that mass mobilization and political participation constitute political development. He draws our attention to the danger that the mass is vulnerable to manipulation, and that the participation of people in politics, caused by sterile emotionalism and demagoguery, is not their genuine participation. Such mass mobilization and participation, Pye warns, would prove detrimental to the state and the society.

Pye Differs from Karl Deutsch and F. W. Riggs

Riggs emphasized stability and orderly change as crucial parameters of political development. According to Pye, stability or order is of secondary importance while 'getting things done' is of primary importance. Orderly change may be desirable, but still more important is the direction of change.

As opposed to Edward A. Shils and K.H. Silvert who have defined political development as the organization of political life and the performance of political functions according to the standards expected of a modern nation-state, Pye has focused on nation-building. Though nationalism has a role to play, nation-building demands much more attention. Pye says, 'Development entails the translation of diffused and unorganized nationalism into a spirit of citizenship and equally the creation of state institutions that can translate into policy and programmes the aspiration of nationalism and

citizenship'. In brief, political development is nation-building.

Pye also disputes the view-point that political development is political modernization, because such a view would create an impression that political development is part of the modernization process. He asserts that political development has an autonomous character which it would lose if it is assumed that political development is part of modernization.

Having removed the misconceptions about political development, Pye presents his own model of political development which he calls 'development syndrome'. According to him, political development consists of three elements, namely, equality, capacity and differentiation.

Equality: The members of the system should enjoy political and legal equality. Law should recognize all of them as equals, and they should have equal rights to take part in the political process. Nobody should suffer from any type of discrimination, and achievement rather than ascription should be the basis of recruitment to public offices.

Capacity: The system should have the capacity to deliver the goods and meet the aspirations of people. A developed polity is distinguished by the nature of its performance, and by the quantity and quality of its outputs. The government should be effective and efficient and should be able to look after the welfare of people. The political system should have the capacity to affect the rest of the society and economy. The political development of a system is also correlated with its secular orientation and administrative rationality.

Differentiation: In course of time political functions have multiplied both in nature and number, and in order to perform these numerous, diverse functions, there is the need of differentiated structures. Functional specialization can be ensured only by differentiated structures. Thus, the third element of political development is functional specialization and structural differentiation.

Pye says that these dimensions of equality, capacity and differentiation lie at the heart of the developmental process, but this does not mean that they necessarily fit easily together. On the other hand, there have been acute tensions between the demands for equality, the requirements for capacity and the process of differentiation. Pye calls this 'developmental trap'. A political system can avoid falling into this trap if it succeeds in absorbing and managing tensions arising from such conflicting demands. Pye is also of the view that development is not unilinear, and that it is not marked by distinct stages. On the other hand, development is characterized by a range of problems arising separately or concurrently.

Differentiation refers to increasing separation, and delineation and specialization of roles and associations which accompany modernization. With more and more development the political structure will attain greater complexity and there will be larger number of functional units. By equality we mean egalitarianism and widespread social justice. By capacity we mean the ability not only to overcome the divisions and manage the tensions resulting from increased differentiation, but to respond to or contain the participatory and distributive demands created by the principle of equality. It also includes a capacity to explore and direct routes to continuous change. All the three imperatives operate in a condition of reciprocal dependence. For instance, it is egalitarianism which strengthens the capacity to overcome divisions and promotes integration. Similarly, the realization of the principle of equality in education can fulfil the specialized needs of a modern differentiated society. Again, the proper differentiation of roles and inter-institutional functional delineation are necessary for the development of perfect integrative capacity of a polity. Thus the three elements in the syndrome are interdependent. Because of this interdependence, sometimes a 'lag' is experienced. In short, it means that unless the three elements simultaneously grow and at a largely uniform rate, political development is bound to be lopsided and uncoordinated.

SIDNEY VERBA'S ANALYSIS

On the basis of differential distribution of political orientations in different cultures, Almond and Sidney Verba have classified political cultures into three types, namely, parochial, subject and participant cultures.

1. Parochial culture: The members of this culture do not have significant orientation towards national objects like national political structures and actors, and policies and decisions made by them. Their interest in and awareness of national developments are minimal. On the contrary, their interest in local affairs is quite substantial. They are also inclined to be active in family and community activities. They are concerned about their caste, tribe, and region and least concerned about national government and its policies.

2. Subject culture: In this culture individuals have high frequency of orientation towards the political system as a whole and its outputs, but they have little orientation towards its inputs as well as towards the 'self'. They have a fairly good idea about the national government and what it is doing. They want the government to make favourable policies and decisions. But they would not make efforts to influence these policies and decisions. They have little confidence in their capacity to influence the authorities and fight against injustice. They are quite passive and they think that it is their duty to accept the system and not to challenge or change it.

3. Participant culture: The individual belonging to this culture tends to play an activist role. He has not only high awareness of the political system and its inputs and outputs. He also seeks to be actively involved in them. On the one side, he ignites political demands and support. On the other, he plays a meaningful role in policy-making. Having a sense of political efficacy, he takes an active part in different spheres of politics.

The three types of political culture discussed above are the Weberian types. It is almost impossible to find them anywhere in a pure form. On the contrary, three mixed varieties of political cultures are mostly in existence.

1. Parochial-subject - In this culture, there is a tendency on the part of the individual to drift away from purely local structures and institutions and he has some idea of specialized roles in the government. But his awareness of national political bodies is quite vague, and his knowledge of his own role in the political system is poor. Moreover, his confidence in his capacity to influence the government is small.

2. Subject-participant - The members of this culture are divided into two groups. While some of them are politically active and have high orientation towards all types of political objects, others are passive in politics and do not have a sense of political efficacy. Such cultures are present in Germany, France and Italy.

3. Parochial-participant - In this culture the input institutions are generally local, and the output institutions at the national level are fairly developed. The people are also officially encouraged to take part in the political process. But they are inclined to be mostly involved in local institutions and organizations like caste and tribal associations. Even the national organizations like the civil service, army and legislature lose much of their vitality because

of the corrosive influence of parochial forces like casteism, communalism, and regionalism. National political parties infrequently indulge in pampering parochial groups.

When two cultures meet, according to Verba

When a society comes in contact with another society, the cultures of the two societies are likely to be influenced by each other. Either culture, while accepting some elements of the other culture, may also pass on some of its elements

to the latter. In this process of mutual influence, some parts of each of the two cultures may be totally transformed or may undergo partial modification. This pattern of cultural penetration in both directions occurs when the two cultures are, more or less, of equal strength, and when both are open to new ideas. If, on the other hand, there is a meeting of two societies which are closed systems and intensely suspicious of alien ideas, there is little possibility of the two cultures influencing each other unless neither of them is strong enough to force the other to open its windows.

When there is an encounter between two unequal societies, the pattern of cultural penetration would be different. The weaker society will open its windows to the culture of the stronger one. The former may do it voluntarily or it may be forced to do it. Colonial rule in Asian and African countries presented several patterns of culture contact. In the case of encounter between two unequal cultures, the nature of influence on the recipient culture would depend on the nature of the recipient culture as well as that of the donor culture.

The donor culture may be agglomerative or assimilative. An agglomerative culture would favour slow and gradual changes in the recipient culture, but would not abolish the hierarchy, status and privileges of its constituent groups. For example, British administration in India did not change the hierarchical order conferring prerogatives, privileges and status on the native rulers and their officials, although democratic and secular ideas were slowly injected into the Indian society. The assimilative culture, on the other hand, is in a sense equalitarian. When it meets the people of another culture, it either accepts or rejects their humanity. There will be few ranks and privileges in the new society. One is either accepted as a full member of the society with full rights and privileges, or he is denied membership of the society. In case one is denied membership, he is kept outside the core of the society in some 'reserved' category. While the British culture is agglomerative, the French culture is assimilative. However, these are ideal types, and political cultures tend in one direction or another. In most cases, cultures are 'mixtures': while some parts of a culture are agglomerative, its other parts are assimilative.

The recipient culture has two options.

It may welcome the donor culture and express interest in accepting some elements of the latter, or it may resist the donor culture. In the case of unequal relationship culture resistance on the part of the weaker society is not possible. If not willing, the weaker society would be forced to accept culture penetration by the stronger society.

Whether it is voluntary or forcibly imposed, acculturation may be analysed in terms of syncretism. Syncretism occurs when any element of the donor culture is perceived by the members of the recipient culture not in the way it is understood by the members of the donor culture, but in such a way that it seems compatible or congruent with their central values. When the members of the recipient culture perceive an external idea or value not as alien to them, but in conformity with their cultural milieu, they welcome it

and incorporate it into their culture. At the time of acceptance, the borrowed cultural element does not lose its original meaning or form; it is only reinterpreted by the recipient group so as to fit into its conceptual framework. Where syncretism occurs, acculturation becomes easier.

Political cultures can be divided into two types, namely, consummatory and instrumental. In consummatory cultures, religion has a predominant influence, and every social relationship is linked to it. All that happens in society is explained in terms of wider transcendental meaning. No surprise, there is little differentiation in consummatory culture. On the other hand, instrumental cultures are characterized by internal differentiation[^] and different spheres of life like religious, social, economic and political enjoy large amount of autonomy. In these cultures, other spheres of life are not subordinate to the religious sphere, and no attempt is made to attribute everything to some transcendental force. Instrumental cultures seek immediate gratification; in consummatory cultures one feels gratified by the transcendental value which is attached to his act.

Acculturation proceeds in an orderly manner in instrumental cultures which are capable of taking the syncretic route. In other words, the members of this culture are inclined to give a new meaning to the borrowed elements of the donor culture so as to fit them into the central values of their culture. But the consummatory cultures are seldom capable of taking the syncretic route. They tend either to resist all change, because they fear that change in one sphere will affect everything else, or to change totally and rapidly when they change.

Acculturation helps in passing on good ideas of the donor culture to the recipient culture. As a result of this, the recipient

culture is likely to get rid of some of its elements which are undesirable and harmful. The borrowing culture may drift away from autocracy to democracy, from parochialism to universalism, and from backwardness to development. But there is also the possibility of the borrowing culture being polluted and infected by certain features of the donor culture. One of these harmful effects is 'culture pollution'. There is now deep concern among the intellectuals of the developing world that their cultures are being increasingly polluted by the onslaught of the Western electronic media. Some ideas may be good for Western societies, but may prove to be bad for developing societies. Even if some of these ideas have value for developing countries, the latter are not yet ready to welcome or absorb them.

In the initial stage of acculturation, political leaders belonging to the recipient culture will pass through some strain: there will be ambiguity regarding their personal identity as a result of which their capacity to forge and strengthen national identity will be undermined. These leaders will be subjected to double pull in opposite directions. Though inclined to welcome the new, they are not yet willing to leave the old. This mood of belonging to two opposite worlds is bound to strain their self-identity and consequently cripple their capacity to build a strong national identity.

ACTIVITY

Apply Sidney Verba's theory to the Indian sub-continent and write a report reflecting your ideas.

SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- David Ernest Apter is considered as an American political scientist. He is famous for his outstanding contribution to the field of political analysis, *The Politics of Modernization*, 1915, *Political Change*, 1973, *Choice and Politics of Allocation* etc. His contribution to the field of development theory is much significant. With his famous work, he coined the famous paradigm of development with democracy, the problem of innovation and marginality and the question of governability and violence.
- According to Apter, there are four models of political socialization. They are the accumulation model, the interpersonal transfer model, the identification model and the cognition-development model.
- Following Apter we can broadly distinguish between two stages of development processes: pre-industrial and post-industrial stages.
- Lucian Pye before presenting his own view of political development has tried to remove some misconceptions about it. According to Pye, it is wrong to equate political development with economic development, administrative development and legal development. Economic development would contribute to political development, but the latter is not exclusively dependent upon it.

- Riggs emphasized stability and orderly change as crucial parameters of political development. According to Pye, stability or order is of secondary importance while 'getting things done' is of primary importance.
- Differentiation refers to increasing separation, and delineation and specialization of roles and associations which accompany modernization.
- Sidney Verba is an American Political scientist. His interest lies in the study of comparison. On the basis of differential distribution of political orientations in different cultures, Almond and Verba have classified political cultures into three types, namely, parochial, subject and participant cultures.

KEYTERMS

- **Acculturation:** It is the adoption of the behaviour patterns of the surrounding culture.
- **Political modernization:** It is the political aspects of modernization, which refers to the ensemble of structural and cultural changes in the political system of modern societies.
- **Political socialization:** It is the study of the developmental processes by which people of all ages and adolescents acquire political cognition, attitudes, and behaviours.

ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. According to Apter, there are four models of political socialization. They are the accumulation model, the interpersonal transfer model, the identification model and the cognition-development model.
2. Interpersonal transfer
3. Identification
4. Nation-building
5. Differentiation refers to increasing separation, and delineation and specialization of roles and associations which accompany modernization.
6. False
7. True

QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on Apter's Interpersonal model and Cognitive model.

2. According to Lucian Pye what are the three elements of political development?
3. According to Sidney Verba, what happens when two cultures meet?
4. What is political modernization?

Long-Answer Questions

1. How do Pye's ideas differ from Karl Deutsch and F. W. Riggs?
2. Write a short note on the four models of political socialization as suggested by Apter.
3. Explain political modernization? List its features.
4. What is David Apter's idea of political modernization?
5. Discuss Lucian Pye's views on political modernization.
6. State Sidney Verba's view on political modernization.

10.10 FURTHER READING

Dahl, Robert A. and Bruce Stinebrickner. 2005. *Modern Political Analysis*. New Delhi: PHI Learning.

Johari, J.C. 1987. *Contemporary Political Theory—New Dimensions, Basic Concepts and Major Trends*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.

Rathod, P.B. 2001. *Political Analysis—Historical and Modern Perspective*. Jaipur: ABD Publishers.

Verma, S.L. 2008. *Advanced Modern Political Theory—Analysis and Techniques*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.



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