



NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY
Choice Based Credit System
(CBCS)

SELF LEARNING MATERIAL

HPS

POLITICAL SCIENCE

CC-PS-08

Under Graduate Degree Programme

PREFACE

In a bid to standardize higher education in the country, the University Grants Commission (UGC) has introduced Choice Based Credit System (CBCS) based on five types of courses viz. *core, generic, discipline specific, elective, ability and skill enhancement* for graduate students of all programmes at Honours level. This brings in the semester pattern which finds efficacy in sync with credit system, credit transfer, comprehensive continuous assessments and a graded pattern of evaluation. The objective is to offer learners ample flexibility to choose from a wide gamut of courses, as also to provide them lateral mobility between various educational institutions in the country where they can carry their acquired credits. I am happy to note that the university has been recently accredited by National Assessment and Accreditation Council of India (NAAC) with grade “A”.

UGC (Open and Distance Learning Programmes and Online Programmes) Regulations, 2020 have mandated compliance with CBCS for U.G. programmes for all the HEIs in this mode. Welcoming this paradigm shift in higher education, Netaji Subhas Open University (NSOU) has resolved to adopt CBCS from the academic session 2021-22 at the Under Graduate Degree Programme level. The present syllabus, framed in the spirit of syllabi recommended by UGC, lays due stress on all aspects envisaged in the curricular framework of the apex body on higher education. It will be imparted to learners over the six semesters of the Programme.

Self Learning Material (SLMs) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. From a logistic point of view, NSOU has embarked upon CBCS presently with SLMs in English / Bengali. Eventually, the English version SLMs will be translated into Bengali too, for the benefit of learners. As always, all of our teaching faculties contributed in this process. In addition to this we have also requisitioned the services of best academics in each domain in preparation of the new SLMs. I am sure they will be of commendable academic support. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders who will participate in the teaching-learning based on these study materials. It has been a very challenging task well executed, and I congratulate all concerned in the preparation of these SLMs.

I wish the venture a grand success.

Professor (Dr.) Ranjan Chakrabarti
Vice-Chancellor

Netaji Subhas Open University

Under Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)

Subject : Political Science (Hons.)

Programme Code : HPS

Course: Core Course (CC-08)

Course Code : CC-PS-08

Course Title : Political Process and Institution

First Print : December, 2022

Printed in accordance with the regulations of the
Distance Education Bureau of the University Grants Commission.

Netaji Subhas Open University

Under Choice Based Credit System (CBCS)

Subject : Political Science (Hons.)

Programme Code : HPS

Course Code : CC-PS-08

Course Title : Political Process and Institution

• BOARD OF STUDIES •

Prof. Chandan Basu

Director, School of Social Sciences
(Chairperson), Netaji Subhas Open University

Prof. Sobhanlal Dattagupta

Retd. Surendranath Chair Professor
University of Calcutta

Prof. Amitava Ray

Retd. Associate Professor
Gurudas College

Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar

Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Dr. Narayan Chandra Datta

Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Prof. Krityapriya Ghosh

Retd. Associate Professor
Presidency College (WBES)

Dr. Barnana Guha Thakurta (Banerjee)

Head and Associate Professor
Department of Political Science, NSOU

Prof. Sital Prasad Nag

Associate Professor
Department of Political Science, NSOU

Dr. Utathya Banerjee

Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

• COURSE WRITERS •

Module - I : Dr. Utathya Banerjee

Associate Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Netaji Subhas Open University

Module - II : Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar

Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Netaji Subhas Open University

Module - III : Prof. Rudraprasad Roy

Assistant Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Amdanga Jugal Kishore Mahavidyalaya

Module - IV : Dr. Utathya Banerjee

Associate Professor,
Department of Political Science,
Netaji Subhas Open University

• COURSE EDITOR •

Prof. Sital Prasad Nag

Associate Professor
Department Of Political Science
NSOU

• Editorial Assistance, Formatting, Language Editing and Coordination •

Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar

Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science, NSOU

Notification

All rights reserved. No part of this Self-Learning Material (SLM) may be reproduced in any form without permission in writing from Netaji Subhas Open University.

Dr. Ashit Baran Aich

Registrar (Acting)



**Netaji Subhas
Open University**

**UG : Political Science
(HPS)**

Course Code : CC-PS-08

Course Title : Political Process and Institution

CONTENTS

MODULE – 1

Unit 1	<input type="checkbox"/> Major Approaches : Behavioural and Political Economy	09 – 17
Unit 2	<input type="checkbox"/> System Approach and Structural Functional Approach	18 – 26
Unit 3	<input type="checkbox"/> Institutionalism	27 – 34
Unit 4	<input type="checkbox"/> New Institutionalism	35 – 42
Unit 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Contemporary Approach: Post Modern and Feminist	43 – 54

MODULE – 2

Unit 6	<input type="checkbox"/> Election System: Definition and Procedures	57 – 66
Unit 7	<input type="checkbox"/> Types of Election System- Hare and List System	67 – 76
Unit 8	<input type="checkbox"/> First Past the Post Representation	77 – 84
Unit 9	<input type="checkbox"/> Proportional Representation	85 – 93
Unit 10	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed Representation	94 – 106

MODULE – 3

Unit 11 □ Historical Context of Emergence of Party System	109 – 118
--	-----------

Unit 12 □ Types of Political Party System: Bi-Party System in USA & UK	119 – 125
---	-----------

Unit 13 □ Uni-Party System: China	126 – 134
--	-----------

Unit 14 □ Multi-Party System: France	135 – 143
---	-----------

Unit 15 □ Party System in Post- Communist Society	144 – 152
--	-----------

MODULE – 4

Unit 16 □ Meaning; Historical Evolution of Nation States in West and in the East	155 – 166
---	-----------

Unit 17 □ Post-Colonial Context to Nation and State Debate	167 – 174
---	-----------

Unit 18 □ Process of Democratization on Post Authoritarian and Post Communist Countries	175 – 181
--	-----------

Unit 19 □ Historical Context of Federation and Confederation	182 – 192
---	-----------

Unit 20 □ Debate around the Territorial Division of Power	193 – 199
--	-----------

MODULE - 1

Unit 1 □ Major Approaches : Behavioural and Political Economy

Structure

- 1.1 Objective**
- 1.2 Introduction**
- 1.3 Meaning of Behaviouralism**
- 1.4 Scope of Behavioralism**
- 1.5 Criticism of Behaviouralism**
- 1.6 Meaning of Political Economy**
- 1.7 Scope of Political Economy**
 - 1.7.1 Adding the Physical World**
 - 1.7.2 Adding Human Learning, Psychology and Socialisation**
 - 1.7.3 Adding Complexity**
 - 1.7.4 Adding the Moral/Cultural World**
- 1.8 Conclusion**
- 1.9 Summing Up**
- 1.10 Probable Questions**
- 1.11 Further Reading**

1.1 Objective

After studying this unit ,learners would be able to:

- explain the meaning of behavioural approach
- meaning of political economy
- different tenets of behavioural approach
- evaluate the behavioural approach in the light of the various criticism.
- how Political Economy developed into a separate field of Political Science and Economics

1.2 Introduction

The behavioural movement in American Political Science in the 1950s and the 1960s placed a lot of emphasis on the science part to Politics. It is argued that modern empirical approaches have found their best manifestation in behaviouralism where many writers have laid emphasis on the collection and examination of facts relating to the actual behaviour of man as a social and political being. It is an approach in which seeks to provide an objective, quantified approach to explaining and predicting political behaviour. Main focus of behaviouralism is the behaviour, actions, and acts of individuals rather than the functions of institutions such as legislatures, executives, and judiciaries. According to some scholar behaviouralism implies the application of meticulous scientific and statistical methods in order to standardise means of investigation. It ensures a value-free study of the discipline of politics. Behavioural approach emphasises that political science should be studied in manner similar to the study of natural sciences. In this context, the supporters of behavioural approach argue that the main role of a political scientist is to collect and analyse factual data in an objective manner.

Like Behaviouralism political economy is an interdisciplinary branch of the social sciences that focuses on the interrelationships among individuals, governments, and public policy. In the late nineteenth century, to create a science of society modelled after developments in the hard sciences, William Jevons and Alfred Marshall, among others, established the neoclassical paradigm that continues to provide a model for mainstream economics. Choosing to concentrate on describing, preferably through a set of mathematical equations, the outcomes of different combinations of productive factors (land, labour, and capital), led to the formation of a new school of thought called political economy. The main concern of political economy is to determine the relationship between governments and individuals, and how public policy affects society. This is done through the study of sociology, politics, and economics. Research by political economists is conducted in order to determine how public policy influences behavior, productivity, and trade. Much of their study helps them establish how money and power are distributed between people and different groups.

1.3 Meaning of Behaviouralism

Behaviouralist or Behavioural approach is particularly associated with the work of American political scientist after the Second World War, but its origins can be traced back to the works of Graham Walla's (Human Nature in Politics) and Arthur Bentley (The Process of

Government), both published as early as 1908. Bentley argued that group interaction constituted the reality of political life. Charles E. Merriam (1875–1953) was the pioneer of the behavioural approach. He is also the founder of the Chicago school which has contributed to the behavioural movement. He inspired political scientists to look at political behaviour as one of the essential objects of inquiry. He emphasized on the renewal of scientific endeavour and emphasized the need for a policy science by using quantitative techniques. Robert Dahl defines Behaviouralism as a movement for bringing political studies into closer affiliation with theories, methods, findings and outlook in modern psychology, anthropology, and economics and it is an attempt to make the empirical component of Political Science more scientific. Behaviouralism laid stress on political activity and on the behaviour of men and women who control these institutions. It replaced the study of ideas by the study of facts. It considered political activity manifested in behaviour as the true subject of Political Science. A political activity may take form of an individual contesting an election. It may be the activity of a group seeking the adoption of a particular policy in its favour by the government. As different people pursue different interests, such activities tend to generate disagreement, competition and conflict. The distinctive quality of Politics is that it also includes physical coercion or force by the government. It may and usually does involve the persuasive influence and effort of the government to resolve conflicts through its balanced policy decisions. Politics is also viewed as a process whereby individuals, groups or communities seek to achieve their specific but conflicting goals.

1.4 Features of Behaviouralism

Behaviouralism as such came to be understood as something wider than the study of political behaviour, yet political behaviour was its main focus. Behaviouralism as a movement in political science did not remain confined to the study of individual based political behaviour, but developed into a set of orientations, procedures and methods of analysis. To understand political behaviour, behaviouralists use the following methods: sampling, interviewing, scoring and scaling, and statistical analysis. Behaviouralism studies how individuals behave in group positions realistically rather than how they should behave. In practice, it embraced all that lends a scientific character to the modern political science. According to Easton, (1962) the intellectual foundations of Behaviouralism consist of eight major tenets:

- Regularities

It means that observable uniformities have been found in the behaviour of individuals. Though individuals behave differently under different circumstances, uniformities can be discovered in their political behaviour. People uniformly react to circumstances.

The consequence is certain general conclusions can be framed based on uniform observable behaviour.

- Verification

Generalisations are valid if they are found to be so after empirical testing and verification. Explanatory statements are to be verified or falsified by confronting them with observable behaviour.

3. Techniques:

The behaviourists collect and interpret data, not in a haphazard way or indiscriminately but methodologically and scientifically i.e., by adopting improved techniques borrowing from other sciences. In other words, the behaviourists do not take any data or fact as granted. They adopt cautious steps so that any mistake or misconceptions cannot crop up.

- Quantification:

Data and facts are processed scientifically. Rigour and precision in political analysis demand quantification of research data and application of mathematical and statistical measurement.

- Values

Behaviourists insist on separating facts from values. Objectivity of political analysis can be ensured only if it is value free.

- Systematisation

Research should be systematic. Theories should be built on the basis of logically interrelated body of concepts and propositions. Theories should be of causal nature and should be based on analysis, explanation and prediction.

- Pure Science

Behaviourists believe in a Pure Science approach. Theoretical understanding of Political phenomena should be used for solving urgent social problems.

- Integration:

It believes in the interrelatedness of all social sciences and aims to make Political Science 'interdisciplinary'. The 'political man' can be understood as a whole, by linking him with his other aspects: social, cultural, economic, religious, psychological and historical. Political Science, to be more productive, should be integrated with other social sciences.

1.5 Criticism of Behaviouralism

The major criticisms of the behaviouralist approach rests on the positivist influence claim which holds that: “statements which are neither definitions nor empirical are meaningless” in its entire ramification. By implication, it has been argued by certain scholars that since the behavioural approach share the same mode of thought with logical positivism, it invariably becomes vulnerable to any weakness inherent in positivism.

Further the approach has been criticized by both conservatives and radicals for the purported value-neutrality. Conservatives see the distinction between values and facts as a way of undermining the possibility of political philosophy.

Criticism of behaviouralism science can not be evaluatively neutral not and fact can not be separated from value. The factual data of Politics must be judged and appraised by moral criteria.

Critics argue that obsession with quantification leads to trivialisation of research Behaviouralism fails to distinguish between the important and the trivial Technicians are exalted at the expense of content and Substance.

Behaviouralism has been to criticized as study of irrelevancies. According to Leo Strauss, the break with the common sense understanding of political things compels the new political science to abandon the criteria of relevance that are inherent in political understanding.

Moreover, the scientific credentials of behaviouralism was called into question. If the focus of analysis is observable behaviour, it is difficult to do much more than describe the existing political arrangements which implicitly mean that the status quo is legitimized. This conservative bias was demonstrated by the fact that democracy was, in effect, redefined in terms of observable behaviour.

1.6 Meaning of Political Economy

???

1.7 Political Economy

Introduction :

Over its long lifetime political economy has had many different meanings. For Adam Smith, Political economy was the science of managing a nation’s resources so as to create wealth. For Marx, it was that how the ownership of the means of production influence historical

Process. For much of twentieth century, the phrase political economy has had contradictory meanings. Sometimes it was viewed as an area of study of the interrelationship between economics and politics, while at other times it was viewed as a methodological approach. The specific meaning of the concept depends on the theoretical tradition, liberal or Marxist, which is placed. The political, economy approach to the study of comparative politics proposed that there exists a relationship between politics and economics and that this relationship works and makes itself manifest in several ways.

Evolution of Political Economy

From the time of Aristotle till the middle ages, the concept of economics as a separate sphere was unknown. The word economy dates back to Aristotle and signified 'the art of household management'. As the political evolution in Greece followed the sequence household-village-city state, the study of management of the household came under the study of politics. Among the classical political economists Adam Smith considered political economy as a branch of the science of a Statesman or legislator. Mandel dated Political economy the development of a society based on commodity production. Marx's major work, Capital is subtitled "A critique of Political Economy" Marx began with such terms as capital, landed property and wage labour. He criticized his predecessors Adam Smith and Joseph Proudhon for basing their conceptions of political economy upon illusions of an 18th century Society of free competition in which the individual appears liberated from the constraints of nature. According to Marx the notion of individual Freedom evolved with the break-up of feudal forms of Society and with the creation of new forces of production. Against the illusion of individualism, Marx set his critique of the early bourgeois conceptions of Political economy. The work of Adam Smith tended to perpetuate the bourgeois conception, influencing David Ricardo, whose theory of value served the utopian Socialists. In the 18th century Political economy was identified on a field of government concerned with directing Policies toward the enhancement of government and community wealth. In the 19th century Political economy was a social science related to economics but Primarily concerned with government rather than commercial or personal economies. No great tradition of political economy seems to have established itself in the discipline of government of political science and only recently it has come in vogue. During the early decades of the twentieth century, the work of Political Scientists tended to be more descriptive than theoretical and focused of formal began and governmental institution. The work of the mid twentieth century followed in this tradition but also turned attention to informal institutions and processes and to problem often limited in scope and significance. The contemporary revival of interest in political economy is more the consonance of efforts by radical economists and sociologists.

Political Economy Approach

The Political economy approach provides an economic interpretation of political connotations. It seeks to study the social relations that evolve between people in the process of production distribution exchange and consumption. Different writers have emphasized the theoretical, conceptual and methodological difference between liberal and Marxist political economy.

Liberal Perspective

The liberal perspective emerged as a critique of the total Political control and regulation of economic affairs which found expression in the 16th and 17th century Mercantilism School of thought. Adam Smith, David Ricardo, J. H Keynes among others are often regarded on the leading exponents of the liberal perspective. Adam Smith identified laws of the market that explain the drive of individual self interest in a competitive milieu and how this results in goods desired by society according to demand and the price it is willing to pay. Individualism signified order in the market economy as Smith envisaged a competitive market equilibrium.

David Ricardo advocated the accumulation of capital as the basis for economic expansion. He believed that restriction on private investment would be elimination and that government should not interfere in the economy. He agreed that free trade benefitted all the participants as it led to specialization which increased efficiency and productivity. Thomas R. Malthus contributed a theory of population to Political economy, arguing that population reproduces faster than food production to that waters. Population were checked, masses would face starvation and death.

The threat of socialism led to the formation of the marginalist theory of value and neoclassical political economy. The neoclassicists emphasize equilibrium and neglected the disturbances that affect equilibrium. Their Framework is to static, not dynamic. It does not deal with structural crises, nor does it relate capitalist to imperialism.

These problem led some economists to study periodical crises. John M. Keynes moved political economy from a apologetic stance on capitalism to a pragmatic one. Rather than justify capitalism in theory it was now essential to preserve it by mitigating the extent of periodical fluctuation. According to Keynes, the market had to be improved through the political management of the state. The state showed play a positive role in providing directions for the economy so that any market failure in the state can be averted.

Post Keynesians have attempted to provide alternative paradigm to orthodox economics. They emphasize realism with attention to the relevance of real economic problems. Among the basic premises of this school are that a free market economic process is & Fundamentally

unstable, production rather than exchange is at the base of analysis; and disequilibrium and change over time rather than equilibrium and stability are essential.

Neo-liberal perspective

Neo-liberals describe the political economy approach from the perspective of the market. Neo-liberals give primacy to the private sector because of its efficiency and stresses on the need to liberalize trade through open market. It seeks to maximize the role of the private sector. According to the neo-liberals, the market economy being a sphere of society, operates according to its own laws. Market delivers fairness and economic justice. Free market is the economic system of free individual and it is necessary to create wealth.

Marxist Perspective

Marxist perspective has been developed by Karl Marx followed by other thinkers such as Engels, Lenin, Trotsky, Bukharin among others. Marx worked out a theory of surplus value as well as a synthesis that allowed for an explanation of class struggle.

He developed theories on the price of production and the tendency of the rate to fall. He set forth basic laws of development. He argued against the use of fixed, immutable eternal categories. Instead one should examine the historical movement of production relations. He insisted that the production relations of every society form a whole, the parts can not be separated from the whole so that one can explain society in terms of all relations simultaneously coexisting and supporting one another. Marx and Engels had worked out a conception of base and superstructure. The base or economic structure of society becomes the real foundation on which people enter into essential relations over which they exercise little control. In constant, the legal and political superstructure is a reflection of that base and changes in the economic foundation bring about transformation in the superstructure.

The Stalinist period dampened interest in Marxist theories of political economy, but after 1960 there was a revival of interest promoted by the work of Paul Boran, Paul Sweezy along with the writings and of hundreds of other Marxists throughout the world.

Marx examined commodities and money, noting differences in use and exchange values. He looked at the circulation of commodities and capital, the transformation of money into capital, labour power and surplus value, and the process of capitalist production as a whole. Marx described the process by which money and commodities transform into capital and in which the owners of money and means of production confront workers.

Political fundamentally addresses the broad historical sweep of capitalism. Paul Sweezy in The theory of capitalism development- and Ernest Mandel in Marxist economic theory interpreted Marx's findings, emphasizing the economic implications in particular. He distinguished

competitive (1780-1880) and (1880-1940) imperialist capitalism from capitalism which have evolved since the second World War. His Late capitalism attempts to integrate theory and history in the tradition of Marx.

Samir Arnia in Accumulation on world scale (1974) combined theory with history on a holistic level. He argued that accumulation is essential to the capitalist mode of production as well as to the socialist mode of production, or but not to procapitalist mode of production. All modes and formation of the contemporary world reflect accumulation on a world scale Primitive accumulation does not belong to the precatory of capitalism but is contemporary on well capitalist and socialist world markets are not distinguishable, for there is only one the world capitalist market- in which socialist countries marginally participate. Furthermore, capitalism is a world system.

Immanuel Wallerstein in The Modern World System doted the modern world system from the 16th century but identified four periods in its evolution origin (1450-1640), mercantile consolidation. (1640-1815) industrial expansion (1815-1917) and contemporary capitalist world (1917- present). He elaborated and refined André Gunder Frank's theory of capitalist development of under development and emphanzed market relations.

All there works help to transcend some of the problem found in many theories of development and underdevelopment and underdevelopment can not be understood. in isolation from development. Both development and under development are unified and integrated into the world capitalist system of accumulation.

1.8 Conclusion

The behavioural approach has made signifact contribution to develop the scientific basis of political science. Empiricism and quastification have sufficically enriched the anality of research in the disipline. However its executive methology and techniques has led to considervable reglect in content and substance, Strong desire for objectivity has resulted in virtuae discarding of moral values.

The political economy approach emerged to explain the relationship among socio-political phenomental. At the basis of this approach was the assumption of a relationship between the domains of politics and economics. Attention to development, underdevelopment, accumutation etc. Allows for an examination of political as well as economics issues. Some might argue that economists should deal premarily with theories of imperialism and dependency and political science with theories of the state and class. But all these issue neel to be assimilated by the political economist. Infact there is a need to reconstitute economics and political science into political economy.

Unit 2 □ System Approach and Structural Functional Approach

Structure

- 2.1 Objective**
- 2.2 Introduction**
- 2.3 Definition of System Approach**
- 2.4 Basic Components of System Approach**
- 2.5 Scope of System Approach**
- 2.6 Definition of Structural Functional Approach**
- 2.7 Basic Components of Structural Functional Approach**
- 2.8 Scope of Structural Functional Approach**
- 2.9 Conclusion**
- 2.10 Summing Up**
- 2.11 Probable Questions**
- 2.12 Further Reading**

2.1 Objective

After studying this unit, learners would be able to

- understand the meaning of system approach in political science.
- discuss the essential features of system approach and its growth.
Know the importance of system approach as a wholistic approach in the political system.
- understand the definition and meaning of Structural-functional Approach
- discuss the essential components of Structural -functional Approach to the study of Comparative Public Administration.
- explain the scope of Structural -functional approach in the changing world.

2.2 Introduction

In the era of globalised society and organisations the need or urge for a successful administration within a set of framework demands a structure system approach. Organisations are transcending national boundaries. They are engaging in product diversification, which often lead to complexities. To explain such a growing phenomenon, systems approach of organisation become important. The modern organisational approach is called systems approach. The political system theory of David Easton and the functional theory of Robert Merton, Gabriel Almond and others influence this approach. The system approach marks a departure from the earlier approaches of organisation.

The structural-functional approach is derived from earlier uses of functionalism and systems models in anthropology, sociology, biology, and political science. Structural functionalism became popular around 1960 when it became clear that ways of studying U.S. and European politics were not useful in studying newly independent countries, and that a new approach was needed. Structural-functionalism assumes that a bounded (nation-state) system exists, and studies structures in terms of their function(s) within the system. For structural functionalists the question to be answered is what does a structure (guerrilla movement, political party, election, etc.) Do within the political system (of country x)? The goal is to find out what something actually does in a political system, as opposed to what it is supposed to do. Thus, structural functionalists would not waste time studying constitutions in Third World countries if they found that the constitutions [structures] had little impact on political reality.

2.3 Defination of System Approach

The **systems approach** is an old concept. The approach stands on the assumption that breaking down of a complex concept into simple easy to understand units helps in better understanding of the complexity. Ludwig von Bertalanffy first proposed the systems approach under the name of ‘General System Theory’.

Even though he had orally created the notion of the general systems theory in the 1940’s he formally published it in 1968 (Ludwig von Bertalanffy 1968). He introduced system as a new scientific philosophy and defined it in a formal manner. He noted that most systems (biological or physical) of any practical *relevance* are open as they interact with the *environment*. Therefore, to understand the system it has to be differentiated from the *environment*, *i.e.*, the boundary of the system has to be clearly defined along with its interaction with the *environment* from within this boundary. The most important activity of a system is to maintain administrative order and equilibrium among sub-system.

L.vonBertalanffy advanced a general systems theory more than a quarter century ago. Although his theory was built within the framework of modern theoretical biology, it is now clear that this has a more 'general significance of formulating principles of a general systems approach to the analysis of objects of reality'. He first put forward the idea that organism is an open system. His organismic concepts were based on the idea that 'organism is not a conglomerate of separate elements, but a certain system possessing organization and wholeness' and 'this system is continually changing'. He also thought that knowledge of such object needed a change in the method of thinking as against the old analytical summative approach which proceeded from understanding of the properties of the parts. According to Bertalanffy an organism is not a conglomerate of separate elements, but a certain 'system possessing organization and wholeness'. By system Bertalanffy means 'complexes of elements standing in interaction'. Any system is called closed if it neither takes in nor emits matter (only energy exchange is possible).

2.4 Basic Components of System Approach

A developed political system is characterised by differentiation of structures for the performance of specific functions. In less developed political systems, functions of interest articulation, interest aggregation and political communication might be performed by some structures which have not taken a definite shape, but in developed system growth of interest group, political parties and mass media would be clearly discernible. The System approach concentrates on the holistic entity of the system without neglecting the components. It attempts to understand the role each component plays in the system while simultaneously understanding the activity of the whole system. Major concepts of the systems approach are:

- **Holism** : A change in any part/component of a system affects the whole system directly or indirectly (Boulding 1985, Litterer 1973, von Bertalanffy 1968).
- **Specialization** : A whole system can be divided into granular (smaller easy to understand) components so that the specialized role of each component is appreciated.
- **Non-summation** : Every component (subsystem/partial system) is of importance to the whole. It is therefore essential to understand the actions of each component to get the holistic perspective (Boulding 1985, Litterer 1973).
- **Grouping** : The process of specialization can create its own complexity by proliferating components with increasing specialization. To avoid this, it becomes essential to group related disciplines or sub-disciplines.

- **Coordination** : The grouped components and sub components need coordination. Without coordination the components will not be able to work in a concerted manner and will lead to chaos. Coordination and control is a very important concept in the study of systems as without this we will not be a unified holistic concept.
- **Emergent properties** : This is an important concept of systems approach. It means that the group of interrelated entities (components) has properties as a group that is not present in any individual component. This is the holistic view of a system. For example, multicellular organisms exhibit characteristics as a whole which are not present in individual constituents' parts like cells.

2.5 Scope of System Approach

Scope of systems theory was necessitated by the change in the conceptual pictures of the world by science in the 20th century. It recognizes three stages in the development of object in scientific analysis: (1) organized simplicity, (2) un-organized complexity, and (3) organized complexity. Further Almond and his associates discerned four input functions and three output functions.

Input functions are:

1. Political socialisation and recruitment
2. Interest articulation
3. Interest aggregation and
4. Political communication.

Output functions are:

5. Rule-making
 6. Rule-application and
 7. Rule-adjudication.
- Of these, output functions correspond to conventional governmental functions, which are performed by formal governmental organs, viz. legislature (rule-making), executive (rule-application) and judiciary (rule-adjudication). Although all structures are multi-functional, yet some structures are especially suited for specific functions.

Almond has paid special attention to input functions which are performed by non-governmental structures or institutions. In opposition to reductionism, the need for constructing a unified science on the basis of perspectivism was felt by the developing science. Perspectivism is founded on the idea that general categories of thought are similar in widely differing branches of modern science; hence the possibility of evolving a unified science on the basis of isomorphy of laws in its various fields. That makes it possible to speak of the structural similarity of the theoretical models used in various fields of science.

The principal aims of general systems theory are: (I) formulating general principles and laws for systems irrespective of their specific features, the nature of their constituent

elements and relationship between them; (2) formulating precise and rigorous laws of a special type for non-physical fields of knowledge through the analysis of biological, social and the behavioural objects as system; (3) creating a basis for the synthesis of modern scientific knowledge by revealing the isomorphy of the laws pertaining to different spheres of reality.

Because of its general nature, systems theory is directly associated with philosophy. Naturally tremendous interest has been shown in it by adherents of dialectical materialism. In fact, Karl Marx presented the capitalist formation as a systemic whole, The authors of this monograph have correctly shown that, in spite of its tremendous significance, systems theory cannot replace dialectical materialism and cannot be equated with philosophy.

2.6 Definition of Structural Functional Approach

The structural-functional approach is derived from earlier uses of functionalism and systems models in anthropology, sociology, biology, and political science. Structural functionalism became popular around 1960 when it became clear that ways of studying U.S. and European politics were not useful in studying newly independent countries, and that a new approach was needed. Structural-functionalism assumes that a bounded (nation-state) system exists, and studies structures in terms of their function(s) within the system. For structural functionalists the question to be answered is what does a structure (guerrilla movement, political party, election, etc.) do within the political system (of country x)? The goal is to find out what something actually does in a political system, as opposed to what it is supposed to do. Thus, structural functionalists would not waste time studying constitutions in Third World countries if they found that the constitutions [structures] had little impact on political reality.

2.7 Basic Components of Structural Functional Approach

Structural functionalism is based on a systems model. For analytical purposes the political system is considered to be the nation-state, and the environment is composed of the interactions of economic, social, and political variables and events, both domestic and external. The idea is that there are a number of actors in the national political system (political parties, bureaucracies, the military, etc.) and that the actions of all these actors affect each other as well as the system. The political analyst must determine the importance of these actors in a particular political system. This is done by analysing the functions performed by the various actors. Any changes in the system also affect all the actors. The

feedback mechanisms allow for constantly changing inputs, as actors react to outputs.

Structural functionalists, like systems analysts, have a bias toward systemic equilibrium, (i.e. toward stability). Such a bias tends to make this approach conservative, as stability, or evolutionary change, is preferred [and more easily analysed.], to radical, or revolutionary change. A problem which arises with this system-based model is that the nation-state's boundaries are often permeable in the real world, rather than being the neatly bounded nation-state conceptualized by structural functionalists. In other words, in the real world it is usually difficult to state exactly what the boundaries are, leading to some conceptual difficulties. For example, some international actors are only intermittent, such as the U.S. when it intervenes directly in Haitian or Panamanian politics. Should U.S. military forces be considered a part of the Panamanian or Haitian political systems?

2.8 Scope of Structural Functional Approach

The structural functional approach provides a useful framework for categorizing and comparing data, but has been criticized as being essentially static. It was not very useful for analysing or predicting change; the issue of why, how, when, and in what direction, political development occurs. This issue of development, or change, is, of course, crucial for the Third World.

The theory of structural functionalism is closely associated with the work of Talcott Parsons. The main question that Parsons addresses in his theory refers to processes of how individuals become members of a given society in order to guarantee the survival and maintenance of the social system (Parsons and Bales, 1955). According to Parsons, society is a global social system that is based on an integrated value system. The individual person participates in the social system by interacting with others in accordance with the various roles and positions he or she holds in that system. The global social system itself consists of hierarchically ordered subsystems that are characterized by corresponding institutionalized norms. On the one hand, these norms are supposed to be congruent with society's integrated value system and, on the other hand, they determine the expectations and rules attached to specific positions and roles.

2.9 Conclusion

System approach has to be broad, holistic and explanatory. Approach does not go beyond its criteria of selection. As such, it is often descriptive, partial or segmental. A paradigm is a framework of ideas that establishes general context of analysis, combining mixture of philosophical assumptions and criteria of valid knowledge. A theory is a generalised

statement summarising the real or supposed actions of a set of variables whether dependent or independent or intervening. It could be micro or macro, abstract, concrete or formal. To analyse the modern organisations systems approach is more appropriate and relevant. Systems theory portrays public policy as an output of the political system. It is a useful aid in understanding the policy-making process. Systems approach helps us to conceptualise the linkages between the environment, the political system and public policy. The structural functionalism attained such a dominant position during the crucial period of development of the social sciences in the aftermath of World War II, it simultaneously attracted significant opposition and widespread criticism from a diversity of theoretical and methodological positions and disciplinary approaches, especially involving anthropologists, philosophers, and sociologists. In the United States and Europe, the critics included Marxists, feminists

In response to criticisms, structural functionalists looked at history and concluded that political development takes place when an existing political system is unable to cope with problems or challenges confronting it without further structural differentiation or cultural secularization.

2.10 Summing Up

The systems approach, though claims to provide a dynamic analysis of the system, remains confined to its maintenance. It claims to have undertaken empirical research, but has failed to provide enough conceptual tools for investigation. It has not been able to project system, particularly political system more than the state. The approach is, more or less conservative. Yet the systems approach is unique in many respects. It has provided a wide scope in understanding and analysing social behaviour and social interactions. It has drawn a lot from natural sciences and has very successfully used their concepts in social sciences. It has been able to provide a degree of methodological sophistication to our discipline.

Structural functional approach influences the structure on the larger administrative system and the impact the total administrative system on a particular structure. For instance, the approach evaluates the effect of personnel policies on the overall performance of an administrative system and likewise, the influence of important policies and decisions on human resource management. Thus, the structural-functional approach is multi-functionality in terms of political, economic, social, cultural, and technological premises; multi-structuralist, requisites and pre-requisite functions.

2.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions :

1. Discuss the meaning and importance of system approach?
2. Analyse the objective of system approach?
3. Critically evaluate the role of system approach?
4. Discuss the various tenants or components of system approach?
5. Discuss the meaning and importance of structural functional approach?
6. Analyse the objective of structural functional approach?
7. Critically evaluate the scope of structural functional approach?
8. Discuss the various components of structural functional approach?

Long Questions :

1. Briefly discuss the effect of system approach?
2. Make an evaluation of system approach?
3. Briefly discuss the effect of structural functional approach?
4. Make an evaluation of structural functional approach

Short Questions :

1. Write a short note on system approach?
2. What are the principal aim of system approach?
3. Write a short note on structural functional approach?
4. Structural functional approach is based on which model

2.12 Further Reading

1. Beckhard, R. (1969). Organization Development: Strategies and Models. Addison-Wesley.
2. Bergvall-Kåreborn, B. (2002). Multi-modal approach to soft systems methodology. Doctoral Thesis. Lulea,
3. Box, G.E. P. and Draper N. R. (1987). Empirical Model-Building and Response Surfaces. Wiley.
4. Burke, W.W. (2008). Organization Change, Theory and Practice. Sage Publications Inc.
5. Checkland, P., and Scholes, J. (1990). Soft Systems Methodology in Action. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

6. Check land, P. (1999). *Systems Thinking, Systems Practice: Includes a 30-Year Retrospective*. West Sussex: John Wiley and Sons Ltd.
7. Coleman, B. (1995). *Essential Rumi*, Harper One.
8. Daniels, S. E., and Walker B. G. (2001). *Working through Environmental Policy Conflict: The Collaborative Learning Approach*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
9. Arora, Ramesh K. 2021. *Comparative Public Administration: An Ecological Perspective*. New Delhi: New Age International.
10. Heady, Ferrell. 1995. *Public Administration: A Comparative Perspective*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
11. Jones, C. O. (1977). *An introduction to the study of public policy* (2nd ed.). Boston: Duxbury.
12. Lambeth, E. B. (1978). Perceived influence of the press on energy policy making. *Journalism Quarterly*, 55(1), 72.
13. Levy, M. J. (1968). Structural-functional analysis. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), *International encyclopaedia of the social sciences* (Vol. 5, pp. 21-29). New York: Macmillan.
14. Merton, R. K. (1968), *^9oc, 4l theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.
15. Mitchell, W. C. (1962). *The American polity: A social and cultural interpretation*, New York: Free Press.
16. Buchanan J and Tollison R (1984) *The Theory of Public Choice-II*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
17. Burns D (2006) Evaluation in complex governance arenas: The potential of large system action research. In: Williams B and Imam I (eds) *Systems Concepts in Evaluation: An Expert Anthology*. Point Reyes, CA: Edge Press, pp. 181–196.
18. Byrne D (1998) *Complexity Theory and the Social Sciences: An Introduction* London: Routledge.
19. Chettiparamb A (2014) Complexity theory and planning: Examining ‘fractals’ for organising policy domains in planning practice. *Planning Theory* 13(1): 5–25.
20. Chilcott J (1998) Structural-functionalism as a Heuristic Device. *Anthropology and Education Quarterly* 29(1): 103–111.
21. Cilliers P (2000) *Complexity and Post Modernism: Understanding Complex Systems*. London: Routledge.
22. Clark T (1972) Structural-functionalism, exchange theory, and the new political economy: Institutionalization as a theoretical linkage. *Sociological Inquiry* 42(3–4): 275–298.
23. Colomy P (1986) Recent developments in the functionalist approach to change. *Sociological Focus* 19: 139–158.

Unit 1 □ Institutionalism

Structure

- 3.1 Objective
- 3.2 Introduction
- 3.3 Definition
- 3.4 Basic Core of Institutionalism
- 3.5 Scope of Institutionalism
- 3.6 Criticism
- 3.7 Conclusion
- 3.8 Summing Up
- 3.9 Probable Questions
- 3.10 Further Reading

3.1 Objectives

After reading this particular unit, you will be able to

- Learn as what is the definition of institutional Approach.
- Know the scope of Institutional Approach in making comparison with other approaches.
- Understand the limitations and importance of Institutional Approach in the field of comparative political analysis.
- Explain as what is the basic core of Institutional Approach.

3.2 Introduction

Institutional approaches are ancient and important approach to the study of Political Science. Political scientists have also long been interested in institutions. Indeed, in its early years political science meant the study of political institutions (Wilson 1891). But, with some important exceptions (Herring 1940; Key 1947), early political science was often a more descriptive than analytical. 'Comparative politics,' in particular, consisted mostly of detailed configurative studies of different legal, administrative, and political structures. In the immediate

post-war years, a new generation of political scientists attempted to make the study of politics more 'scientific.' For many this effectively meant that political science ought to model itself on the 'hard sciences' which they believed was fundamentally a deductive process. Thus, rather than studying the details of political life and inductively uncover the patterns of behaviour and action, political 'science' should be a deductive science that seeks to discover of the general laws and fundamental forces that lay behind political action. Focusing on particular institutions, proponents this intellectual agenda implied, was 'a-theoretical.' These approaches mainly deal with the formal aspects of government and politics. Institutional approaches concerned with the study of the formal political structures like legislature, executive, and judiciary. It focused on the rules of the political system, the powers of the various institutions, the legislative bodies, and how the constitution worked. Political theorist like Aristotle Polybius in the ancient time to Laski and Finer in the present day have seem to lay stress on the formal structure of political organisation like legislature, executive and judiciary. Main drawback of this approach was its narrow focus on formal structures and arrangements. In far-reaching terms, an institution can be described as 'any persistent system of activities in any pattern of group behaviour. More concretely, an institution has been regarded as 'offices and agencies arranged in a hierarchy, each agency having certain functions and powers

Any approach into a problem-solving matter displays certain characteristics, thus institutionalism also has some characters which are (a) subject matter (i.e., what is being studied) (b)vocabulary (the tools or the language) and (c) the choice of political perspective (which determines the vantage point and indicates the direction from and to what purposes enquiry is directed at). If the features of the institutional approach were considered against each of these three counts, it may be seen as marked out by (a) its concern with studying institutions of government and the nature of distribution? of power, viz., constitutions, legal-formal institutions of government (b) its largely legalistic and frequently speculative and prescriptive normative vocabulary, in so far as it has historically shown a preoccupation with abstract terms and conditions like 'the ideal state' and 'good order' (c) a philosophical, historical or legalistic perspective.

3.3 Defination

Institutional approach is closely related to traditional approaches and gives an independent identity to the study of politics in a systematic way. Prior the study of politics was confined with the study of state and government, thus institutional approach or institutionalism widened the horizon of study of states by focusing in the various institution and organs of the

government. An institution is a set of offices and agencies arranged in a hierarchy where each office or agency has functions and powers. Each office or agency is manned by persons with definite status and role; other persons also expect them to perform this role. The activities of an institution are not confined to its office holders.

The major works which are seen as representing the institutional, approach is in comparative politics, have concerned themselves only with governments and institutions in western countries. This approach is a belief in the primacy of western liberal democratic institutions. This belief not only sees western liberal democracy as the best form of government, it gives it also a 'universal' and 'normative' character. The 'universal' character of western liberal democracy, assumes that this form of government is 'not only the best, it is also universally applicable. The 'normativity' of western liberal democracies follows from this assumption. If it is the best form of governance which is also universally applicable, liberal democracies is the form of government which should be adopted everywhere.

3.4 Basic Core of Institutionalism

The study of institutions has been dominant not only to the arena of comparative politics, but to the political science field as a whole. Many writers have argued that institutions have shaped political behaviour and social change. These authors have taken an "institutionalist" approach which treat institutions as independent variables. The institutional approach to political analysis emphasises on the formal structures and agencies of government. It originally concentrated on the development and operation of legislatures, executives and judiciaries. As the approach developed however, the list is extended to include political parties, constitutions, bureaucracies, interest groups and other institutions which are more or less enduringly engaged in politics.

The main focus of the institutional approach (i.e. its subject matter) was (a) law and the constitution, (b) historical study of government and the state understand the manner in which sovereignty, jurisdictions, legal and instruments evolved in their different forms, (c) the manner in which structures of government functioned (theory and practice) which included study of distributions of power and how these manifested themselves between nation and state, centre and local government, administration bureaucracy, legal and constitutional practices and 'principles.

The institutional approach further proceeds to study the organisation and functioning of government and its various organs along with political parties and other institutions affecting politics. Classification of governments, starting from Aristotle (monarchy, tyranny, aristocracy, oligarchy, polity and democracy) to modern classification (democracy and dictatorship,

parliamentary and presidential, unitary and federal, etc.), identification of levels of government (federal, state and local) as well as branches of government (executive, legislative, judicial), composition and powers of each of these and their interrelationships (largely in legal terms), etc. are the chief concerns of this approach. It aims at giving an elaborate description of facts. Hence it exemplifies a shift from normative to empirical approach, and from a historical to a contemporary concern within the sphere of traditional approaches. However, it relies heavily on description rather than explanation. Hence it fails to qualify as a contemporary approach.

3.5 Scope of Institutionalism

Institutions are important because they shape or influence the behaviour, power and policy preferences of political actors. The emphasis here on shaping and influencing implies that institutional dynamics, whilst often important, do not explain everything. The preferences and resources of political actors might be drawn from a number of sources. Also, institutionalism is a ‘middle-range’ theory because institutions can be thought of as standing above actors but below wider ‘structural’ forces in politics (Pontussen 1995). These broader structural factors include, for example, the impact of class forces or the impact of the domestic or international economy on politics. This raises the question of where to draw the boundaries of institutional factors; particularly since it is clear that macro-level structures, such as class relations, also clearly impact on behaviour. Ultimately, the distinctions here are analytical in nature. It is useful to distinguish between institutional and wider structural factors, particularly since the former often play an important role in shaping and mediating the impact of the latter (Steinman and Thelen 1992: 11). For example, class forces are important in all capitalist societies, but the actual impact of such forces will be mediated by the institutional make up of the state, by the nature of trade union organisation or by the dynamics of party competition.

The most important contributions to Institutionalise theorizing on change have come from those scholars who specifically have tried to examine relationship between human agency and ideas (Campbell 2002; Lieberman 2002; Blyth 2008; North 2008). Traditionally, (Especially those in the rational choice school) institutions are created by individuals seeking maximize their individual interests. Ideas, in this view, were simply epiphenomenal or justification for people’s ‘real’ motivation. But such an approach is unsatisfactory; both at the common sense level (we know that human beliefs and ideas matter for our choices) and because these approaches fail to explain how we move from one equilibrium to another.

3.6 Criticism

The criticism of the institutional approach are: (a) with its preoccupation with the institutions, it neglected the individual; hence during the ascendancy of this approach, the study of voting behaviour and political attitudes of the individual was left to sociologists; (b) in the absence of overarching institutions governing international politics, it practically neglected the study of international politics; it confined its attention to international relations and description of the United Nations and its associated agencies and left the study of international politics to historians and students of international law; (c) being concerned with the established institutions alone, it neglected the role of violence or threat of violence, political movements and agitations, war and revolutions, etc.; and finally (d) it neglected the role of informal groups and processes in shaping politics.

Further the institutional approach is criticised as it is slightly old, political experts still concentrate chiefly on scrutinising the major political institutions of the state such as the executive, legislature, the civil service, the judiciary and local government, and from these examinations, valuable insights as to their organisation can be drawn, proposals for reform conversed and general conclusions obtainable. The approach has been critiqued for the disregard of the informal aspects of politics, such as, individual norms, social beliefs, cultural values, groups' attitudes, personality and the processes. Institutional approach is also criticized for being too narrow. It ignores the role of individuals who constitute and operate the formal as well as informal structures and substructures of a political system.

3.7 Conclusion

It should not be forgotten that institutions form a very important part of politics. Any discussion of politics without reference to the corresponding institutions will lead us nowhere. Moreover, in the present-day turmoil, particularly in the developing countries, constitution-making and institution-building is the order of the day. Institutional approach is inadequate in itself. But any other approach will also be incomplete without paying due attention to institutions.

Institutionalisms have begun to argue that we can understand change in evolutionary terms and thus bring some of the insights from evolutionary theory into the study of institutional evolution. Whereas traditional political science has taken a mechanical approach to the study of politics and human affairs (Hall 2003) an evolutionary approach to institutional change allows one to integrate contingency into the study as well be more honest with the fact that there are no truly independent variables of interest in human affairs. Almost

Short Questions :

1. Write a short note on institutionalism?
2. What are the core features of institutionalism?

3.10 Further Reading

1. Blyth, Mark M. (1997). “Any More Bright Ideas?” The Ideational Turn in Comparative Political Economy’. *Comparative Politics*, vol. 29, no. 2: 229-50.
2. Bourdieu P. 1990. *In Other Words*, Stanford, CA: Stanford Univ. Press
3. Campbell JL, Pedersen O. 2001. Introduction. In *The Rise of NeoLiberalism and Institutional Analysis* eds. JL Campbell, O Pederson. Princeton: Princeton Univ. Press
4. DiMaggio, Paul J. and Powell, Walter W. eds. (1991) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
5. March, James G., and Johan P. Olsen. 1989. *Rediscovering Institutions*. New York: Free Press.
6. Green, Donald and Ian Shapiro (1994) *The Pathologies of Rational Choice* New Haven: Yale University Press.
7. Greif, Avner and Latin, David D. (2004) “A Theory of Endogenous Institutional Change,” *American Political Science Review* vo. 98, no. 4: 633-652.
8. Habermas J. 1989. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (trans. T Burger and F Lawrence). Cambridge MA: MIT Press
9. Hall P and Taylor R. 1996. *Political Science and the Three New Institutionalisms*. *Pol. Stud.* 952-973
10. Hardin, Russell (1982) *Collective Action* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins.
11. Hay C. 2006. *Constructivist Institutionalism*. In *The Oxford Handbook of Political*
12. *Institutions*, eds. RAW Rhodes, S Binder, and B Rockman. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press

Unit 1 □ New Institutionalism

Structure

- 4.1 Objective
- 4.2 Introduction
- 4.3 Defination
- 4.4 Basic Emphasis Of New Institutionalism
- 4.5 Scope Of New Institutionalism
- 4.6 Conclusion
- 4.7 Summing Up
- 4.8 Probable Questions
- 4.9 Further Questions

4.1 Objective

This unit attempts to deal with the understanding of what are the basic premises of New Institutionalism and its impact on the study of comparative politics. After reading this unit, you will be able to

- Learn the definition as what constitutes New Institutionalism.
- Understand the basic core of New Institutionalism in the light of the two different school of thoughts.
- Know the scope of the New Institutionalism Approach.

4.2 Introduction

With the beginning of twentieth centuries, political science had the paradigm shift in the study of its various approaches. It commenced by describing and mapping the formal institutions of government and the modern state, both within specific countries and on a comparative basis. In tandem with constitutional research by students of law and studies in public administration (a sub-field within political science), the emphasis in this kind of ‘old’ institutionalism in political science was on charting the formal-legal and administrative arrangements of government and the public sector. From today’s perspective, the old

institutionalism displayed little interest in cumulative theory building. The main emphasis was on description, not on explanation or theory building. After the World War II, a second major school in political science developed (especially in the United States). This rejected or at least watered down the focus on institutions and argued instead that political behaviour and the sources of political power were derived primarily through informal relationships within and beyond the institutions of government. In particular, attention shifted somewhat away from the state and the formal organisations of government towards a more 'society centred' focus, with an emphasis on the socially embedded nature of pressure group politics, individual political behaviour and informal distributions of power. It was argued that the best way of explaining behaviour was not through reading the rule book but through the direct observation of behaviour itself. New Institutional Approach is explicitly theoretical. New Institutionalism not only focuses on the organisational and formal structures of institutions and laws like parliament, executive, judiciary etc., it also takes into account the norms and informal practices like Trade Unions, pressure groups etc, that shapes the functioning and evolutions of institutions in various ways.

As in political science there have been a number of reasons forth renewal of interest in institutions so institutions tend to change. First, 'social, political and economic institutions have become larger, considerably more complex and resourceful. Second, there has been a renewed interest in the 'state' in a number of schools of political analysis, including Marxism. Third, institutional factors have figured prominently in explanations of why countries pursued such different responses to the common economic challenges of the 1970s and 1980s. Fourth, the major public policy revisions since the 1970s in the face of such challenges have also involved wholesale institutional restructuring, impacting especially on the role of the state and involving substantial public sector reform.

4.3 Defination

New institutionalism, as the name suggests brings about an institutional change and revival in the existing approach in the formal version of the institutionalism. In economics, there have been a range of arguments about how and why institutions matter. For example, scholars have argued that institutions can play an important role in reducing transaction costs and various a associated forms of market uncertainty and information costs and also in helping to monitor and enforce contracts and agreements. Thus, economic institutions, such as the firm, are created to organise a process of pulling back from the open market to 'internalise' certain forms of transactions to help cope with such problems. In sociology, emphasis is put on the way in which institutional life establishes normative orientations,

rational. There is an old debate in the social sciences about the extent to which agents' behaviour is self-determined or whether or to what extent their behaviour is shaped by wider institutions or structures.

- Historical Institutionalism

Historical Institutionalism as an approach developed in response to the group theorists like pluralists on the one hand and the structural-functionalist theorists on the other. While it has borrowed from these two theories it also tries to go beyond them. Thus, the Historical Institutionalism model places the state at a crucial explanatory role. The state here is seen not as a single body but as a complex set of institutions. This set of institutions is capable of shaping the character and outcomes of group conflicts. Further, they also tried to explore how other social and political institutions of society, apart from those of the state, also shape institutional and group interactions. The historical institutionalism is inductive, not deductive. Thus, the search for empirical regularities through repeated observations, not deductive first principles, is the preferred strategy for inquiry. Historical institutionalisms emphasise on shaping the role of institutions, there is less emphasis in the rational choice. The key question from an historical institutionalism is, 'what is the appropriate response to this situation given my position and responsibilities?'

Historical institutional is mishelpful in explaining the choices of situated subjects in institutional settings. Historical institutionalism's strength is its inductive methodology and its willingness to derive working models of rationality and actor preferences not through abstracted assumptions but through careful empirical observation. Taking actor preferences and rationality seriously is an important step in building a proper 'micro foundational' account of politics and institutional life. The most basic claim of all types of institutionalism is that institutions matter when it comes to explaining political behaviour. The rational choice approach has lent too far towards a relatively rigid form of institutional 'over determination'.

Further new institutionalism has been applied to the study of policy network and state capacity. In view regarding this a policy network can be defined as a *structured pattern of interaction* between the key actors in a given public policy arena, be it health policy, economic policy or whatever. Typically, the key actors in question are state actors (politicians, key bureaucrats) and non-state actors (business leaders, unionists, interest group leaders etc.) who bargain and wield power and resources in patterns of policy contestant compromise. As such, a policy network - as a structured pattern of interaction between policy actors - is not an institution but a set of behaviours between actors. This type of policy making which typically emerges

from such a network tends to be ad hoc and reactive. The state itself is too weak and open to impose order much from above and then on-state actors are themselves fragmented and unable to exercise decisive leadership. The system may be quite democratic in the sense that there are many voices, but it is also often directionless and frustrating from any kind of strategic policy perspective. The other concept which is state capacity can be defined as the ability of the state to achieve its own goal. Institutional factors play a major role in defining and underpinning state capacity. The particular types of institutional capacities in question overlap to some extent with the policy network dynamics noted above, particularly in relation to the institutional attributes of the state.

4.5 Scope of New Institutionalism

New institutionalism would seem better at explaining institutional inertia not episodes of change, especially rapid change. Therefore, cases featuring rapid and dynamic change might be expected to push at or indeed beyond the limits of institutionalist explanation. Nevertheless, it is always important to explain change processes as an interaction between institutional actors and external pressures. However, most of the models of institutional change emphasise that the key drivers of change are often external or exogenous to the institutional setting, usually the result of some kind of external disturbance or crisis. First, 'broad changes in the socioeconomic or political context can produce a situation in which previously latent institutions suddenly become salient'; second, similar drivers of change 'produce a situation in which old institutions are put in the service of different ends', and third, where 'exogenous changes produce a shift in the goals or strategies being pursued within existing institutions.

The central debate which surrounds the scope of new institutionalism is to what extent power dynamics need to be understood. Institutionalism tends to emphasise the role of established rules, routines, taken-for-granted practices, policy legacies, sunk costs and path dependency. Hence, as Thelen and Steinmo) argue, a 'critical inadequacy of institutionalist analysis has been a tendency towards mechanical, static accounts that largely bracket the issue of change and sometimes lapse inadvertently into institutional determinism'. In this view, institutions are seen as strong on inertia, resisting change until perhaps mounting pressures suddenly force change with a lurch. The new institutionalism approach has a very significant impact on the recent major reforms in the public sector management and institutional designs. The typical starting point in such exercises is to assume the worst about human behaviour and build management and institutional systems with built in disincentives regarding

such behaviour. As noted above, rational choice approaches assume rational but wholly selfish behaviour on the part of actors. Hence, the critical test in the institutional design of public or governing institutions is ‘whether institutions serve to help transform private interests into public interests.

New institutionalism also supports varieties of capitalism we encounter in different countries. The new Institutionalism is also applied in understanding and analysing the politics in the developing world. We have seen that how the international bodies like World Bank or International Monetary Fund have emphasised on the institutions in the developing world while allocating the funds for development purposes. In the analysis of these international bodies sound, effective and the institutions of good governance are prerequisites for the development. It is believed that sound and effective institutions can bring about the desired results. However, the major problems in such understanding of institutions were that it ignored the uneasy relationship between externally assisted and designed formal institutions on the one hand and deeply embedded local institutions on the other. New Institutional Approach no longer focuses only on the organisational and formal structures of institutions and laws. It also takes into account the norms and informal practices that shapes the functioning and evolutions of institutions in various ways. New Institutional Approach also takes into account the informal institutions like Trade Unions, pressure groups etc. New Institutional Approach is explicitly theoretical. New Institutional Approach is more interested in analysing the dynamic process of institutional change.

4.6 Conclusion

New institutionalism can be relatively stable and durable structures that live longer than individuals, or unstable sets of ideas that are taken for granted on one day only to be challenged the next. the new institutionalism has been a focus at the field level, based on the insight that organizations operate amidst both competitive and cooperative exchanges with other organizations. This attention to the structure of relations and the formulation of logics within a field has opened the door to studying the emergence of competing mind sets and logics, as well as an understanding of how contention develops within a field. The latter focus has led some institutionalists to join forces with political sociologists and social movement analysts. While several early statements noted the limitations of institutional arguments with respect to assuming that ideas and practices diffused seamlessly and without contestation, has emphasized how political opportunities and cultural frames shape the diffusion process, and that social movements are critical to the acceptance of ideas. New institutionalism focuses on ‘critical junctures’ as moments of institutional change has parallels with work on the contested, multi-level aspects of diffusion processes.

4.9 Further Reading

1. Alexander, Jeffrey C., Bernhard Giessen, Richard Münch, and Neil J. Smelser, eds. 1987.
2. Micro-Macro Link. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
3. Bates, Robert H. 1989. *Beyond the Miracle of the Market: The Political Economy of Agrarian Development in Rural Kenya*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.
4. Becker, Gary. 1976. *The Economic Approach to Human Behaviour*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.
5. Boudon, Raymond. 1987. "The Individualistic Tradition in Sociology." In *The Micro-Macro Link* edited by Jeffrey Alexander, Bernhard Giesen, Richard Münch, and Neil Smelser. Berkeley, Calif.:
6. University of California Press.
7. Brinton, Mary. 1992. *Women and the Economic Miracle: Gender and Work in Postwar Japan*. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.
8. Campbell, John L. and Leon N. Lindberg. 1990. "Property Rights and the Organization of Economic Activity by the State." *American Sociological Review* 55: 634–47.
9. Coase, Ronald. 1937. "The Nature of the Firm." *Economica* 4: 386–405. 1960. "The Problem of Social Cost." *Journal of Law and Economics* 3: 1–44.
10. Coleman, James S. 1990a. *Foundations of Social Theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 1990b. "Commentary: Social Institutions and Social Theory." *American Sociological Review* 55: 333–39.
11. Collins, Randall. 1980. "Weber's Last Theory of Capitalism: A Systematization." *American Sociological Review* 45: 925–42.
12. Cook, Karen S., Richard M. Emerson, Mary R. Gillmore, and Toshio Yamagishi. 1983.
13. "Distribution of Power in Exchange Networks: Theory and Experimental Results." *American Journal of Sociology* 89: 275–305.
14. Cook, Karen Schweers, and Margaret Levi. 1990. *The Limits of Rationality*. Chicago, Ill.: University of Chicago Press.

Unit 5 □ Contemporary Approach: Post Modern and Feminist

Structure

- 5.1 Objective**
- 5.2 Introduction**
- 5.3 Defination of Post Modenism**
- 5.4 Post Modern Political Theory basis features**
- 5.5 Definition of Feminism**
 - 5.5.1 History of Feminist Movement**
- 5.6 Basic Features of Feminist Approach**
- 5.7 Basic tenets of Eleminism**
 - 5.7.1 Sustainability**
 - 5.7.2 Cultural Competence**
 - 5.7.3 Balance and Reciprocity**
- 5.8 Types of Feminist Approach**
 - 5.8.1 Socialist Feminism**
 - 5.8.2 Liberal Feminism**
 - 5.8.3 Radical Feminism**
 - 5.8.4 Black Feminism**
- 5.9 Conclusion**
- 5.10 Summing Up**
- 5.11 Probable Questions**
- 5.12 Further Reading**

5.1 Objective

After reading this unit, learners will be able to

- Explain the increasing of postmodernism.
- Understand the emerging postmodern trends in social science

- Describe the basic components and features of postmodernism.
- Understand the meaning of Feminist Approach.
- Explain the emergence and different forms of Feminist Approach.
- Understand the basic features of the Feminist Approach both.

5.2 Introduction

Post modernism is a modernism is a philosophical movement evolved in reaction to modernism the tendency in contemporary culture to accept only objective truth. It emphasizes the role of language power reaches, and motivations in the formation of ideas and beliefs. It claims that there is no absolute truth and that the way people perceive the world is subjective. For the post modernist reality is what is constructed. There are only interpretations, no sentences, but all differences.

Post modernism in political theory emerged and continues to develop in relation to other theoretical approaches including Feminism, liberalism, psychoanalytic theory, critical theory and utopianism. It makes most sense, when understood in dialogue with other perspectives as part of a discussion about the nature of reality, and the possibilities for its improvement in terms of justice, freedom of humaneness.

The pioneers of Postmodernism is the French intellectual Jean-Francois Lyotard (1924-1998). Jacques Derrida also is one of the most important philosopher of Postmodernism Michel Foucault put orphans on power and dominations.

Women all over the world face inequality, subordination, and secondary status compared to men. This subjugation very often results in the oppression, marginalization and exploitation of women that are characteristic feature of patriarchal societies. Patriarchy is a social system marked by the rule of father or the eldest male member on the family and property. It establishes male as the chief authority within the family and society thus privileging them in all arena of life. At the same time, it disadvantages the women relegating them to the secondary status and making them dependent on men in all possible ways. The institution of patriarchy has thrived since long time in history and has percolated to all societal structures and mechanism consequently reproducing the male dominance and hegemony. In the public, from which women were excluded, men set the terms of their public and private power. Women were forcibly and legally excluded from participating in public. They could not vote, matriculate into most institutions of higher education, or serve in military institutions. Women were excluded from political participation even as laws they had no hand in crafting or voting upon cemented their

inequality in matters of voting, divorce, property ownership and labour. Political philosophers, to the extent that they addressed these issues, tended to present arguments for women's continued exclusion from the public and for the paternalistic care of their interests by heads of households. Susan Moller Orkin's work showed that the world of the household was structured by hierarchy, domination and inequalities which were not justified and since beyond the realm of the 'public', were treated by political theorists as requiring no justification. Born out of the struggles of the feminist movements of the 20th century, feminist political theory is characterized by its commitment to expanding the boundaries of the political. Feminism, as a political movement, works to fight inequality and the social, cultural, economic, and political subordination of women. The goal of feminist politics is to end the domination of women through critiquing and transforming institutions and theories that support women's subordination. Feminist political theory is a field within both feminist theory and within political theory that takes a feminist approach to traditional questions within political philosophy, contemporary and historical. In this entry, I will explore the nature of feminist political theory by asking two questions: what is feminist about feminist political theory, and what is specifically political about feminist political theory.

5.3 Definition of Post Modernism

Postmodernism has been defined as an "incredulity towards metanarratives." Metanarratives, otherwise known as grand narratives or master narratives, aim to offer a totalizing schema for interpretation of events and experiences – historical or contemporary. For instance, Marxism could run the risk of being a metanarrative insofar as all the problems of the world are reduced to the question of "class"; or, scientism could be defined as metanarrative insofar as the truth/authenticity of every experience or every event is asked to be measured in terms of scientific findings. The postmodernist considers metanarratives to be the product of totalitarian intentions and dismiss them as involving the fallacy of essentialism. As opposed to the grand narratives, Postmodernism experience is constituted by inevitable exposure to "hyper reality." Broadly speaking, hyper reality refers to the world of simulation and the world of the virtual. In these worlds, images constitute reality – be it the proliferation of images on news channels or on the internet. Images, in the postmodern world, do not necessarily *represent* a given reality. Images *are* reality. A simulacrum is a virtual or fake reality induced by the media or other ideological apparatuses. These images can be doctored and edited, and can even be created on the desktop, for instance. Images and videos on social media, for example, have a tremendous impact on determining our sense of reality. Thus, the difference between the virtual and the actual/physical reality collapses. The virtual

does not correspond to the actual; the virtual creates the actual. (Baudrillard, *Simulacra and Simulation*; •iek, *The Reality of the Virtual*). Further Postmodernism questions the notion of a singular “centre.” There is no central meaning to a text; a text is always already open to multiple readings. Since the notion of an “authorial intention” promotes the idea of central meaning, the institution of the Author, with an upper-case “A,” is declared dead. At best, the biography of an author could be considered as biographies – small narrative units comprising discursive codification of events – which, in the end, are nothing but one set of textual units among hundred others which could be used to intertextuality engage with literature. The Author is redefined as “paper author” or a discursive construct. (Barthes “Death of the Author” & “From Work to Text”; Derrida, “Structure, Sign, and Play in the Discourse of Human Sciences”). As a whole Postmodernism problematizes the notion of truth, at least in two ways. First, the questioning of metanarrative is reflected in how postmodernism, both in theory and in practice, interrogates the idea of an absolute Truth with an upper-case “T,” and demonstrates that truths always exist in plural versions. Truth is not a “*universe*,” but a kind of a “*multiverse*” – having multiple versions and variations. However, in the final analysis, the supremacy of one particular truth over others is determined by the structures of power in a given socio-economic situation. Secondly, the hyper real and the virtual realities, in the postmodern world, influence the construction of a world of “post-truth” where truth-claims, devoid of objective and traditional idea of “facticity,” “can be made, and even discursively substantiated, with control over information and data which can be generated by any and every user. (Foucault, *Power/Knowledge*)

5.4 Post Modern Political theory: Basic Features

The basic features of postmodernism as an approach to one study of Policies are:

1. There always exists for the political world that is persistently resistant to theoretical capture or to any fixed form. Derrida describes this indeterminate dimension as difference. This restlessness, functions as a chastening limit to the projects, of political mastery, final moral codes or normative consensus. This reminds us of the capacity for resistance, even a moment of independence of life and world. Post modern political theory tries to acknowledge this resistance and to resist the urge to expel this disruptive force from politics. Its operation is seen as a condition of positivity from this perspective any attempt to achieve a final and fixed form of political order is futile.
2. One distinguishing mark of post modern political theory is its rejection of metanarratives that present themselves as expressive of transcendent truth or that view nature or history as having an intrinsic purpose or that entail a two world metaphysics, Plato's division between the true world of the forms and the deceptive world of shadows

appearance, Augustine's city of God and city of Man, Kant's noumenal and phenomenal realms and Hegel's implicit idea on it unfolds in his etc. are examples of metanarratives in political theory.

3. Postmodern theory reposition the human in relation to the non human entities and forces with which it shares the world. Human beings are more complex animals, with an extra added ingredient called intellect or rational soul. Humans are hybrids of animal and machine, culture and biology, language and affect. The postmodern emphasis on shared material basis all things advances an ecological sense of interconnectedness. In its environmentalism postmodernism completes with other theoretical approaches as a route to a more progressive policies.
4. Postmodern theorists picture the human beings to be engaged in ongoing transition between being and becoming. Individuals and states are not fully in charge of this process or best understood as the mater agent behind it Humanity has good, though inadequate resources for intervening in life and inflecting the direction of becoming. Becoming can be faultiated, shifted or resisted, but not commanded or ordered completely. Postmodern political theory tends to conceive the relationship social order and change as an open system susceptible to unpredictable encounters and the periodic emergence of new formations.
5. Postmodern approaches to political theory do not reject reasoning, rationality, or enlightenment values. They do call into question. Reason, He, i.e, the Kantian idea of a transcendental field that find do various expression in the scientific, moral, and aesthetic judgments of human beings.

There is a distinctive set of fears and anxieties that provoke postmodern thinking including the excessive regulation and normalization of persons, places and experiences, are of the negative effects of social rationalization and Scientific categorization is the marginalivation and demigration of people found not to measure up to prevailing criteria of rationality, normality and responsibility.

6. Postmodern Political theory draws attention to the socially transformative potential of micro political practice. Micro political activities are not official acts presidents and Parliaments and they are often not aimed directly of elections or legislative agendas. Rather the key agencies of micro politics are television shows, films, military training professional meeting, clubs, neighborhood gangs and internal mobilizations. It's key targets are bodily affect, social tempers, political moods and cultural sensibilities. The emphasis upon, micro politics derives from the belief that there is an indispensably somatic and affective dimension to political action. Micro politics aims to reform refine intensity or discipline the emotions, aesthetic impulses, moral urges and different

moods that enter into political programmer party affiliations, ideological commitment and policy preferences. Postmodern political theory acknowledges that micro politics can be pursued on behalf of different aims and a wide variety of political ideologies.

7. One significant postmodern insight is that the power exercised over citizens and subjects does not only issue from the state and its laws. It also operate, more diffusely and more insidiously by means of normal, everyday practices which have no particular author. Foucault describes the first as a juridical model of power and the second as disciplinary, normalizing or bio-power. His early genealogies of criminality, madness and sexuality draw attention to the medical, educational military and even architectural practices that function to inscribe norms right onto body. Foucault in this early genealogies exposes the normal individual as a ruse of power. In his later works he enunciates the more complex thesis that there is no self without power and discipline, and no power or discipline that does not also harbour opportunities for freedom in terms of arts of the self.
8. For the Postmodern theorists the metanarrative of a lost golden age of social coherence and inquest forced morality is inappropriate even as a regulative ideal. In the Contemporary world multicultural societies are the norms, where technological developments increase the spread with which social transformation occurs, people with diverse culture co exist on the same territory and under the same government. They support a kind of pluralism where social groups with divergent moral traditions and competing beliefs form pragmatic alliances.

Criticism

In all arenas discussions of postmodernism are highly charged. It is routinely denounced as mimilistic, immoral or politically irresponsible. Indeed, the term is invoked more often by those who oppose postmodernism than by those sand to be its practitioners.

Within political theory, critics from both the right and the left have tended to see postmodernism as a rejection of the quest for an objective truth behind subjective experiences. Because this quest is thought to set the condition of possibility for any affirmative claim, Post modern political theory is charged with being anti-political and unable to take an ethical stand except that of resistance, disobedience, refusal or deconstruction for deconstruction's sake. It remains unspecific about normative orientation in the here and now. However, it can not be denied that postmodernism is an innovative body of theoretical work that came of age in the last several decades.

5.5 Definition of Feminism

Feminism is a movement as well an ideology that represents efforts to achieve the objective of equality, dignity, rights, emancipation and empowerment of women by adopting various creative ways and means.

Etymologically speaking, the word feminism is derived from the French word '*féminisme*' and seems to have been popularized in the 1890s. According to the Merriam-Webster Dictionary (Online Dictionary). It is the theory of the political, economic and social equality of the sexes and it also denotes organized activity on behalf of women's rights and interests. The Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines feminism as "a belief that women should be allowed the same rights, power and opportunities as men and be treated in the same way". It also lays emphasis on the set of activities intended to achieve this state of equilibrium. Feminism is defined as the advocacy of social equality for men and women, in opposition to patriarchy and sexism. In brief, it can be said that feminism is a belief in the equality of sexes.

5.5.1 History of Feminist Movement

While it is very difficult to find out the precise meaning of the word one cannot help but agree with Rebecca West, the famous writer who wrote in 1913, "I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat or a prostitute" (West, 1982, p.5). In the early years, the word carried negative connotations as it sometimes does even now. Another question may be raised here in order to clarify the definition of the word feminism, that is, what would we call women who continued to work for the cause but did not call themselves feminists? There are several examples like the first-wave women trade unionists in Britain who fought for equal pay. Closer home, Sarojini Naidu totally disapproved being called a feminist. But in both the cases, the contribution to the cause of women's movement has been of immense value politically. It may be emphasized here that the contexts of feminism keep changing and all those working for the cause come within its ambit. Writing about South Asia, Kumari Jayawardena defines feminism as, "embracing governments for equality within the current system and the struggles that have attempted to change the system" (Jayawardena, 1986, p.2). Feminism might have different meaning and connotations in different regions, countries and spaces and it might differ according to the requirements of class, caste, background, educational level consciousness etc. However, broadly speaking it creates an awareness of women's oppression and exploitation in society and inspires conscious action by women and men to change this situation.

5.6 Basic Features of Feminist Approach

Feminist political theorists employ characteristic strategies, methods, values, and concerns. There is a normative and methodological core to feminist approach, consisting of the following:

- a. Concern with power relations, whether these are gendered, physical, racial, class-based, or cultural, etc.
- b. Openness to question seemingly natural objects, such as the self, the family, the existing modes of political discussion and debate. Feminist political theorists illuminate and question the power relations embedded in these seemingly natural institutions.
- c. Critique of the history of political philosophy and its norms and theories.
- d. Critique of the history of feminist political theory and its norms and theories. Critique theoretical exclusions, with the goal of understanding the experience and values that are excluded by mainstream political theory and with an eye toward constructing theories that are inclusive.
- e. Rejection of essentialism, the notion that social categories are unchangeable with essences that map onto given characteristics and inequalities. Although some feminist political philosophers, often called ‘difference feminists’, have taken up the idea that there is a feminine essence, even these feminists argue that the patriarchal or sexist concept of ‘woman’ is not the ‘essence’ of women. On the other side of this debate are those that argue that all social identities are constructed. Others propose that we can not know what ‘women’ are or whether there is an essence of women until we remove the barriers to women’s empowerment.
- f. Focus on experience or critical understanding of individual experience; this is sometimes called ‘stuntedness’. Although this is a contested concept in feminist political theory, even those who critique the notion of first-person experience recognize the value in testing one’s views against the lived experiences of men and women.
- g. Feminist political theorists showed that when we look to the private realm, what we find is a highly unequal set of power relations and questionable assumptions about human motivation. Key theoretical and political outcomes of this project include: the political recognition of household work as labour; the legal recognition of marital rape and domestic violence as crimes; challenges to the notion that women are the natural and therefore justly exploited primary care-givers of children and the elderly; and challenges to the view that the head of household automatically can be taken to fairly represent the interests of his family. The idea of the head of

household as a benevolent shepherd of the interests of his servants, women and children, is an idea that persists in economic theory. Feminist political theorists revealed that the private, rather than a realm structured by nature and benevolent paternalism was structured by unjustified political inequalities. With this new insight into the power relations of the private and their effect on women's ability to participate in the public, feminist political theorists sought to show that the very distinction between private and public fostered the domination of women. Women's subordination in the private realm of the household, and the devaluing of household work as labour, made possible egalitarianism for men in the public. In her book *The Sexual Contract*, Carole Pateman argues that the sexual division of labour in the household and its hierarchical relations placing the husbands the representative of the family is best understood as a contract prior to the 'social contract', which is among men who are understood as equal and independent. This 'sexual contract', marriage, excludes women from political participation, subordinating them to the will of their husband, who will represent their interests in the public. The world of liberal egalitarian rights guaranteed by a social contract was built, she argued, on a foundation of exploitation and domination.

5.7 Basic Tenets of Feminism

The scope of the Feminist theory is not limited to women's rights and gender equality. It includes guiding principles that can be utilized in a variety of situations. Feminism strongly believes that inclusion leads to equality and that everyone, including women and marginalized groups must be included in decision-making processes. Collaborative work, consultation, dialogue and democratic practices are necessary in decision-making. According to Feminism, information sharing, teaching one another and constant learning allow us to reach our potential and goals. In doing so, Feminism embraces challenges and approaches conflict as an opportunity to reflect, evaluate, and educate. Other conceptual categories as a feminist approach are Sustainability, Cultural Competence, Balance and Reciprocity.

5.7.1 Sustainability

Feminism promotes the sharing of power and working in a democratic and collaborative fashion. It also encourages continuous evaluation and processes of reflection in order to ensure that the work is effective and in line with feminist principles. This feminist approach allows the project to sustain in long-term.

5.7.2 Cultural Competence

Feminism believes in respecting, accepting and celebrating individual and collective diversity amongst different ages, ethnicities, cultures, abilities, sexualities, geographies, religious beliefs, politics, classes and education. It also promotes equality and inclusion of various groups. Feminism recognizes that inclusion leads to equality. It also encourages creating balanced power relationships and sharing responsibilities, leadership and authority.

5.7.3 Balance and Reciprocity

Feminist strategies are based on extensive assessment, reflection and consultation in a collaborative manner while creating a balanced power relationship between the different parties involved. The goal is to embrace and share skills and knowledge while providing opportunities to all parties to develop their leadership potential and build a relationship based on trust and inclusion.

5.8 Types of Feminist Approach

Feminist political theory is fundamentally a set of theorists debating, disagreeing and critiquing. Thus, the variety of characteristics of what counts as feminist political theory, what is most interesting and what keeps feminist political theory relevant are the differences between feminist political theorists. There is not just one feminist theory, but rather a variety of feminist theoretical and practical perspectives through which feminists critique one another and the political, economic, social and cultural phenomena that impede the emancipation of women. There are some major schools of feminist political thought. The history of feminist political theory organize this history in terms of the waves of women's movements. Following are the different wave of feminism 19th-early 20th century movement for women's rights, which are: socialist feminists, liberal feminists, radical feminists and Black feminists. These groups developed some of the major theories of feminist politics, and their dialogues and disagreements with one another characterized feminist political theory until the 1980s. Difference feminists emerged in the 1980s. Debates among these feminists influenced the new schools of post structuralism feminists in the 1990s. In the late 90s – early 2000s, these groupings of feminist theorists changed in a variety of ways.

The different feminist approach are as

5.8.1 Socialist feminism

Socialist feminists begin with a class analysis and argue that the fundamental force of masculine domination is economic. There are many varieties of socialist feminism as there are socialist theories, but they range from the somewhat superficial analogy between the

domination of the working class by capitalists to the domination and exploitation of women by men to the highly sophisticated examination of the workings of gender in economic policy. Socialist feminists have offered powerful theoretical arguments exposing women's economic, political, and emotional exploitation as part of a broader analysis of class and of the effects of capitalism. Socialist feminists and Marxist feminists joined together to critique liberal feminists reliance on the political aims of liberal politics, often arguing that one could be politically equal and yet economically and socially oppressed and thus unable to use one's political freedoms equally. Some of the pioneers of this approach are: Charlotte Perkins, Angela Davis, and Nancy Fraser. Feminist critical theorists, such as Nancy Fraser, Seyla Benhabib and Iris Young, may also be considered socialist feminists, given the Marxist roots of critical theory.

5.8.2 Liberal Feminism

Liberal feminists argue that the central aims of liberal theory: freedom, equality, universal human rights and justice are the proper aims of feminist theory. Liberal feminists use figures and concepts from the liberal tradition to develop feminist institution sand political analyses. Martha Nussbaum, a liberal theorist, insists that most feminist theorists who claim to reject liberal values are in fact providing useful internal critiques of liberalism and show just how powerful the norms of liberalism can be for emancipator feminist practice. Liberal feminists question the import of gender and suggest that emancipating women requires that they be treated and recognized as equal, rights bearing human agents. Key figures include: Mary Wollstonecraft, Martha Nussbaum and Susan MollerOkin.

5.8.3 Radical Feminism

Radical feminists argue that at the heart of women's oppression is male domination, which is pervasive. Male domination is built in to the conceptual and social architecture of modern patriarchal societies. Men dominate women not just through violence and exclusion but also through language. Thus, radical feminists seek to identity and institutions based on domination and provide the tools for simultaneously critiquing and recreating relationships and cultural forms not based on domination. The strongest forms of radical feminism argue that there can be no reform, but only recreation of the notions of family, partnership, and child-rearing, and that to do so in a way that preserves women's dignity requires the creation of women-only spaces. Key figures include: Shulasmith Firestone, Mary Daly, Andrea Dworkin, Katherine Mackinnon, Sarah Hoagland and Marilyn Frye.

5.8.4 Black Feminism

Black feminist thought (so-identified) began with the critique and rejection of the feminist movement's overwhelming concern with the lives and experiences of white middle class

women. Black feminists argued that white feminist theorists were comprehensively excluding the experience of women of colour and working women from their movement and from their political analyses. Black feminists and others argued that feminist theory needed to analyse race along with class and gender to understand the different ways in which women were oppressed and exploited. Some of the pioneers are: Wells, Mary Church Terrell, Alice Walker, Audre Lorde, Patricia Hill Collins, Kimberle Crenshaw, Gloria Hull, Patricia Bell Scott, Angela Davis, Beverly Guy-Sheftall, Barbara Smith, and Melissa Harris Perry. Political philosophy emerged out of a critique of white radical feminists who insisted that the political aim of women's emancipation could not be achieved with men. This effectively required Black women to choose between gender and racial solidarity, which womanists and Black feminists resisted. As a positive political philosophy, based in African American women's experience, womanist theory tells a different history of women's struggles for emancipation.

5.9 Conclusion

Like all approaches to political theory postmodernism has developed a distinctive vocabulary. It has refused to translate its insight directly into an Indian compatible with the traditional cognitive machinery of political thought. If there is a vision of politics common to postmodern theories it is of a political realm that re negotiates the age old debate between being and becoming in order to give more room to becoming and to render itself more open to change and democratic in operation.

Political theory needs to be more historical and more conceptualized, it needs to be more engaged with the world, with issues of oppression and human misery; needs to become more cosmopolitan and to propose a moral vision beyond the disagreements and debates between different feminism perspectives, its emphasis on historicized and conceptualized analysis, its focus on real world inequalities, its dialogue with black and post colonial critiques, its moral critique of universalistic models of democratic representation, justice and redistribution, feminist political theory has much to offer to political theory as a whole.

5.10 Summing Up

Postmodernism is a confession of modesty, if not despair. There is no truth, only truths. There is no grand reason, only reason. There is grand narrative of human progress only countless stories of people and their cultures. In short postmodernism is an extreme form of relativism.

The feminist approach is reflective of larger transformations in the perceptions and constructions of social reality.

5.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions :

1. Discuss the basic features of post modernism approach?
2. Examine the importance of Feminism as an approach to the study of comparative policies.

Short Questions :

1. Briefly discuss the effect of post modernism?
2. What is mean by metanarative?
3. Write a short note on Black feminism.

Objective Questions :

1. Who is Jacques Derrida?
2. What is French Word from which Feminism is derived?
3. What is basic principal for which Feminists Fight?

5.12 Further Reading

1. Eagleton, T. (1985). Capitalism, modernism and postmodernism. *New Left Review*, 152(1985):60–73.
2. Eribon, D. (1991). *Michel Foucault*, trans. Betsy Wing, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP.
3. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage.
4. Habermas, J. (2015). *The philosophical discourse of modernity: Twelve lectures*. John Wiley & Sons.
5. Heywood, A. (2012). *Political ideologies: An introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan.
6. Berlin, J. A. (1992). Poststructuralism, cultural studies, and the composition classroom: Postmodern theory in practice. *Rhetoric Review*, 11(1):16–33.
7. Eagleton, T. (1985). Capitalism, modernism and postmodernism. *New Left Review*, 152(1985):60–73.

8. Eribon, D. (1991). *Michel Foucault*, trans. Betsy Wing, Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard UP.
9. Ramazanođu. C. (with Holland, J.). (2002). *Feminist methodology: Challenges and choices*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
10. Rampton, M. (2008). Three waves of feminism. *The magazine of Pacific University*. Retrieved on September 12, 2009 <http://www.pacificu.edu/magazine/2008/fall/echoes/feminism.cfm>.
11. <http://www.pacificu.edu/magazine/2008/fall/echoes/feminism.cfm>.
12. Ropers-Huilman, B. (Ed.). (2003). *Gendered futures in higher education: Critical perspectives for change*. Albany, NY: SUNY.
13. Roth, B. (2004). *Separate roads to feminism: Black, Chicano, and White feminist movements in America's second wave*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
14. Sellers, S. A. (2008). *Native American women's studies: A primer*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
15. Smith, A. (2007). Native American feminism, sovereignty and social change. In J. Green (ed.), *Making space for Indigenous feminism* (pp. 93-107). New York, NY: Zed Books.

MODULE – 2

Unit 6 □ Election System: Definition and Procedures

Structure

- 6.1 Objective
- 6.2 Introduction
- 6.3 Need for Election
- 6.4 Election and Election System
- 6.5 Factors central to assessing an Election System
- 6.6 Functions of Elections
- 6.7 Direct and Indirect Election
- 6.8 Conclusion
- 6.9 Summing Up
- 6.10 Probable Questions
- 6.11 Further Reading

6.1 Objective

This unit would acquaint the learner with:

- Meaning and definition of election and election system.
- Procedure of election system.
- Importance of election in political system.
- Various types of election system.

6.2 Introduction

It is a valuable political right of the people to choose a ruler to govern and run the state especially, in the democratic political system. However, not only in the democratic political system but also the rulers of undemocratic systems hold elections to give legitimacy to their rule or maintain the stability of their rule. Different democracies worldwide have separate state structures, different political histories, government systems, political institutions, and political cultures that can make a difference in the elections process of a particular political system or country. Due to this, different types of elections and election systems can be observed at different levels of elections in different countries or within the country.

Most countries in the world regard periodic and regular elections as a core attribute of democracy. In 2016, a total of 132 elections were held worldwide in presidential, legislative or local contests. Electoral processes held under conditions that meet global and regional standards for being credible give meaning to democracy's core values of political equality and the accountability of those who govern. At a basic and practical level, elections are a critical element of an effective anti-corruption strategy, even if the fear of losing an election is not always enough to prevent elected officials from being corrupt. Nonetheless, how far the underlying rules of the game of elections affect the practice of democracy is often under-appreciated. The rules embodied in an electoral system are critical to how democracy is practiced in a given setting.

6.3 Need for Election

Elections are the lifeline of a democracy. Elections fulfil following needs:

- i) Election is the best way by which representatives of the people can be chosen and sent to legislatures to serve their interests.
- ii) When there is a contest between different candidates for the same position, it gives the voters freedom of choice and makes it easy to elect candidates by casting their vote.
- iii) Elections help the people to evaluate government's activities, political parties know that they will be ousted from power if they do not perform according to the people's expectations.
- iv) By contesting elections either as members of a political party or as independent candidates, people get a chance to form the government and make laws and policies for the welfare of their people and the country.
- v) Election is the only means to peacefully transfer power/ authority to a new authority or ruler.
- vi) Elections can make citizens an active participant in the policymaking or rulemaking process

6.4 Election and Election System

The strengths of democracy are reflected in citizens' intensity and attachment when it comes to casting their votes. Millions of voters engage in elections. Voters in a democracy contribute to the governance process. This is of great importance in understanding and

legitimizing the true meaning of democracy. An election is a process in which people vote to choose a person or group of people to hold an official position. The election is a mechanism by which people can choose their representatives at regular intervals and change them if they wish to do so. It is the process through which people choose their representatives to form the government.

The electoral system is one of the primary sources of institutional diversity among democratic countries. The electoral system is an essential element in the political system of a state. It is regulated by legal norms that, taken as a whole, form electoral law and the electoral right. An electoral system is the rules that decide how votes are cast, counted and translated into legislature seats, and these systems vary widely worldwide. They govern the conduct of elections. The Electoral Systems focuses on the design, mechanisms, and effects of different electoral systems on national, local and supranational levels. There are various elements of election, such as the offices for election, an electoral college, candidates for election, procedures for election, the rules for capturing the vote and counting it, declaration of results, and certifying the fidelity of the elections.

The choice of Electoral System is one of the most important institutional decisions for any democracy. The choice of a particular electoral system has a profound effect on the future political life of the country concerned, and electoral systems, once chosen, often remain relatively constant as political interests solidify around and respond to the incentives presented by them. However, while the conscious design has become far more prevalent recently, traditionally, it has been rare for electoral systems to be consciously and deliberately selected.

The global movement towards democratic governance in the 1980s and 1990s, stimulated a new urgency in the search for enduring models of appropriate representative institutions and a fresh re-evaluation of electoral systems. This process was encouraged by realizing that the choice of political institutions can significantly impact the broader political system. Electoral systems are today viewed as one of the most influential political institutions and of crucial importance to more general issues of governance.

Electoral processes held under conditions that meet global and regional standards for being credible give meaning to democracy's core values of political equality and the accountability of those who govern. Nonetheless, how far the underlying rules of the game of elections affect the practice of democracy is often under-appreciated. The rules embodied in an electoral system are critical to how democracy is practiced in a given setting. Electoral systems are the rules in constitutions or laws that describe how votes are translated into seats, such as a typical single presidential 'seat', a member of parliament's seat, or a member of local government's seat.

Fourth, perhaps the most important institution for ensuring a credible and, to the extent possible, free and fair election is the electoral management body (EMB).

6.6 Functions of Elections

The elections in democracies serve **four principal functions**. These help to identify the most critical questions for understanding why and how elections matter. The four principal functions of elections are:

- a) **Legitimization of ruler:** The legitimacy of ruling elites in a democracy is ideally conferred through ‘free and fair’ or ‘clean’ electoral processes that are free of corruption, intimidation or restricted choice. An important question for any electoral process is - how and in what ways does the electoral process confer on the government legitimacy to wield authority and to advance socio-economic development?
- b) **Exercising accountability.** Through electoral processes, leaders are ‘held to account’ by the people for providing security and fostering development—or providing critical goods and services such as a stable environment for economic development. To what extent does the electoral process allow the exercise of accountability? The relationship between elections and accountability is not automatic. It depends on the conscious and politically educated citizens of the political system.
- c) **Choosing ‘representatives’.** Representation happens in quite formal ways, such as through the nomination of candidates and lists of political parties. Still, representation also has a deeper meaning regarding how such individuals or organizations portray what they seek to represent. In practical terms, representation can be presented as -
 - i) Ideological representation: such as by a ‘socialist’ party.
 - ii) In geographic terms: such as by Italy’s Northern League, in India Jharkhand Mukti Morcha.
 - iii) Ethnic, racial, religious, or sectarian lines: Such as the political parties in Northern Ireland.
 - iv) Other lines, such as the environmentalism of the Green Party in Germany.Constructing ideas of ‘representation’ is at the core of electoral processes in that they articulate visions of inclusion and exclusion in the political community and its shared values, purposes, and goals.
- d) **Exercising voice, aggregating preferences:** Electoral processes give meaning to the principles of political equality and popular control in democracy. In ideal conditions,

they also help to ‘educate’ the voter by setting common agendas, defining the issues, articulating alternatives and options, and engaging in competition with others on the best way forward. The concept of ‘voice’ is essential to electoral processes, together with the aggregation of each citizen’s views into a common social or public choice.

Other functions are:

- e) **Educating voters:** The campaigning process provides the electorate with much information about parties, candidates, policies, the current government’s record, the political system, and so on. However, this leads to education only if the information provided and how it is provided engages public interest and stimulates debate, as opposed to apathy and alienation. As candidates and parties seek to persuade rather than to educate, they also have a strong incentive to provide incomplete and distorted information.
- f) **Influencing policy:** Elections deter governments from pursuing radical and deeply unpopular policies, but in the only unexceptional case, when a single issue dominates the election campaign, can they be said to influence policy directly. It can also be argued that the range of policy options outlined in elections is typically so narrow that the result can be of only marginal policy significance. Others suggest that government policy is, in any case, shaped more by practical dictates such as the state of the economy than it is by electoral consideration.
- g) **Strengthening elites:** Elections can also be a vehicle through which elites can manipulate and control the masses. This possibility encouraged Proudhon to warn that ‘universal suffrage is counter-revolution. Political discontent and opposition can be neutralized by elections that channel them in a constitutional direction and allow governments to come and go while the regime itself survives. Elections are particularly effective in this respect because, at the same time, they give citizens the impression that they are exercising power over the government.
- h) **Making Government:** Election makes governments directly only in states such as the USA, France, and Venezuela in which the political executive is directly elected. In the more common parliamentary system, elections influence the formation of governments, most strongly when the electoral system tends to give a single party a clear parliamentary majority. The use of proportional representation may mean that governments are formed through post-election deals and that government can be made and unmade without the need for an election.
- i) **Recruiting of Politician:** In democratic states, elections are the principal source of political recruitment, taking into account also of the processes through which parties nominate candidates. Politicians thus tend to possess talents and skills

related to electioneering, such as charisma, oratorical skill, and good looks, not necessarily those that suit them to carrying out constituency duties, serving on committees, and running government departments. Elections are typically not used to fill posts that require specialist knowledge and experiences, such as those in the civil service or judiciary.

6.7 Direct and Indirect Election

Elections may be Direct or Indirect.

- a) **Direct Election :** Direct election is a process by which the voters participate directly in the choice of public office holders. In the direct election process, citizens vote directly for deputies to the representative body. Direct election involve the electorate casting their votes directly in an election for candidates of their choice that will represent them either in the executive or legislature, without any interference. An example of direct election is the election of Lok Sabha and Legislative assemblies in various states in India; election of the President of France which has been a popular vote since the amendment of the Constitution of the first French Republic in 1962.

The characteristics and features Direct Election include the following:

- The voters that do not need to go through any intermediate body or person to select their political leaders.
- Direct election is the method of election most closely associated with democracy.
- Direct election may be open or secret ballot, by proxy or by postal voting.
- It may take the form of referendum, plebiscite, recall or initiative.
- Direct elections will be conducted in small or large states.

Direct election has the following advantages.

- i) It allows the electorate themselves to choose their representatives.
- ii) The voters know the candidates and issues directly involved in an election and this raises thier political consciousness.
- iii) There is direct communication between the electors and the prospective political leaders.
- iv) The rights of the electors are restored in voting for the right candidate of their choice.

- v) It satisfies the democratic principle by its openness and mass participation in political decision making of the country.
- vi) Direct election is simple and easy-to-understand by the electorate. It gives the electorate quality of votes; One Man, One Votes.

Direct election has the following disadvantages.

- i) If the electorate is left to itself, as it may not be able to make the best choice among candidates. This is largely the case with ignorant or uninformed voters.
 - ii) It is difficult to organise a direct election in a large under developed country with poor infrastructure.
 - iii) Although direct election is open, the real issues and interests at stake tended to be masqueraded. As such, election is more or less a ritual as the preferred candidates representing the interests of the party oligarchy still have a very good chance of being elected.
 - iv) This mode of election is expensive to operate as the government, Election Commission, political parties and even candidates have to expend huge amounts of money on elections.
- b) **Indirect Election** (by several stages): In the indirect election process, the members of the representative body are elected by subordinate elected bodies or electoral colleges that may be made up either of electors elected by the population or of the subordinate representative bodies, or both.

As a rule, direct elections are established in the socialist countries; the majority of the chambers of supreme representative bodies in Yugoslavia and the regional and metropolitan councils in Hungary are formed through indirect elections. In the bourgeois countries, in the context of party rivalry, indirect elections distort the will of the voters in favour of the strong bourgeois parties.

In the majority of cases, the legislation of socialist countries governing elections to state bodies provides for secret voting, which guarantees the voters free expression of their will.

Most bourgeois states' electoral systems are founded on the principle of the so-called free mandate. (The independence of the deputy from the voters),

Socialist electoral systems are based on the principle of imperative mandate. In a socialist system, deputies or representatives are bound by the voters' mandate. They are responsible to the citizen in all of their activity.

Correspondingly, the right to recall deputies /members who have not justified the voters' confidence is lacking in bourgeois states.

In socialist states, the right to recall deputies is one of the most important elements of the electoral system. In the erstwhile USSR, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, it was exercised through open voting at assemblies of voters, whereas in Poland, Rumania, and Yugoslavia, recall is by the same procedure as the elections; in the German Democratic Republic, recall is carried out by the representative body itself, on the initiative of the voters.

6.8 Conclusion

Electoral processes give meaning to the principles of political equality and popular control in democracy. In ideal conditions, they also help to 'educate' the voter by setting common agendas, defining the issues, articulating alternatives and options, and engaging in competition with others on the best way forward. The concept of 'voice' is essential to electoral processes, together with the aggregation of each citizen's views into a common social or public choice.

Political institutions shape the rules of the game under which democracy is practiced. It is often argued that the most straightforward political institution to manipulate is the electoral system, for good or bad. In translating the votes cast in a general election into seats in the legislature, the choice of electoral system can effectively determine who is elected and which party gains power. While many aspects of a country's political framework are often specified in the constitution and can thus be difficult to amend, electoral system change often only involves new legislation and can thus be subject to manipulation by the unscrupulous majority. Even with each voter casting the same vote and the same number of votes for each party, one electoral system may lead to a coalition or a minority government. At the same time, another may allow a single party to assume majority control.

6.9 Summing Up

- Most countries in the world regard periodic and regular elections as a core attribute of democracy.
- The electoral system is a strong determinant of the nature of democracy.
- The effect of electoral systems as rules for translating votes into seats, which in turn affects how parties organize and arrange themselves in relation to one another in a

party system, is highly complex phenomenon.

- Voters in a democracy contribute to the governance process and mediate the legitimacy of equality and pluralism.
- The Electoral Systems focuses on the design, mechanisms, and effects of different electoral systems on national, local and supranational levels.

6.10 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions

1. What is an Election (electoral) system? Discuss the various components of the election system.
2. What is the direct and indirect method of the election? Discuss the demerits of the direct election method.
3. Explain the Factors for assessing an Election System.
4. Discuss the Importance of Electoral Systems in a democratic country.

Short Questions

1. Briefly discusses the need for an election.
2. What are the different types of Election Systems?
3. Briefly discusses the need for an election.

Objective Questions

1. Which constitutional amendment introduces the direct election method to elect the president of France?
2. Name any country where the right to recall deputies is one of the essential elements of the electoral system.

6.11 Further Reading

1. Heywood, Andrew. Politics, Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002.
2. Andrew, Heywood, Political Theory: An Introduction. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
3. Gouba, O P. An Introduction to Political Theory. New Delhi: Macmillan India Limited,1999.

4. Ray, Amal and Bhattacharya Mohit. Political Theory: Ideas and Institutions, Kolkata: World Press, 2003.
5. Electoral System Design: An Overview of the New International IDEA Handbook, Stockholm: International IDEA, 2005.

Unit 7 □ Types of Election System- Hare and List System

Structure

7.1 Objective

7.2 Introduction

7.3 Types of Electoral System

7.3.1 Majoritarian electoral systems

7.3.1.1 Plurality Elections

7.3.1.2 Second Ballot Majority-Runoff Systems

7.3.1.3 Alternative Vote

7.3.2 Semi-Proportional Systems

7.3.2.1 Single Transferable Vote (STV)

7.3.3 Proportional Representation:

7.3.3.1 List System (Party Lists Systems)

7.3.3.2 Hare System Voting

7.3.4 Mixed Systems

7.4 Conclusion

7.5 Summing Up

7.6 Probable Questions

7.7 Further Reading

7.1 Objective

After study of this unit the learners will/would be able to:

- Explain the various types of electoral system.
- Understand the method of Hare and List System
- Explain applicability and necessity of Hare and List System
- Understand the importance of Hare and List System

7.2 Introduction

Scholars specialized in the field of election system are amazed by the diversity and complexity of contemporary electoral systems. The rules that govern how votes are cast and seats allocated differ markedly from one country to another. Selecting an electoral system is not a purely technical decision. It may have huge consequences for the operation of the political system. Harold J Laski has suggested that an electoral system should satisfy four general considerations. In the first place, the system should so constitute the legislature that on the vital issues of public policy the legislature must reflect the opinions of the majority and minority. Secondly, the area which return representatives to the legislature must be small enough to develop personal relation between the elected representatives and the electorate. Thirdly, the electoral system must have 'a means between elections, of checking the result of a general election by revealing the drift of opinion among the voters'. Fourthly, the system must develop a direct and close relationship between the government and the electorate.

Typologies of electoral systems can be based on the electoral formula, which determines how votes are to be counted in order to allocate seats, on district magnitude, which refers to the number of seats per constituency or on ballot structure, which defines how voters express their choice. Experience teaches that electoral engineers are quite imaginative folks. There are three basic electoral formulas, corresponding to as many criteria of legitimacy as to what is required to be elected. Supporters of plurality are satisfied when a candidate gets more votes than each individual opponent, while others feel that one should be declared the winner only if he or she can muster more than half of the vote, that is, a majority. Advocates of proportional representation (PR) feel that political parties should be represented in parliament in exact (or nearly exact) proportion to the vote they polled. Mixed systems combine PR with either plurality or majority. It is convenient to examine electoral formulas in chronological order (from the oldest to the more recent) and in the order of their complexity (from the simplest in its application to the most sophisticated). While plurality in English parliamentary elections dates back to the Middle Ages and majority began to be applied to legislative elections in the early 19th century, PR was imagined during the first half of the 19th century and began to be used for national legislative elections at the end of that century.

7.3 Types of Electoral System

There are countless electoral system variations, the most common way to look at electoral systems is to group them by how closely they translate votes won into parliamentary seats won; that is, how proportional they are. To do this, one needs to look at both the vote-seat relationship and the level of wasted votes. For example, South Africa used a classically proportional electoral system for its first democratic elections of 1994, and with 62.65% of the popular vote the African National Congress (ANC) won 63% of the national seats. The electoral system was highly proportional, and the number of wasted votes (i.e., those which were cast for parties who did not win seats in the Assembly) was only 0.8% of the total. In direct contrast the year before, in the neighbouring nation of Lesotho, a classically majoritarian First Past the Post electoral system had resulted in the Basotho Congress Party winning every seat in the 65-member parliament with 75% of the popular vote; there was no parliamentary opposition at all, and the 25% of electors who voted for other parties were completely unrepresented. This result was mirrored in Djibouti's Block Vote election of 1992 when all 65 parliamentary seats were won by the People's Rally for Progress (Rassemblement Populaire pour le Progrès) with 75% of the vote.

However, under some circumstances non-proportional electoral systems (such as FPTP) can accidentally give rise to relatively proportional overall results. This was the case in a third Southern African country, Malawi, in 1994. In that election the leading party, the United Democratic Front won 48% of the seats with 46% of the votes, the Malawian Congress Party won 32% of the seats with 34% of the votes, and the Alliance for Democracy won 20% of the seats with 19% of the votes. The overall level of proportionality was high, but the clue to the fact that this was not inherently a proportional system, and so cannot be categorized as such, was that the wasted votes still amounted to almost one-quarter of all votes cast.

Electoral Systems or Election Systems that are currently in use vary across the globe. There are many ways on the basis of which, electoral system can be classified. Classifying them on the basis of Structure of the ballot, electoral formula and distinct Magnitude; we get four broad categories: Plurality System, Majority System, Proportional Representation and Mixed -member Representation. Further, different types of systems fall within each of these types.

Ever since the seminal work of Maurice Duverger (1954) and Douglas Rae (1971), a flourishing literature has classified the main types of electoral systems and sought to analyse their consequences. Systems vary according to a number of key dimensions including district magnitude, ballot structures, effective thresholds, mal apportionment, assembly size,

and open/closed lists, but the most important variations concern electoral formula.

Electoral formula determines how votes are counted to allocate seats. There are four main types:

- A) **Majoritarian formulas** (including plurality, second ballot, and alternative voting systems);
- B) **Semi-proportional systems** (such as the single transferable vote, the cumulative vote, and the limited vote);
- C) **Proportional representation** (including open and closed party lists using largest remainders and highest averages formula); and,
- D) **Mixed systems** (like the Additional Member System combining majoritarian and proportional elements).

7.3.1 Majoritarian Electoral Systems

A worldwide survey found that 83 out of 150 countries were found to use majoritarian systems (Inter-Parliamentary Union 1993). This is the oldest electoral system, dating back at least to the 12th Century, and also the simplest. This category can be subdivided into those requiring candidates to win a plurality, or an absolute majority (50+ percent) of votes to be elected.

7.3.1.1 Plurality Elections

Plurality systems, otherwise known as ‘first-past-the-post, is used for election to the lower chamber in 43 countries including the United Kingdom, Canada, India, the United States, and many Commonwealth states. The aim of plurality systems is to create a ‘manufactured majority’, that is to exaggerate the share of seats for the leading party in order to produce an effective working parliamentary majority for the government, while simultaneously penalising minor parties, especially those whose support is spatially dispersed. In ‘winner take all’, the leading party boosts its legislative base, while the trailing parties get meager rewards. The focus is effective governance, not representation of all minority views. The basic system of simple plurality voting in parliamentary general elections is widely familiar: countries are divided into territorial single-member constituencies; voters within each constituency cast a single ballot (marked by a X) for one candidate; the candidate with the largest share of the vote in each seat is returned to office; and in turn the party with an overall majority of seats forms the government. One feature of this system is that single-member constituencies are based on the size of the electorate. The United States is divided into 435 Congressional districts each including roughly equal populations with one House representative per district. Boundaries are reviewed at periodic intervals, based on the census, to equalize the electorate. Yet the number of electors per constituency

varies dramatically cross-nationally: for example India has 545 representatives for a population of 898 million, so each member of the Lok Sabha serves about 1.6 million people, while in contrast Ireland has 166 members in the Dial for a population of 3.5 million, or one seat per 21,000 people. The geographic size of constituencies also varies substantially within countries, from small, densely packed inner-city seats to sprawling and more remote rural areas.

7.3.1.2 Second Ballot Majority-Runoff Systems

Other systems use alternative mechanisms to ensure that the winning candidate gets an overall majority of votes. In France the second ballot ‘majority-runoff’ system is used in elections for the Presidency. Candidates obtaining an absolute majority of votes (50 percent+) in the first round are declared elected. If this is not the case a second round is held between the two candidates who got the highest number of votes. This system is used in 15 of the 25 countries with direct presidential elections including Austria, Columbia, Finland and Russia. In the 1996 Russian Presidential election, for example, 78 candidates registered to run for election, of which 17 qualified for nomination. Boris Yeltsin won 35.3 percent of the vote in the first round, with Gennadii Zyuganov, the Communist candidate; close behind with 32 percent, and Alexander Lebed third with 14.5 percent of the vote. After the other candidates dropped out, and Lebed swung his supporters behind Yeltsin, the final result was a decisive 53.8 percent for Yeltsin against 40.3 percent for Zyuganov.

7.3.1.3 Alternative Vote

Another majoritarian system is the Alternative Vote, which is used in elections to the Australian House of Representatives and in Ireland for Presidential elections. Australia is divided into 148 single member constituencies. Instead of a simple ‘X’, voters rank their preferences among candidate (1,2,3...). To win, candidates need an absolute majority of votes. Where no one gets over 50 per cent after first preferences are counted, then the candidate at the bottom of the pile with the lowest share of the vote is eliminated, and their votes are redistributed amongst the other candidates. The process continues until an absolute majority is secured. In the 1996 Australian elections, for example, there was a close call on the first preferences, with both the Australian Labour Party and the Liberal party getting 38.7 percent of the vote. In the final preferences however the ALP won 46.4 percent compared with 53.6 percent for non-ALP candidates. Again this process translates a close lead into a more decisive majority of seats for the leading party. This systematically discriminates against those at the bottom of the poll in order to promote effective government for the winner.

7.3.2 Semi-Proportional Systems

Semi-proportional systems provide another option, including the cumulative vote where citizens are given as many votes as representatives, and where votes can be cumulated on a single candidate (used in duel-member seats in 19th Century Britain and in the State of Illinois until 1980). The limited vote is similar, but voters are given fewer votes than the number of members to be elected (used in elections to the Spanish Senate). In Japan, until 1994, voters used the Single Non-Transferable Vote where electors cast a single vote in a multi-member district.

7.3.2.1 *Single Transferable Vote (STV)*

The system in this category, which continues to be used, is the 'Single Transferable Vote' (STV) currently employed in legislative elections in Ireland, Malta, and the Australian Senate. Each country is divided into multi-member constituencies which each have about four or five representatives. Parties put forward as many candidates as they think could win in each constituency. Voters rank their preferences among candidates (1, 2,3,4...). The total number of votes is counted, and then the number of seats divides this total in the constituency to produce a quota. To be elected, candidates must reach the minimum quota. When the first preferences are counted, if no candidates reach the quota, then the person with the least votes is eliminated, and their votes redistributed according to second preferences. This process continues until all seats are filled.

7.3.3 Proportional Representation

Proportional Representation systems are widely used in Europe and in Australia for upper houses. Proportional Representation systems attempt to relate the allocation of seats as closely as possible to the distribution of votes. Many Proportional Representation systems have been developed to overcome the problems of proportionality that are associated with single member constituencies which use either plurality or majoritarian systems. Multi-member constituencies where there is more than one vacancy are necessary for proportional representation to work well.

Where majoritarian systems emphasize governability, proportional systems focus on the inclusion of minority voices. Proportional electoral systems based on Party Lists in multimember constituencies are widespread throughout Europe, and worldwide 57 out of 150 countries use PR.

7.3.3.1 *List System (Party Lists Systems)*

Proportional Representation systems can be broadly grouped into two categories:

- (a) **List systems and**

(b) **The Single-Transferable Vote system.** In turn, List systems can be further divided into:

- (i) Largest Remainder and
- (ii) Highest Average categories.

List systems may or may not allow the elector to choose between candidates of the same party. List systems can be either

- (1) Closed, allowing no choice at all;
- (2) Flexible, where the voter can vote for the party or a candidate;
- (3) Open, where there is no party vote, but candidates listed in order; or
- (4) Free, where the candidates are not placed in any order by the parties

The principle of proportional representation is that the seats in a constituency are divided according to the number of votes cast for party lists, but there are considerable variations in how this is implemented in different systems. Party lists may be open as in Norway, Finland, the Netherlands and Italy, in which case voters can express preferences for particular candidates within the list. Or they may be closed as in Israel, Portugal, Spain and Germany, in which case voters can only select the party, and the political party determines the ranking of candidates. The rank order on the party list determines which candidates are elected, for example the top ten to fifteen names. Party Lists may also be national as in Israel, where all the country is one constituency divided into 120 seats. But most Party Lists are regional, as in Belgium where there are seven regions each sub-divided into between 2-34 seats. The electoral formula varies among systems. Votes can be allocated to seats based on the highest averages method. This requires the number of votes for each party to be divided successively by a series of divisors, and seats are allocated to parties that secure the highest resulting quotient, up to the total number of seats available.

7.3.3.2 Hare System Voting: (*Ranked choice voting*):

This system was named by the name of Sir **Thomas Hare**, (1806 - 1891) a British lawyer, MP, and proponent of electoral reform. Hare system is an election system of proportional representation that aims to achieve party representation in the closest proportion to actual voting strength by transferring votes beyond those needed to elect a candidate from that candidate to the next indicated choice. In this method voters rank candidates in order of preference - 1st choice, 2nd choice, 3rd choice, etc. All first choices are tallied and in a single-winner race, if no candidate receives a majority (50%+1) of first-choice votes, the less popular candidates are eliminated and ballots cast for these candidates are redistributed to more popular candidates, based on their voters' second choices, until one candidate wins with a majority. As a result, every vote counts and very few votes are

“wasted.” Voters cast their vote for their favourite candidate knowing that if he or she doesn’t gather enough votes to win, their vote will count toward their second choice. This helps ensure that more voters than ever are represented by someone they voted for and provides greater opportunity for more diverse representation

The basic concept of Proportional Representation systems is to allocate seats in a legislature or Houses of Parliament in a relationship which is proportional to the number of votes cast in the election. To achieve this requirement a number of different and complex computational arrangements have been devised. These arrangements may or may not include the use of a quota.

A quota in this context is the number of votes required to obtain a seat. The simplest method of determining a quota is to divide the number of valid votes by the number of seats to be allocated. This method is often referred to as the Hare quota.

Three alternatives to the Hare quota exist:

- (1) The Hagen-bach-Bischoff quota, in which the number of votes is divided by the number of seats plus one;
- (2) The Droop quota, in which the number of votes is divided by the number of seats plus one and adding one to the quotient;
- (3) and the Imperial quota, in which the number of votes is divided by the number of seats plus two.

The Largest Remainder system favours smaller parties over larger parties when using the Hare quota. The relative importance of remainders in the allocation of seats can be reduced by the use of a lower quota (Hagen-bach-Bischoff or Droop quota). Lower quotas result in more seats being allocated on the basis of parties receiving a full quota and less being allocated by remainders. However, the use of a lower quota does not always overcome the proportionality problem of the Largest Remainder system.

To overcome problems associated with the Largest Remainder system, the Highest Average system was devised. The object of the Highest Average system is to ensure that when all seats have been allocated the average number of votes required to win one seat shall be as near as possible the same for each party.

The Highest Average system can be used with or without a quota. When used with a quota, the system is sometimes referred to as a Hagen-bach-Bischoff system. The system derives its name from the method of allocation of seats to parties. Under the system, each party’s votes are divided by a series of divisors to produce an average vote. The party with the highest averages votes after each stage of the process is allocated a seat. After a party

has been allocated a seat, its votes are then divided by the next divisor.

The Highest Average system has a number of different variations, depending upon the divisors used and whether a quota is used or not. The d’Hondt version uses the numbers one, two, three, four, etc. as its divisors.

The form of Proportional Representation familiar to most Australians is the Single-Transferable Vote system used in elections for the Senate, the Legislative Councils of New South Wales, South Australian and Western Australia and the Tasmanian House of Assembly. The Tasmanian system, referred to as Hare-Clark, differs from the system used for the Senate and States’ Upper Houses in a number of ways. However, the basic concepts are the same.

7.3.4 Mixed Systems

Many newer systems, such as those recently adopted in Italy, New Zealand and Russia, use mixed systems, although with a variety of alternative designs. The Additional Member System (combining majoritarian and proportional elements) used in Germany combines single member and party list constituencies. Electors have two votes. Half the Members of the Bundestag (328) are elected in single-member constituencies based on a simple plurality of votes. The remaining MPs are elected from closed party lists in each region (Land). Parties, which receive, less than a specified minimum threshold of list votes (5 per cent) are not be entitled to any seats. The total number of seats, which a party receives in Germany, is based on the Niemeyer method, which ensures that seats are proportional to second votes cast for party lists. Smaller parties which received, say, 10 per cent of the list vote, but which did not win any single member seats outright, are topped up until they have 10 per cent of all the seats in Parliament. It is possible for a party to be allocated ‘surplus’ seats when it wins more district seats in the single-member district vote than it is entitled to under the result of the list vote.

7.4 Conclusion

Every political system has its political history and socio-economic and political variations. When a political system selects or decides on a particular election method for its own, there must be an option for the decision maker of that country or pre-condition of that specific socio-economic background. So we have different types of election systems all over the globe at present, and each method is marked by distinct features. But none of them are accurate or perfect regarding the representation of the masses.

This unit focuses on the different election and electoral systems; their distinctive features and procedures mark each scheme. Mitchell and Gallagher have identified eight criteria for evaluating electoral systems, which are: accuracy of the representation of voters' preferences; socio-demographic representation in legislature; personal accountability of representatives to constituencies; high levels of political participation; cohesive and disciplined parties; stable, strong and effective government; identifiability of government options; and opportunity for voters to remove government from office.

7.5 Summing Up

- i. Selecting an electoral system is not a purely technical decision. It may have huge consequences for the operation of the political system.
- ii. The first necessary step for an understanding of the consequences of an electoral system is to have a good grasp of the kinds of electoral systems that exist.
- iii. The electoral systems currently in use in representative democracies can be divided into two basic kinds: majoritarian systems and proportional representation systems.
- iv. There are many ways on the basis of which, electoral system can be classified
- v. There are countless electoral system variations.
- vi. To classify the election system on the basis of Structure of the ballot, electoral formula and distinct Magnitude

7.6 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions

1. Discuss the List and Hare system of voting.
2. Explain the Proportional Representation System of voting.
3. Discuss the Hare System Voting.

Short Questions

1. Write a note on mixed election system.
2. Write a note on majoritarian electoral systems.
3. Explain the Second Ballot Majority-Runoff Systems.

Objective Questions

1. According to the Inter-Parliamentary Union report (1993), how many countries followed majoritarian election systems?
2. Name any country that adopted the Second Ballot Majority-Runoff System.
3. The name of Sir Thomas Hare is related to which electoral system?

7.11 Further Reading

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.
- 6.

Unit 8 □ First Past the Post Representation

Structure

- 8.1 Objective
- 8.2 Introduction
- 8.3 Features of The First-Past-The-Post [FPTP] System
- 8.4 First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems: An Indian Experience
- 8.5 Advantages of First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems
- 8.6 Conclusion
- 8.7 Summing Up
- 8.8 Probable Questions
- 8.9 Further Reading

8.1 Objective

After study of this unit the learners will be able to :

- Explain the various features of First past the Post Representation
- Understand the applicability of First past the Post Representation
- Discusses the advantages of First past the Post Representation
- Explain the Disadvantages of First past the Post Representation
- Understand the important of First past the Post Representation

8.2 Introduction

First past the post electoral system is usually labelled as the most straightforward electoral system. It is used in many countries around the world. This system is the simplest form of plurality/majority system, using single member constituency and candidate-centered voting. The entire country is divided into small geographical units called constituencies in the FPTP system. Every constituency elects **one representative**, where a voter votes for one candidate. A candidate who gets more votes than other candidates is declared the winner. The winning candidate need not get a majority, i.e., 50%+1 of the votes.

The voter is presented with the names of the nominated candidates and votes by choosing

one, and only one, of them. FPTP ultimately allows people to vote for the preferred candidate on the ballot paper and the candidate that reaches the benchmark first, with the most votes, wins, although the proportional representation electoral system takes this stance too. The winner takes all, yet the other parties win nothing; this allows the two large parties to compete constantly. The winning candidate is simply the person who wins the most votes; in theory, he or she could be elected with two votes if every other candidate only secured a single vote.

First Past The Post (FPTP) systems are found in different assembly elections and General election in India. This system also found primarily in the UK and those countries historically influenced by Britain. Along with the UK, the cases most often analysed are Canada, India and the United States. FPTP is also used by a number of Caribbean countries; in Latin America by Belize; in Asia by five countries, Bangladesh, Burma, India, Malaysia and Nepal; and by many of the small island countries of the South Pacific. In Africa 15 countries, mostly former British colonies, use FPTP systems.

8.3 Features of The First-Past-The-Post [FPTP] System

There are three main features that distinguish single member plurality from other types of electoral systems in the world:

- i) The entire country is divided into small separate geographical units called constituencies.
- ii) For each constituency, one representative is elected Candidates represent a specific geographic area, called a constituency.
- iii) The candidate who gets the highest number of votes in the constituency is declared as the winner.
- iv) There is only one member elected in each constituency.
- v) Votes are counted on a constituency by constituency basis for the individual candidates, not for political parties.
- vi) In order to win a riding, a candidate does not need to receive a clear majority (considered 50 percent plus one) of the votes.
- vii) Instead, the candidate only needs to receive a *relative* majority (also called a plurality majority), meaning that he/she received more votes than any other candidate in the riding district.
- viii) Under the single member plurality system, a candidate can win a riding even though the majority of voters voted against him. This system is also known as plurality system.

8.4 First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems: An Indian Experience

India remains the largest democracy in the world, with over 800 million electors in the parliamentary election of 2004. Its parliamentary government and FPTP electoral system are a legacy of British colonialism, which ended in 1947. The British introduced self-government to India in stages. It was not until the end of colonial rule and the adoption of the Indian Constitution in November 1949 by a Constituent Assembly that universal suffrage was achieved. The Constituent Assembly, which comprised eminent jurists, lawyers, constitutional experts and political thinkers, and laboured for almost three years, debated which electoral system would best suit India before finally choosing to retain the FPTP electoral system. Various proportional representation systems were considered and attracted many advocates, given India's extraordinarily diverse and multi-ethnic society. Still, FPTP was chosen mainly to avoid fragmented legislatures and help form stable governments—stability being a significant consideration in a country emerging from immediate postcolonial communal bloodshed and with widespread poverty and illiteracy. Under the Indian Constitution, voters elect a 543-member Lok Sabha (lower house of the Parliament) from single-member constituencies. By contrast, the upper house of Parliament, the Rajya Sabha or Council of States, and the corresponding upper houses of some states are indirectly elected by members of the state legislative assemblies. There is also a president who is elected by an electoral college composed of members of both houses of Parliament and the legislatures of the states and a vice president who is elected by the members of the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha only. General elections are held once every five years generally. The prime minister holds office for as long as he or she can command a majority in the Lok Sabha. All the successive Congress Party governments which ruled India continuously until 1977 served for almost five years, close to the maximum allowed in the constitution. From 1977 to 1997, governments were less stable, and several prime ministers had to resign due to party splits or votes of no confidence before completing their full term. Since 1997, a period of stability seems to be emerging again, now under coalitions of parties. All these political environments have arisen from the same FPTP electoral system. The significant effect of the electoral system until 1977 was to guarantee majority governments based on a minority of voter support. The FPTP electoral system initially resulted in the ruling Congress Party securing stable majorities in the Lok Sabha, usually against a fragmented opposition. This fragmentation was characterized by a rise in popularity of regional and state parties in some areas. When the opposition parties combined to form coalitions and started putting up familiar candidates against the Congress candidates (as was the case in the 1977 and 1989 general elections), the Congress majorities vanished. Moreover, the

nature of the system meant that small changes in the vote share often had a dramatic impact on the number of parliamentary seats won, as shown in the following table, relating votes for the Congress Party to the number of seats won.

8.5 Advantages of First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems

First Past The Post system, like other plurality/majority electoral systems, is defended primarily on the grounds of simplicity and its tendency to produce winners who are representatives beholden to defined geographic areas. The First-Past-The-Post [FPTP] system is widely seen to be unfair and many attempts have been made to improve or replace it in countries where it is in use. However, the system does have a number of advantages. The main advantages are:

- a) First Past The Post system provides a clear-cut choice for voters between two main parties. The inbuilt disadvantages faced by third and fragmented minority parties under FPTP in many cases cause the party system to gravitate towards a party of the 'left' and a party of the 'right', alternating in power. Third parties often wither away and almost never reach a level of popular support above which their national vote achieves a comparable percentage of seats in the legislature.
- b.) First Past The Post system (FPTP) gives rise to single-party governments. The 'seat bonuses' for the largest party common under FPTP (e.g. where one party wins 45 per cent of the national vote but 55 per cent of the seats) mean that coalition governments are the exception rather than the rule. This state of affairs is praised for providing cabinets which are not shackled by the restraints of having to bargain with a minority coalition partner.
- c) When operated with single member constituencies, it provides for a direct relationship between the member of the legislature and the local constituency. The system is secret and simplest for the voter; and the voter's vote is NOT transferable, or manipulated by party hands. It is NOT perfect, but it is also how we order our lives in any situation where there is competition for ONE winner.
- d) Because elections are contested at the constituency level, there can be a degree of local control over the party's choice of candidate, and parties must take some account of the constituency's wishes when selecting a candidate.
- e) First Past The Post system gives rise to a coherent opposition in the legislature. In theory, the flip side of a strong single-party government is that the opposition is also given enough seats to perform a critical checking role and present itself as a realistic

alternative to the government of the day.

- f) It advantages broadly-based political parties. In severely ethnically or regionally divided societies, FPTP is commended for encouraging political parties to be 'broad based', encompassing many elements of society, particularly when there are only two major parties and many different societal groups. These parties can then field a diverse array of candidates for election. In Malaysia, for example, the Barisan Nasional government is made up of a broadly-based umbrella movement which fields Malay, Chinese and Indian candidates in areas of various ethnic complexions.
- g) First Past The Post system elects the candidate who receives the largest number of votes. Candidates cannot be elected as a result of the transfer of a third or fourth preference, thus defeating the candidate with the largest number of first preference votes.
- h) The system is straightforward and easy to understand. Electors are not required to choose from vast lists of candidates or to exercise preferences they may not have. The system is uncomplicated and produces a speedy outcome.
- i) The system allows electors to directly choose the government and not be subject to backroom wheeling and dealing that can occur when a large number of parties are elected to the legislature.
- j) It excludes extremist parties from representation in the legislature. Unless an extremist minority party's electoral support is geographically concentrated, it is unlikely to win any seats under FPTP. (By contrast, under a List Pluralist Representation system with a single national-level district, a fraction of 1 per cent of the national vote can ensure representation in the legislature.)
- k) It promotes a link between constituents and their representatives, as it produces a legislature made up of representatives of geographical areas. Elected members represent defined areas of cities, towns or regions rather than just party labels. Some analysts have argued that this 'geographic accountability' is particularly important in agrarian societies and in developing countries.
- l) It allows voters to choose between people rather than just between parties. Voters can assess the performance of individual candidates rather than just having to accept a list of candidates presented by a party, as can happen under some List PR electoral systems.
- m) It gives a chance for popular independent candidates to be elected. This may be particularly important in developing party systems, where politics still revolves more around extended ties of family, clan or kinship and is not based on strong party-

political organizations.

- n) There is less likelihood of a proliferation of minor parties, which may make the formation of stable governments difficult.

Finally, because elections are contested at the constituency level there is a greater possibility of outstanding candidates being elected regardless of party support.

8.6 Disadvantages of First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems

However, FPTP is frequently criticized for a number of reasons. These include :

- a. **The First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems** excludes smaller parties from ‘fair’ representation, in the sense that a party which wins approximately, say, 10 per cent of the votes should win approximately 10 per cent of the legislative seats. In the 1993 federal election in Canada the Progressive Conservatives won 16 per cent of the votes but only 0.7 per cent of the seats, and in the 1998 general election in Lesotho the Basotho National Party won 24 per cent of the votes but only 1 per cent of the seats. This is a pattern which is repeated time and time again under FPTP.
- b. It excludes minorities from fair representation. As a rule, under FPTP parties put up the most broadly acceptable candidate in a particular district so as to avoid alienating the majority of electors. Thus it is rare, for example, for a black candidate to be given a major party’s nomination in a majority white district in the UK or the USA, and there is strong evidence that ethnic and racial minorities across the world are far less likely to be represented in legislatures elected by FPTP. In consequence, if voting behaviour does dovetail with ethnic divisions, then the exclusion from representation of members of ethnic minority groups can be destabilizing for the political system as a whole.
- c. **The First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems** excludes women from the legislature. The ‘most broadly acceptable candidate’ syndrome also affects the ability of women to be elected to legislative office because they are often less likely to be selected as candidates by male-dominated party structures. Evidence across the world suggests that women are less likely to be elected to the legislature under plurality/majority systems than under PR ones. **The Inter-Parliamentary Union’s** study of Women in Parliament found that, as at June 2004, on average 15.6 per cent of the representatives in lower houses of legislatures were women. Comparing established democracies in 2004, those using FPTP averaged 14.4 per cent women in the legislature, but the figure was almost double that —27.6 per cent— in those countries

that use some form of PR. This pattern has been mirrored in new democracies, especially in Africa.

- d. It can encourage the development of political parties based on clan, ethnicity or region, which may base their campaigns and policy platforms on conceptions that are attractive to the majority of people in their district or region but exclude or are hostile to others. This has been an ongoing problem in Asia - African countries like India, Malawi and Kenya, where large communal groups tend to be regionally concentrated. The country is thus divided into geographically separate party strongholds, with little incentive for parties to make appeals outside their home region and cultural-political base.
- e. **The First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems** exaggerates the phenomenon of 'regional fiefdoms' where one party wins all the seats in a province or area. If a party has strong support in a particular part of a country, winning a plurality of votes, it will win all, or nearly all, of the seats in the legislature for that area. This both excludes minorities in that area from representation and reinforces the perception that politics is a battleground defined by who you are and where you live rather than what you believe in. This has long been put forward as an argument against FPTP in Canada.
- f. **The First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems** leaves a large number of wasted votes which do not go towards the election of any candidate. This can be particularly dangerous if combined with regional fiefdoms, because minority party supporters in the region may begin to feel that they have no realistic hope of ever electing a candidate of their choice. It can also be dangerous where alienation from the political system increases the likelihood that extremists will be able to mobilize anti-system movements.
- g. It can cause vote-splitting. Where two similar parties or candidates compete under FPTP, the vote of their potential supporters is often split between them, thus allowing a less popular party or candidate to win the seat. Papua New Guinea provides a particularly clear example.
- h. It may be unresponsive to changes in public opinion. A pattern of geographically concentrated electoral support in a country means that one party can maintain exclusive executive control in the face of a substantial drop in overall popular support. In some democracies under FPTP, a fall from 60 per cent to 40 per cent of a party's share of the popular vote nationally can result in a fall from 80 per cent to 60 per cent in the number of seats held, which does not affect its overall dominant position. Unless sufficient seats are highly competitive, the system can be

insensitive to swings in public opinion.

- i) **The First Past The Post (FPTP) Systems** are dependent on the drawing of electoral boundaries. All electoral boundaries have political consequences: there is no technical process to produce a single 'correct answer' independently of political or other considerations (as illustrated in annex E). Boundary delimitation may require substantial time and resources if the results are to be accepted as legitimate. There may also be pressure to manipulate boundaries by gerrymandering or malapportionment. This was particularly apparent in the Kenyan elections of 1993 when huge disparities between the sizes of electoral districts—the largest had 23 times the number of voters the smallest had—contributed to the ruling Kenyan African National Union party's winning a large majority in the legislature with only 30 per cent of the popular vote.

8.6 Conclusion

The first-past-the-post (FPTP) system is also known as the simple majority system. In this voting method, the candidate with the highest number of votes in a constituency is declared the winner. This system is used in India in direct elections to the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies. While FPTP is relatively simple, it does not always allow for a truly representative mandate, as the candidate could win despite securing less than half the votes in a contest. In 2014, the National Democratic Alliance led by the Bharatiya Janata Party won 336 seats with only 38.5% of the popular vote. Also, smaller parties representing specific groups have a lower chance of being elected in FPTP.

8.7 Summing Up

- i) First Past The Post (FPTP) system is the simplest form of plurality/majority system, using single member constituency and candidate-centered voting.
- ii) First Past The Post (FPTP) systems are found in different assembly elections and General election in India.
- iii) Under the single member plurality system, a candidate can win a riding even though the majority of voters voted against him. This system is also known as plurality system

Unit 9 □ Proportional Representation

Structure

9.1 Objective

9.2 Introduction

9.3 Origin and Development of PR System

9.4 What is Proportional Representation?

9.5 The basic Principles of Proportional Representation System

9.6 Methods of Proportional Representation System

9.6.1 Party list Proportional Representation:

9.6.2 Mixed-Member Proportional Representation

9.6.3 Single Transferable Vote or Choice Voting

9.7 Advantages of Proportional Representation

9.8 Disadvantages of Proportional Representation System

9.9 Conclusion

9.10 Summing Up

9.11 Probable Questions

9.12 Further Reading

9.1 Objective

After study of this unit the learners will be able to :

- Explain the various features of Proportional Representation
- Understand the applicability Proportional Representation
- Discusses the advantages of Proportional Representation
- Explain the disadvantages of Proportional Representation
- Understand the important of Proportional Representation

9.2 Introduction

Elections in different countries take different forms. Besides several differences in practical arrangements (e.g. registration formalities), dissimilarities also exist concerning the

more technical elements in the election. Especially with reference to how the seats in parliament are distributed after the election, numerous methods are employed. The electoral system – i.e. “the means by which votes are translated into seats in the process of electing politicians into office” – is never the same in two countries. Still, given the abundance of systems currently in use, two main categories can be distinguished: non-proportional and proportional systems. Non-proportional systems aim to achieve a clear majority for one of the parties. As such, one hopes to create a strong and stable government. Proportional systems, on the other hand, allocate seats more or less in line with the electoral result (in terms of votes) obtained by each party. Proportional representation is the idea that the seats in parliament should be in proportion to the votes cast. This has the advantage of lowering voter alienation and politically motivated violence, but the ensuing multiparty systems tend to be less stable.

The proportional representation electoral system seeks to create a representative body that reflects the overall distribution of public support for each political party. Majority or plurality systems effectively reward strong parties and penalize weak ones by providing the representation of a whole constituency to a single candidate who may have received fewer than half of the votes cast (as is the case, for example, in India, United States). Proportional representation ensures minority groups a measure of representation proportionate to their electoral support. Systems of proportional representation has been adopted in many countries, including Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland.

9.3 Origin and Development of Proportional Representation Electoral System

Advocates for proportional representation argue that an election is like a census of opinion as to how the country should be governed, and only if an assembly represents the full diversity of opinion within a country can its decisions be regarded as legitimate. For example, proponents maintain that the plurality system can produce unrepresentative, minority governments, such as in the United Kingdom, where the two major parties governed the country for the last three decades of the 20th century with little more than 40 percent of the votes. In India, after independence, all ruling parties at the center ruled without the support of the majority number of votes. The proportional system also is suggested as a means of redressing the possible anomaly arising under majority or plurality systems whereby a party may win more seats with fewer popular votes than its opponents, as occurred in the British elections of 1951 and February 1974.

Unlike the plurality system, which uses single-member constituency/districts, proportional representation systems use multimember constituencies. Systematic methods of applying proportional representation were first developed in the mid-19th century in Denmark by Carl Andrae and in Britain by Thomas Hare and John Stuart Mill. Methods currently in use include the single-transferable-vote method (STV), the party-list system, and the additional-member system.

9.4 What is Proportional Representation?

Proportional representation refers to electoral systems designed to approximate the ideal of proportionality in converting citizens' votes into legislative seats. All proportional representation systems require multimember constituencies. The degree to which a proportional representation scheme approaches proportionality increases with the number of representatives elected per constituency.

9.5 The basic Principles of Proportional Representation System

The basic principles underlying proportional representation elections are

- All voters deserve representation and that all political groups in society deserve to be represented in a legislature in proportion to their strength in the electorate.
- In order to achieve this fair representation, all proportional representation systems have certain basic characteristics — characteristics that set them apart from our current election system.
- First, they all use multi-member districts. Instead of electing one person in each district, as we do here in the U.S., several people are elected.
- These multi-member constituency/districts may be relatively small, with only three or four members, or they may be larger, with ten or more members. (The figures below illustrate districting maps for a hypothetical 50-person state senate. Figure 1 shows 50 single-seat districts, as is common with plurality-majority systems. Figure 2 depicts 10 five-seat PR districts, and Figure 3 shows 5 ten-seat PR districts.)

50 Single-Seat Districts

1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1
1	1	1	1	1

Figure -1

Ten 5-Seat PR Districts

5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats
5 Seats	5 Seats

Figure- 2

Five 10-Seat PR Districts

10 Seats
10 Seats
10 Seats
10 Seats
10 Seats

Figure -3

9.6 Forms of Proportional Representation (PR) System

There are many ways to decide representation in parliament/ legislative body, some are more proportional, and some are less. The forms of Proportional Representation are:

9.6.1 Party list proportional representation:

Party list voting systems are by far the most common form of proportional representation. Over 80% of the proportional representation systems used worldwide are some form of party list voting. It remains the system used in most European democracies and in many newly democratized countries, including South Africa.

How It Works

Legislators are elected in large, multi-member constituencies /districts. Each party puts up a list or slate of candidates equal to the number of seats in the district. Independent candidates may also run, and they are listed separately on the ballot as if they were their own party. On the ballot, voters indicate their preference for a particular party and the parties then receive seats in proportion to their share of the vote. So in a five-member district/constituency, if the Party A win 40% of the vote, they would win two of the five seats. The two winning candidates of party A would be chosen according to their position on the list.

There are **two broad types of list systems**:

- a) Closed list and
- b) Open list.

- a) **Closed list:** In a closed list system—the original form of party list voting- the party fixes the order in which the candidates are listed and elected, and the voter simply casts a vote for the party as a whole. **This is shown in the first ballot below**, which illustrates an election for the House of Representatives in a five-seat district/constituency. Voters are not able to indicate their preference for any candidates on the list, but must accept the list in the order presented by the party. Winning candidates are selected in the exact order they appear on the original list. So in the example here, if the party A won two seats, the first two candidates on the pre-ordered list — Sabina Choudhry and Mr. Ritesh Pande would be elected.
- b) **Open list. :** Most European democracies now use the open list system. This approach allows voters to express a preference for particular candidates, not just parties. It is designed to give voters some say over the order of the list and thus which candidates get elected. One version of this is illustrated in the ballot below. Voters are presented with unordered or random lists of candidates chosen in party primaries. Voters cannot vote for a party directly, but must cast a vote for an individual candidate. This vote counts for the specific candidate as well as for the party. So the order of the final list completely depends on the number of votes won by each candidate on the list. The most popular candidates rise to the top of the list and have a better chance of being elected.

9.6.2 Mixed-Member Proportional Voting

Mixed-member proportional representation goes by a variety of other names, including “the additional member system,” “compensatory PR,” the “two vote system,” and “the German system.” It is an attempt to combine a single-member district system with a proportional voting system. Half of the members of the legislature are elected in single-member district plurality contests. The other half are elected by a party list vote and added on to the district members so that each party has its appropriate share of seats in the legislature. Proponents claim that mixed-member proportional voting (MMP) is the best of both worlds: providing the geographical representation and close constituency ties of single-member plurality voting along with the fairness and diversity of representation that comes with PR voting.

This system was originally invented in West Germany right after World War Two, though since then it has also been adopted in several other countries, including Bolivia and Venezuela. It is still one of the least used PR systems, but in recent years it has begun to garner a great deal of attention. In fact, it is now one of the “hottest” systems being considered by those involved in electoral design. In part this growing attention is a result of MMP’s unique claim to be a “compromise” between the two main rival systems. In the 1990s New Zealand

abandoned its traditional single-member plurality system for MMP. Hungary also adopted this approach. Most recently, the newly formed parliaments of Scotland and Wales used this system for their first elections.

How It Works

People cast votes on a double ballot—see the ballot below. First, on the left part of the ballot, they vote for a district representative. This part of the ballot is a single-member district plurality contest to see which person will represent the district in the legislature. The person with the most votes wins. Typically half of the seats in the legislature are filled in this way. So in a hypothetical 100-member state legislature, the winners of these district contests would occupy 50 of the seats.

Official Ballot																															
Election for the United States House of Representatives District One																															
You Have 2 Votes																															
District Vote	Party Vote																														
<p>This vote decides who will be elected to the House of Representatives from this district. Vote by putting an "X" in the box immediately before the candidate you choose.</p> <p>Vote for only one candidate.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓ Vote Here</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 10%;"></td><td style="width: 80%;">Fred Smith</td><td style="width: 10%; text-align: right;">Republican</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Damon Washington</td><td style="text-align: right;">Democrat</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Cheryl Houston</td><td style="text-align: right;">New Party</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Naomi Lintz</td><td style="text-align: right;">US Taxpayers</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>John Henderson</td><td style="text-align: right;">Independent</td></tr> <tr><td></td><td colspan="2" style="text-align: center;"><i>Write In</i></td></tr> </table>		Fred Smith	Republican		Damon Washington	Democrat		Cheryl Houston	New Party		Naomi Lintz	US Taxpayers		John Henderson	Independent		<i>Write In</i>		<p>This vote decides the share of seats that each of the parties listed below will have in the House of Representatives. Vote by putting an "X" in the box immediately before the party you choose.</p> <p>Vote for only one Party.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">↓ Vote Here</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr><td style="width: 10%;"></td><td style="width: 90%;">Republican Party <small>Kim, Dirks, Case, Packard, Deutsch</small></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>Democratic Party <small>Matteo, Myers, Lee, Bork, Gorr</small></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>The New Party <small>Morkarski, Pine, Lebaro, Fletcher, Devino</small></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td>US Taxpayers <small>Daves, Chevalier, Brown, Noyes, Parker</small></td></tr> <tr><td></td><td> </td></tr> <tr><td></td><td> </td></tr> </table>		Republican Party <small>Kim, Dirks, Case, Packard, Deutsch</small>		Democratic Party <small>Matteo, Myers, Lee, Bork, Gorr</small>		The New Party <small>Morkarski, Pine, Lebaro, Fletcher, Devino</small>		US Taxpayers <small>Daves, Chevalier, Brown, Noyes, Parker</small>				
	Fred Smith	Republican																													
	Damon Washington	Democrat																													
	Cheryl Houston	New Party																													
	Naomi Lintz	US Taxpayers																													
	John Henderson	Independent																													
	<i>Write In</i>																														
	Republican Party <small>Kim, Dirks, Case, Packard, Deutsch</small>																														
	Democratic Party <small>Matteo, Myers, Lee, Bork, Gorr</small>																														
	The New Party <small>Morkarski, Pine, Lebaro, Fletcher, Devino</small>																														
	US Taxpayers <small>Daves, Chevalier, Brown, Noyes, Parker</small>																														

On the right part of the ballot—the party list portion—voters indicate their choice among the parties, and the other half of the seats in the legislature are filled from regional lists of candidates chosen by these parties. The party lists are closed in the German version. These party list votes are counted on a national basis to determine the total portion of the 100-seat legislature that each party deserves. Candidates from each party’s lists are then added to its district winners until that party achieves its appropriate share of seats. The following table illustrates how this process works for our hypothetical election. The Democrats won 40% of the party list votes in the 100-member state legislature, so they would be entitled to a total of 40 of the 100 seats. Since they already elected 28 of their candidates in district

elections, they would then add 12 more from their regional party lists to come up to their quota of 40 seats.

Allocation of Seats in MMP

Political Parties	Number of District Seats Won	Percentage of the National Party List Vote	Total Number of Seats Deserved by Party	Number of Seats Added from Party List
Democratic	28	40%	40	12
Republican	18	36%	36	18
U.S. Taxpayers	4	18%	18	14
New Party	0	6%	6	6
Totals	50	100%	100	50

In the German version two electoral thresholds are used, either of which a party must overcome to be allotted seats in the legislature. A party must either get 5% of the nationwide party list vote or win at least three district races in order for it to gain any seats in the legislature. In our hypothetical case, the New Party did not win any district seats, but they did win over 5% of the nationwide vote, so they deserve their share of legislative seats—which in this case would be six seats, all of which would be filled from the regional party lists.

9.6.3 Single Transferable Vote or Choice Voting

This system of proportional representation is known by several names. Political scientists call it “the single transferable vote.” It is called the “Hare-Clark system” in Australia. In the United States, electoral reform activists have taken to calling it “choice voting.” Currently this system is used to elect parliaments in Ireland and Malta. In Australia it is used to elect the federal Senate, as well as the legislatures in several states there. It is also the PR system that was used in a number of cities in the United States during the twentieth century, including New York, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Toledo, and Boulder. It continues to be used today in Cambridge, Massachusetts for elections to their city council and school board.

How It Works

The voting process is illustrated by ballot below. All candidates are listed in the same place on the ballot. Instead of voting for one person, voters rank each candidate in their order

of choice. So if you like Campbell best, you would mark the “1” after his name. If you liked Gomez second best, you would mark “2” by his name, and so on. You can rank as few or as many as you want. This ballot illustrates the use of the AccuVote system used in Cambridge, Massachusetts to elect its city council and school board. Voters fill in the ranking numbers as they would for standardized tests taken in school, which allows for computerized vote counting and ballot transfers.

Choice Voting Ballot

Official Ballot Municipal Elections		
INSTRUCTIONS TO VOTERS	Candidate for City Council District One (Three to be elected.)	<i>Only one vote per candidate</i> <i>Only one vote per column</i>
<p>Mark Your Choices by Filling in the Numbered Boxes Only</p> <p>Fill in the number one <input type="checkbox"/> box next to your first choice; fill in the number two <input type="checkbox"/> box next to your second choice; fill in the number three <input type="checkbox"/> box next to your third choice, and so on. You may fill in as many choices as you please. Fill in no more than one box per candidate. Fill in no more than one box per column.</p>	Douglas Campbell Dem.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	Martha Dains Rep.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	Terry Graybeal Reform	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	Robert Gomez Dem	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	Cynthia Daniels Indep.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	Robert Higgins Rep.	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	<i>Write In</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	<i>Write In</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9
	<i>Write In</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 <input type="checkbox"/> 6 <input type="checkbox"/> 7 <input type="checkbox"/> 8 <input type="checkbox"/> 9

As the name “single transferable vote” implies, this systems involves a process of transferring votes. To understand how the transfer process works, it may be best to start out with a simple analogy. Imagine a school where a class is trying to elect a committee. Any student who wishes to run stands at the front of the class and the other students vote for their favorite candidates by standing beside them. Students standing almost alone next to their candidate will soon discover that this person has no chance of being elected and move to another candidate of their choice to help him or her get elected. Some of the students standing next to a very popular candidate may realize that this person has more than enough support to win, and decide to go stand next to another student that they would also like to see on the committee. In the end, after all of this shuffling around, most students would

be standing next to candidates that will be elected, which is the ultimate point of this process.

In the single transferable vote, votes are transferred around just as the students moved from candidate to candidate in the analogy. The exact order of the transfer process is illustrated in figure below. An example of how the votes are actually transferred is shown in the table that follows. For the sake of simplicity, assume that there is a three-seat district in which six people are running for office. The first step in the process is to establish the threshold: the minimum number of votes necessary to win a seat. The threshold usually consists of the total number of valid votes divided by one plus the number of seats to be filled, plus one vote. The formula looks like this: $\text{Threshold} = (\text{valid votes}/1+\text{seats}) + 1$ vote. So in our three-seat districts with 10,000 voters, a candidate would need $10,000/1+3$ (which is 2,500) plus one more vote, for 2,501.

The second step is to count all the number one choices to see if any candidates have reached the threshold of 2,501. As shown on the table below, the Democrat Gomez has 2,900 voters and he is declared elected. But Gomez actually has 399 more votes than he needs to win. These votes are considered wasted if they stay with Gomez, so they are transferred to the second choices on the ballot. (There are several ways to do this, but we needn't get into those details here.) In the second count, we see the effect of this transfer. The other Democratic candidate, Campbell, gets 300 of those second choice votes, and the independent candidate, Daniels, gets the other 99. The vote totals are now recalculated to see if anyone is now over the threshold. No one is, so the next transfer takes place. The candidate with the least chance to win is eliminated and his or her votes are transferred to their second choices. This candidate is Higgins, the Republican, and 500 of his votes are transferred to the other Republican candidate, Dains; and the other 100 votes are given to Daniels. Again the votes are recounted to see if anyone has reached the threshold. Dains has reached it with 2,800 votes and so she is declared elected. Once again her excess votes are redistributed to their second choices—200 to Graybeal, and 99 to Daniels. But still no one has reached the threshold, so again the lowest candidate is eliminated and those votes transferred. That candidate is Campbell, the Democrat, and 100 of his votes go to Graybeal, and 600 go to Daniels. This puts Daniels, the independent candidate, over the threshold with 2,698 votes, and she is the last one elected.

This transfer process is a bit complicated, so why does it exist? The transfer process was invented primarily to reduce the problem of wasted votes — votes that are cast but do not actually elect anyone. Plurality-majority systems routinely waste large numbers of votes and this is why they are prone to such problems as party misrepresentation, and the

underrepresentation of political minorities, racial minorities, and women. The transfer process in STV is designed to ensure that the fewest votes are wasted and that the maximum number of people gets to elect a representative to office. It acknowledges that there are two kinds of wasted votes: votes for candidates that stand little chance of winning, and votes in excess of what a winning candidate needs. Transferring these votes to their next ranked choice makes it more likely that they will actually contribute to the election of a candidate.

	1 st Count	2 nd Count	3 rd Count	4 th Count	5 th Count
	Number Of Votes	Transfer of Gomez’s votes and results.	Transfer of Higgins’ votes and results.	Transfer of Danins’ votes and results.	Transfer of Cambell’s votes and results.
Douglas Cambell (Dem.)	400	+300 700	700	700	–
Martha Danis* (Rep.)	2,300	2,300	+500 2,800	2,501	2,501
Terry Graybeal (Reform)	2,000	2,000	2,000	+200 2,200	+100 2,300
Robert Gomex* (Dem.)	2,900	2,501	2,501	2,501	2,501
Cynthia Daniels* (Ind.)	1,800	+99 1,899	+100 1,999	+99 2,098	+600 2,698
Robert Higgins (Rep)	600	600	–	–	–

*Winning Candidates.

9.7 Advantages of Proportional Representation

In many respects, the strongest arguments for PR derive from the way in which the system avoids the anomalous results of plurality/majority systems and is better able to produce a representative legislature. For many new democracies, particularly those which face deep societal divisions, the inclusion of all significant groups in the legislature can be a near-essential condition for democratic consolidation. Failing to ensure that both minorities and majorities have a stake in developing political systems can have catastrophic consequences, such as seeking power through illegal means.

Proportional representation systems in general are praised for the way in which they:

- Faithfully translate votes cast into seats won, and thus avoid some of the more destabilizing and ‘unfair’ results thrown up by plurality/majority electoral systems. ‘Seat bonuses’ for the larger parties are minimized, and small parties can have their voice heard in the legislature.
- Encourage or require the formation of political parties or groups of like-minded candidates to put forward lists. This may clarify policy, ideology, or leadership differences within society, especially when, as in Timor-Leste at independence, there is no established party system.
- Give rise to very few wasted votes. When thresholds are low, almost all votes cast in proportional representation elections go towards electing a candidate of choice. This increases the voters’ perception that it is worth making the trip to the polling booth at election time, as they can be more confident that their vote will make a difference to the election outcome, however small.
- Facilitate minority parties’ access to representation. Unless the threshold is unduly high, or the district magnitude is unusually low, then any political party with even a small percentage of the vote can gain representation in the legislature. This fulfils the principle of inclusion, which can be crucial to stability in divided societies and has benefits for decision making in established democracies, such as achieving a more balanced representation of minorities in decision-making bodies and providing role models of minorities as elected representatives.
- Encourage parties to campaign beyond the districts in which they are strong or where the results are expected to be close. The incentive under PR systems is to maximize the overall vote regardless of where those votes might come from. Every vote, even from areas where a party is electorally weak, goes towards gaining another seat.
- Restrict the growth of ‘regional fiefdoms’. Because PR systems reward minority parties with a minority of the seats, they are less likely to lead to situations where a single party holds all the seats in a given province or district. This can be particularly important to minorities in a province which may not have significant regional concentrations or alternative points of access to power.
- Lead to greater continuity and stability of policy. The West European experience suggests that parliamentary PR systems score better with regard to governmental longevity, voter participation, and economic performance. The rationale behind this claim is that regular switches in government between two ideologically

polarized parties, as can happen in FPTP systems, makes long-term economic planning more difficult, while broad PR coalition governments help engender a stability and coherence in decision making which allow for national development.

- Make power-sharing between parties and interest groups more visible. In many new democracies, power-sharing between the numerical majorities of the population who hold political power and a small minority who hold economic power is an unavoidable reality. Where the numerical majority dominates the legislature and a minority sees its interests expressed in the control of the economic sphere, negotiations between different power blocks are less visible, less transparent, and less accountable (e.g. in Zimbabwe during its first 20 years of independence). It has been argued that PR, by including all interests in the legislature, offers a better hope that decisions will be taken in the public eye and by a more inclusive cross-section of the society.

9.8 Disadvantages of Proportional Representation System

Most of the criticisms of PR in general are based around the tendency of PR systems to give rise to coalition governments and a fragmented party system. The arguments most often cited against PR are that it leads to:

- Coalition governments, which in turn lead to legislative gridlock and consequent inability to carry out coherent policies. There are particularly high risks during an immediate post-conflict transition period, when popular expectations of new governments are high. Quick and coherent decision making can be impeded by coalition cabinets and governments of national unity which are split by factions.
- A destabilizing fragmentation of the party system. PR can reflect and facilitate a fragmentation of the party system. It is possible that extreme pluralism can allow tiny minority parties to hold larger parties to ransom in coalition negotiations. In this respect, the inclusiveness of PR is cited as a drawback of the system. In Israel, for example, extremist religious parties are often crucial to the formation of a government, while Italy endured many years of unstable shifting coalition governments. Democratizing countries are often fearful that PR will allow personality-based and ethnic-cleavage parties to proliferate in their undeveloped party systems.
- A platform for extremist parties. In a related argument, PR systems are often criticized for giving a space in the legislature to extremist parties of the left or

the right. It has been argued that the collapse of Weimar Germany was in part due to the way in which its PR electoral system gave a foothold to extremist groups of the extreme left and right.

- Governing coalitions which have insufficient common ground in terms of either their policies or their support base. These coalitions of convenience are sometimes contrasted with coalitions of commitment produced by other systems (e.g. through the use of AV), in which parties tend to be reciprocally dependent on the votes of supporters of other parties for their election, and the coalition may thus be stronger.
- Small parties getting a disproportionately large amount of power. Large parties may be forced to form coalitions with much smaller parties, giving a party that has the support of only a small percentage of the votes the power to veto any proposal that comes from the larger parties.
- The inability of the voter to enforce accountability by throwing a party out of power or a particular candidate out of office. Under a PR system, it may be very difficult to remove a reasonably-sized centre party from power. When governments are usually coalitions, some political parties are ever-present in government, despite weak electoral performances from time to time. The Free Democratic Party (FDP) in Germany was a member of the governing coalition for all but eight of the 50 years from 1949 to 1998, although it never gained more than 12 per cent of the vote.
- Difficulties either for voters to understand or for the electoral administration to implement the sometimes complex rules of the system. Some PR systems are considered to be more difficult than non-PR systems and may require more voter education and training of poll workers to work successfully.

9.9 Conclusion

The proportional representation system more faithfully represents the views of the people, translating them into the MLAs / MPs who represent them. There are many important issues that can have a major impact on how a proportional representation system works in practice. The greater the number of representatives to be elected from a district, the more proportional the electoral system will be. Proportional representation systems also differ in the range of choice given to the voter-whether the voter can choose between political parties, individual candidates, or both.

The rationale underpinning all proportional representation systems is to consciously reduce the disparity between a party's share of the national vote and its share of the parliamentary seats; if a major party wins 40 per cent of the votes, it should win approximately 40 per cent of the seats, and a minor party with 10 per cent of the votes should also gain 10 per cent of the legislative seats. This congruity between a party's share of the vote and its share of the seats provides an incentive for all parties to support and participate in the system.

In many states of USA, elected representatives are responsible for drawing their own constituencies/district boundaries. This leads to abuses, most notably gerrymandering to create "safe" districts for a party or a particular representative. These abuses should of course be corrected. However, when states have reformed their redistricting procedure by putting it in the hands of neutral parties, we find that under the reformed system, incumbents are just as likely to be re-elected, and nearly as many seats are "safe" (non-competitive) as under the old gerrymandered districting.

During the 1980s and '90s, electoral-reform movements pressed for changes in voting systems in Europe. In Britain proportional representation was adopted for elections to the European Parliament and for some local elections in London and Northern Ireland. Several other countries—notably Italy, which adopted a modified constituency-based system to reduce the number of political parties in the legislature and to create more stability in the cabinet—have altered their national voting systems.

9.10 Summing Up

- Proportional representation allows a wider variety of views to be heard and considered.
- The Proportional representation system will avoid the wild pendulum swings of a two-party system. Broad Proportional representation coalition governments will change more gradually, allowing continuity and stability of policy for the long term, which is particularly important for long-term planning by businesses, individuals and government civil servants.
- Apathy is the enemy of democracy. Too many people believe that their vote doesn't count. With the ability to find candidates who align with their views, votes are less likely to be wasted, and participation should be higher.

- While the Proportional representation system is often credited with making representation available to third parties, what's often overlooked is that it also enables the representation of major parties when they're a local minority.
- The proportional representation system more faithfully represents the people's views, translating them into representatives.

9.11 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions

1. Define the Proportional representation system. Explain the various methods of proportional representation system.
2. Explain the basic principles of proportional representation system.
3. Discuss the advantages of proportional representation system.

Short Questions

1. Write a short note on Single Transferable Vote system.
2. Explain, in brief, the Party list proportional representation.
3. Discuss, in brief, Mixed-Member Proportional representation system.
4. Discuss the importance in proportional representation system in modern democracy.
5. Explain the disadvantages of proportional representation system.

Objective Questions

1. Name any country, where the system of propoational representation has been adopted.
2. Name of ywo countries where sytematic meyhods of applying proportional representation were first development.
3. what is the full form of SMD?
4. In which county were proportional representation methods first adopted for national election?

9.11. Further Reading

1. Amy, Douglas, Real Choices: New Voices: The Case for PR Elections in the Unites States (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993)
2. Barkan, Joel D., 'Elections in Agrarian Societies', Journal of Democracy, 6 (1995),

pp. 106-116

3. Birch, Sarah, 'Single-Member District Electoral Systems and Democratic Transition', *Electoral Studies*, 24/2 (June 2005), pp.281-301
4. Bogdanor, Vernon, *What is Proportional Representation?* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1984)
5. Bogdanor, Vernon and David Butler (eds), *Democracy and Elections* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983)
6. Colomer, Joseph (ed.), *Handbook of Electoral System Choice* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2004)
7. Colomer, Joseph, 'It's Parties That Choose Electoral Systems (or Duverger's Laws Upside Down)', *Political Studies*, 53 (2005), pp. 1-21
8. Dahl, Robert, *On Democracy* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998)
9. Downs, Anthony, *An Economic Theory of Democracy* (New York: Harper and Row, 1957)
10. Duverger, Maurice, *Political Parties: Their Organization and Activity in the Modern State* (New York: John Wiley, 1954)
11. Elklit, Jørgen and Nigel S. Roberts, 'A Category of its Own? Four PR Two-Tier Compensatory and Member Electoral Systems in 1994', *European Journal of Political Research*, 30 (1996), pp. 217-240

Unit 10 □ Mixed Representation

Structure

10.1 Objective

10.2 Introduction

10.3 Meaning of mixed representation system

10.4 Majoritarian or Proportional: Linkage between Nominal and List Tiers

10.5 Advantages of mixed member proportional system

10.6 Disadvantages of mixed member proportional system

10.7 Conclusion

10.8 Summing Up

10.9 Glossary

10.10 Further Reading

10.1 Objective

After study of this unit the learners will be able to :

- Explain the meaning and features of Mixed Representation
- Understand the applicability Mixed Representation system
- Discusses the advantages of Mixed Representation system
- Explain the Disadvantages of Mixed Representation system
- Understand the importance of Mixed Representation system

10.2 Introduction

It has long been conventional to divide electoral systems into two broad categories, majoritarian and proportional. Majoritarian systems usually employ exclusively single seat districts/ constituencies with plurality rule and tend to give greater representation to the two parties that receive the most votes. Proportional system must employ multi-seat districts/ constituencies, usually with party list, and typically produce parliamentary representation

that largely mirrors the vote shares of multiple parties. Although the effect on party systems may be arrayed on a continuum ranging from fully proportional to highly disproportional, designers of electoral systems have nonetheless tended to operate with either a "plurality principle" or a "proportional principle" in mind. Recently, however, there has been a marked tendency around the world to mix these two principles of electoral system design. Many newly adopted electoral systems, including those in long established democracies such as Israel, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, and Venezuela, have entailed various hybrids of the competing majoritarian/plurality and proportional principles. In the prototype of a mixed-member system, half of the seats in a legislative chamber are elected in single-seat districts / constituencies while the other half are elected from party lists allocated by proportional representation. Yet, there are numerous variations within the general class of mixed-member system. The universe of such systems has included the following examples:

- a) A system with only one seat elected by the majoritarian principle (example - Israel);
- b) One in which the share of seats elected by proportional representation a quarter (example- Italy);
- c) one in which the majoritarian tire is elected partly in multi-seat districts/ constituencies (example-Venezuela).

Establishing a generic definition of a mixed member electoral system is therefore not as simple as it might at first seem.

10.3 Meaning of mixed representation system

Mixed-member electoral system is defined as a subset of the border category of multiple-tire electoral system. An electoral system employs multiple tires if seats are allocated in two (or more) overlapping sets of districts/constituencies, such that every voter may cast one or more votes that are employed to allocate seats in more than one tire. Examples include the Belgian system of relatively small multi-seat districts/constituencies, from which voters are transferred into upper tiers based on regions to ensure a closer approximation to proportional representation. Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Austria, and Greece are among the proportional representation systems that employ two or three tires of allocation, which usually make the system more proportional than if only one tire were used.

Mixed-member electoral systems are thus a variant of such multiple-tire system, with the specific proviso that one tire must entail allocation of seats nominally whereas the other must entail allocation of seats **by lists**. The distinction between nominal and **list** voting is

based on the nature of the vote cast by the voter and how it is employed to allocate seats. Under nominal voting, voters cast votes for candidates by name and seats are allocated to individual candidates on the basis of the votes they receive. List voters, on the other hand, 'pool' among multiple candidates nominated on a list submitted prior to the election by a party, alliance, or other political organization. There are various hybrids possible, of course, but in general electoral formulas break down into nominal vs. list system. In a mixed-member system there are (at least) two separate overlapping tiers, one of which employs allocation of seats nominally, while another employs allocation to party list. Typically, each voter is provided with the option of casting separate votes in each tier, which in this volume we shall call the nominal vote and the list vote. However, there are cases in which the voter casts only a nominal vote. In such cases allocation of seats in the list tier is based on an aggregation on nominal votes on the basis of party.

The Nominal Tier: Usually the nominal tier consists of **single-seat districts** (SSDs)/ constituencies. Within single-seat districts (SSDs)/ constituencies the allocation formula is usually plurality, though in some systems there is a runoff required in any district in which there is no first-round majority, as in Albania, Georgia, Hungary, and Lithuania. There have also been mixed-member systems with multi-seat nominal-tier districts, including South Korea in 1987 and some districts in Venezuela in 1998. The key point is that for a system to qualify as mixed-member, there must be a tier in which nominal votes are the sole means by which candidates win seats in this tier. Nominal formulas are usually majoritarian, but they need not be. For example, the **single non-transferable vote** (SNTV) is a purely nominal formula, but one that is aptly described in the literature as semi proportional because of its tendency to permit some seats to be won by relatively small parties. Japan's upper house continues to use **single non-transferable vote** (SNTV) in some districts; because there is also an overlapping national list PR tier, this electoral system is a mixed-member system. Taiwan also has a mixed-member system with **single non-transferable vote** (SNTV) in the nominal tier. Although both of these systems belong in the broader family of mixed-member systems, the use of a semi proportional rather than majoritarian formula for the nominal tier places them in a distinctly different branch of the family from those that represent the current "wave" of electoral reform. Notwithstanding these cases, in this volume a mixed-member system will be understood to have a nominal tier of **single-seat districts** (and thus a majoritarian formula) unless otherwise noted.

The List Tier: A mixed-member electoral system must also contain a tier of members elected from party lists that overlays the nominal tier. Most list systems employ a PR formula, such as D'Hondt divisors or the simple quota and largest remainders. However, there are less familiar list majoritarian systems. The US Electoral College is a prominent

example, in which each US state serves as a multi-seat district. Each candidate has a slate of electors for each state, and when a candidate wins the plurality of the state's vote his entire slate is elected. There have been several cases of mixed member electoral systems with list tiers that are at least partially majoritarian. Examples include several former systems of Mexico and South Korea, as well as the current systems of Cameroon and Chad. By far the most common form of list in a mixed-member system is the closed list, wherein candidates are ranked prior to the election by the parties themselves. Voters have no say in the order by which candidates are elected from a closed list. The major alternative to the closed list is the open list, wherein candidates receive preference votes from voters and the order of election from the list is determined by the number of preference votes received. There is no reason why a mixed-member system could not employ open lists in the list tier; however, no mixed member system used at the national level has done so. There have been some alternatives to the closed list, however. Mixed-member systems lend themselves to lists ordered on the basis of which candidates prove to be the "best losers" in the nominal-tier districts in which they are nominated. Variations on the best-loser provision have been used in Mexico (1964-76), as well as by the Italian senate since 1993 and Japan's lower house since 1996. From the point of view of voter choice, the best-loser list is no different from a closed list, at least if the nominal-tier districts are single-seat districts SSDs. As with closed lists, voters do not have the opportunity to select from among multiple candidates within their party's list. Nonetheless, best-loser lists do provide candidates with the incentive to be popular within their districts-even in districts that are "hopeless" for their party to win in the nominal tier-because more popular candidates will be elected from the list tier ahead of less popular cop artisans. In a system that employs a best-loser provision on the list tier, there is in fact no list, per se. rather, parties simply nominate candidates in the nominal tier. Once nominal-tier winning candidates have been determined, any seats that a party may obtain from the list are taken from its pool of nominal tier candidates who did not win their races. Thus, under this system, the nominal-tier districts serve as de facto nominating districts for the list tier. As with the nominating districts used in some list PR systems (such as Slovenia), seats are allocated to parties across a multi-seat district, but are allocated to candidates within parties according to their success at garnering votes in the nominating districts.

10.4 Majoritarian or Proportional: Linkage between Nominal and List Tiers

As noted, mixed-member systems combine the majoritarian and proportional principles in one electoral system. However, notwithstanding the mixture of principles, most mixed-

member systems tend to "lean" towards either majoritarian or proportional in their overall effects. Thus, we identify two broad subtypes, which we call mixed member majoritarian (MMM) and mixed-member proportional (MMP). In this section we show that the primary variable in mixed-member systems that separates MMM and MMP systems is the presence or absence of a linkage between tiers. If the tiers are not linked, then the typical majoritarian boost received by a large party in the nominal tier is not likely to be wiped away by proportional allocation from the list tier. Thus, the principle behind majoritarian systems-giving an advantage to a large party-remains in MMM systems. On the other hand, MMP systems prioritize the list-PR tier, such that large parties do not receive a boost in overall seat allocation, or receive a smaller one than they would in an otherwise similar MMM system.

Linkage refers to whether votes are transferred from the nominal tier to the list tier, or whether the number of list seats a party receives is based in some way on how many nominal-tier seats it has won. At one extreme, the two tiers are parallel; i.e., there is no linkage between tiers in the allocation of seats to parties. Thus, parties' list votes and seats are not adjusted in any way on the basis of votes cast or seats won in the nominal tier. A party in a parallel mixed-member system simply takes its seats in the nominal tier and adds to them

whatever number of seats it wins in the list tier.

If seats are linked, the number of seats a party takes from its list is determined partially by the number of seats it has won from the nominal tier. In these systems a formula is applied to the two tiers combined-either in the whole territory of a jurisdiction, or in regional subdivisions of it. The formula establishes a party's total seat allocation; then list seats are allocated to bring the party's representation up to that total. The form of seat linkage that will most concern us here is the compensatory type, which produces a mixed-member proportional (MMP) system. For example, in Germany a party wins a percentage of seats nationally that is determined by applying a PR formula to the total number of parliamentary seats. Each party then fulfils its entitlement of seats by taking whatever single-seat districts (SSDs) it has won and augmenting them with the number of candidates off the list that it requires to reach its overall entitlement. A similar system was first used in New Zealand in 1996.

Seat linkage occurs also in a type of system that might best be called majority-assuring. The electoral systems used in Mexico in 1988 and 1991 assured the party with the most nominal-tier seats a majority of all seats in the chamber. In other words, the largest party was automatically given whatever number of list seats was necessary to augment the single-seat districts (SSDs) it had won in order for it to have a legislative majority. These systems are rare and are likely to be found in countries of dubious democratic credentials. Thus, they will not concern us further here, though they are a principal feature of the chapters in this volume on

Mexico, and examples have existed elsewhere. The common theme in both the compensatory-PR and majority-assuring systems is that seat allocation from the list tier is determined in part by seat allocation in the nominal tier.

Returning to systems that use PR for the list tier, if votes are linked, then the votes that are used to allocate list-tier seats are not solely the votes that are cast for party lists, because those votes are adjusted by the transfer of votes from the nominal tier. Linkage may take the form of either positive or negative transfers of votes. For example, in Hungary votes cast for candidates who do not win their own single-seat districts (SSDs) races are added to their parties' list votes. Conversely, in Italy parties' list votes are reduced to account for their candidates who are successful in the nominal tier.

By combining the two variables of vote and seat linkage, we can arrive at a typology, shown in Table below:

Table -I

Linkage Between Tiers: A Typology of Mixed-Member Systems With Pr List Tiersa

Seat linkage?	Vote linkage?	
	No	Yes
No (parallel)	MMM	MMM with partial compensation
	Armenia	Hungary
	Georgia	Italy
	Japan	
	Lithuania	
	Macedonia	
	Mexicob	
	Russian Federation	
	Thailand	
	Ukraine	
Yes (compensatory)	MMP	
	Bolivia	
	Germany	
	New Zealand	
	Venezuela	

These are MMM systems, in that they conform to the majoritarian principle that large parties should receive a seat bonus. The seat bonus is not, of course guaranteed (even in purely majoritarian systems), but is likely to result from the parallel combination of over

representation of large parties in the nominal tier and large parties' full proportional share of the list-tier seats. Among cases placed in the upper-left cell of the above Table - I, Mexico deserves special mention because it provides a cap on the degree of over-representation a party may receive. The Mexican provision is that no party may obtain a seat share more than eight percentage points greater than its vote share. Up to this limit seats are allocated in parallel, and the fact that a party with as little as 42% of the votes is likely to win a majority of seats means Mexico's system must be considered mixed member majoritarian (MMM), though in a limited form.

In the upper-right cell, we find systems that have parallel seat allocations but incorporate a mechanism of vote linkage. We consider these cases to remain in the broad category of MMM, because once again, even if a party is overrepresented in the nominal tier relative to its vote share, it is still likely to receive a significant share of the list-tier seats. Nonetheless, the vote linkage provides partial compensation for smaller parties by reducing the number of list seats that such an over-represented party will win compared with a fully parallel system.

In the bottom row of Table 1, we find systems that entail the opposite principle from the MMM systems. Whereas mixed member majoritarian (MMM) systems add seats from the list tier in parallel, even for parties that are already over-represented in the nominal tier, systems with compensatory seat linkage provide list seats to compensate parties that are under-represented in nominal-tier allocation. These MMP systems ensure that the total number of seats in an allocation district-the whole nation in Germany and New Zealand, states in Venezuela-are allocated proportionally

10.5 Advantages of o mixed member proportional system

Some specific advantages of Mixed Member Proportional are:

- a) Mixed Member Proportional (MMP) retains the proportionality benefits of Proportional Representation (PR) systems, it also ensures that voters have geographical representation. They also have the luxury of two votes, one for the party and one for their local MP.
- b) While MMP retains the proportionality benefits of PR systems, it also ensures that elected representatives are linked to geographical districts. However, where voters have two votes-one for the party and one for their local representative-it is not always understood that the vote for the local representative is less important than the party vote in determining the overall allocation of seats in the legislature.

- c) Furthermore, MMP can create two classes of legislators-one group primarily responsible and beholden to a constituency and another from the national party list without geographical ties and beholden to the party. This may have implications for the cohesiveness of groups of elected party representatives.
- d) It retains the proportionality benefits of a wholly PR election- there is a relationship between votes obtained, and representative positions won while ensuring votes have some accountable geographic representation.
- e) It allows voters to have two votes- so votes can be split between parties/people representing different parts of a voter's views.
- f) It is an inclusive system, enabling the legislature to be composed of representatives of various political movements, including minorities, within society.
- g) Under the Mixed Member Proportional system, few votes are 'wasted'; thus, voter turnout is encouraged.
- h) It promotes diversity in candidate nominations for election, assists the election of minorities, and provides representation for some minority or small /regional parties.

10.6 Disadvantages of o mixed member proportional system

- i) One problem of Mixed Member Proportional System (MMP) is that the vote for their local MP is far less important than the party vote in determining the overall allocation of parliamentary seats, and voters do not always understand this. Furthermore, and akin to the difficulties inherent within Parallel systems, MMP can create two classes of MPs.

It should also be remembered that in translating votes into seats, MMP can be as proportional an electoral system as pure List PR, and is therefore bedevilled with all the previously-cited advantages and disadvantages of PR.
- ii) The Mixed Member Proportional System can tend to promote coalition or weak governments, which is difficult to disclose from power.
- ii) Under Mixed Member Proportional System, the vote for a local constituency representative is less important than the vote for a political party in determining the overall allocation of seats. A mixed Member Proportional System can create two classes of parliamentary representatives, each with a different agenda within their party.

- iii) The Mixed Member Proportional System can be complicated for voters to understand how seats are allocated under Mixed Member Proportional System and may require substantial voter education efforts.
- iv) The Mixed Member Proportional System can give rise to 'strategic voting' where votes are encouraged to vote in their constituency for a candidate from a party other than, but in sympathy with, the party they support, to maximise their party's seats under the proportional representation allocation.
- v) The Mixed Member Proportional System is more compressor voters to use for election administrations than the list proportional representation system. At the same time, they are delivering the exact proportionality of results.

In translating votes into seats, MMP can be as proportional to an electoral system as pure List PR, and therefore shares many of PR's previously cited advantages and disadvantages. However, MMP is sometimes seen as less preferable than straight List PR because it can give rise to what is called 'strategic voting' anomalies.

However, one reason why MMP is sometimes seen as less preferable than straight List PR is that it can give rise to what are called 'strategic voting' anomalies. In New Zealand in 1996, in the constituency of Wellington Central, some National Party strategists urged voters not to vote for the National Party candidate, because they had calculated that under MMP his election would not give the National Party another seat in parliament, but simply replace another MP from their party list. It was therefore better for the National Party to see a candidate elected from another party, providing he was in sympathy with the National Party's ideas and ideology, than for votes to be 'wasted' in support of their own candidate.

10.7 Conclusion

Mixed-member systems have been largely successful thus far. They appear to be more likely than most other electoral systems to generate two-block party systems, without in the process reducing minor parties to insignificance. In addition, they are more likely than any other class of electoral system to simultaneously generate local accountability as well as a nationally oriented party system. Other electoral systems may generate a mix of these attributes, but generally not without introducing features that may be seen as undesirable, such as intra-party competition and factionalism, which frequently characterize STV or open-list PR. Mixed-member systems simultaneously encourage divergent incentives that lead party systems to exhibit many of the features of the "efficient" and desirable balance.

On the interparty dimension, they permit some parties to specialize in SSDs and others to specialize in lists. On the intraparty dimension, they permit some legislators to specialize in appealing to local interests while others attend to their party's national priorities.

The central question is- whether mixed-member electoral systems might prove to be the electoral reform of the twenty-first century. Whether or not they will depends to a large degree on how their performance is viewed in the numerous countries that have adopted them in recent years. In particular, it will be crucial to see if their promise of delivering the best of both the majoritarian and proportional worlds of electoral systems is realized. The prospects for the spread of mixed-member systems also depend on the presence elsewhere of the basic conditions that brought about the recent proliferation of mixed-member systems.

Finally, no electoral system is free of disadvantages. Even if mixed-member systems did indeed provide the best of both worlds as we think they often do they nonetheless draw criticism on several accounts. All the criticisms of mixed-member electoral systems, perhaps the most serious is that they are too complex. Simplicity is usually held to be a virtue in electoral systems and MM systems have been criticized as introducing unnecessary complexity. If the connection between voting behaviour and seat outcomes is not readily apparent, the legitimacy of the electoral system may suffer. Some studies have noted that voters in Germany, the longest established MM system, do not really understand whether the nominal vote or the list vote is more important. At the same time, German voters have managed to make good strategic use of their two votes over the years, even if they do not fully understand the mechanics of their MMP system.

10.8 Summing Up

- Shape a legitimate electoral system is a big challenge for any representative body in any democratic political system.
- No electoral system is perfect; each has its advantages and disadvantages.
- The conditions citizens choose their representatives pertain to the critical issues in a democratic system.
- Mixed? member electoral systems are described as a mixture of two principles of electoral system design.
- The mixed? member electoral systems as a subset of the broader category of multiple? tier electoral systems.
- The typology of systems outlined is arranged in three main sections, Mixed? Member Systems as Variants of Multiple? Tier Electoral Systems; Majoritarian or

Short Questions

1. Explain how ballots are counted in the mixed member representation system.
2. Mention the main features of Mixed-member proportional representation.

Objective Questions

1. What is the full form of MMM in representation system?
2. Name any one country has introduced the mixed member representation system?
3. When did the Italian Senate institute the mixed-member election system?

10.10 Further Reading:

- Matthew Shugart., and Martin P. Wattenberg, editors. *Mixed-Member Electoral Systems: The Best of Both Worlds?* Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Reynolds, A., Reilly, B., Ellis, A., 2005. Electoral System Design. The New International IDEA Handbook. Stockholm: International IDEA.
- Bawn, K., Thies, M.F., "A Comparative Theory of Electoral Incentives: Representing the Unorganized under PR, Plurality and Mixed-Member Electoral Systems", *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 15(1), 2003, pp 5-32.
- Bochsler, D., 2009. "Are Mixed Electoral Systems the Best Choice for Central and Eastern Europe or the Reason for Defective Party Systems?" *Politics & Policy* 37(4), 735-767.
- Farrell, D.M. *Electoral Systems. A Comparative Introduction*, New York: Palgrave, Macmillan. 2011
- Lijphart, A. *Electoral Systems and Party Systems: A Study of Twenty-Seven Democracies 1945-1990*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1994.

MODULE – 3

Unit 11 □ Historical Context of Emergence of Party System

Structure

- 11.1 Objectives**
- 11.2 Introduction**
- 11.3 Historical Background of Political Party System**
- 11.4 The Essentiality of Political Party**
- 11.5 Definition of Political Party**
- 11.6 Characteristics of political parties**
- 11.7 Conclusion**
- 11.8 Summing Up**
- 11.9 Probable Questions**
- 11.10 Further Readings**

11.1 Objective

After reading of this unit, learners will be able to :

- Discuss the Origin and development of the political system
- To define political party
- Understand the Characteristics of Political Parties
- Explain the importance of Political Party in a democracy.

11.2 Introduction

Political party means a group of persons organized to acquire and exercise political power. Political parties originated in their modern form in Europe and the United States in the 19th century, along with the electoral and parliamentary systems, whose development reflects the evolution of parties. The term party has since come to be applied to all organized groups seeking political power, whether by democratic elections or by revolution.

In earlier, aristocratic and monarchical regimes, the political process unfolded within restricted circles in which cliques and factions, grouped around particular noblemen or influential personalities, were opposed to one another. The establishment of parliamentary

regimes and the appearance of parties at first scarcely changed this situation. To cliques formed around princes, dukes, counts, or marquesses there were added cliques formed around bankers, merchants, industrialists, and businessmen. Regimes supported by nobles were succeeded by regimes supported by other elites. These narrowly based parties were later transformed to a greater or lesser extent, in the 19th century in Europe and America into organized Political party depending on mass support.

The 20th century saw the spread of political parties throughout the entire world. In less-developed countries, large modern political parties have sometimes been based on traditional relationships, such as ethnic, tribal, or religious affiliations. Moreover, many political parties in less-developed countries are partly political, partly military. Certain socialist and communist parties in Europe earlier experienced the same tendencies.

11.3 Historical Background of Political Party System

Party system is an essential feature of the present representative system of governance. And in practice the government is run with the help of political parties. The emergence of this party politics is a relatively recent event. According to John Blondel, the discussion of party system is still in its primary stage. In ancient Greece and Rome, various clans and groups played the role of political parties. In the Middle Ages, that authority was taken over by the influential contemporary communities such as the aristocracy, the priesthood, the merchant class, etc. In ancient times the political parties did not play useful role in the Greek city-state or in the city life of Rome or in the industrial society in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In fact, the emergence and development of political parties is closely related to the development of the democratic system. However, political parties in the modern sense were formed in England in the seventeenth century. 'Whig' and 'Tory' parties were formed during the reign of 1st Queen Elizabeth. A political party in the modern sense is a political institution or instrument. Political parties are organized as a means to win elections and grab government power. Political parties emerged for this purpose in the early nineteenth century. At present political party system is practically a universal system. Apart from dictatorship and military rule, the existence of political parties is observed everywhere in the rest of the world. And now the party system is the lifeblood of democracy.

11.4 Functions of Political Party

Representative democracy is now seen in most countries. In such a political system, the existence of a political party is essential. There is no room for doubt in this matter. The nature and characteristics of socio-economic conditions are different in

different types of political systems. Due to this, there are differences between the political parties in different countries. In his book 'Modern Politics and Government', Alan Ball says: "Political parties exist in differing forms in various political systems, and while not essential to the political process, it is difficult to imagine the political consequences of their absence in the vast majority of states." Political parties are essential to conduct modern political activities and significance of this role is universally acknowledged. Political parties are one of the major part of modern politics. Political parties have a meaningful connection between government institutions and the various groups and interests of society, and between the state and civil society, regardless of their nature or role.

However, political parties in any state are a part of the existing political structure. Therefore, political parties are closely related to the change of the political system. In recent times, the activities of political parties have expanded over a wide area of political life, regardless of whether they are liberal or socialist.

In a democratic political system Political parties write Sectional interests, bridge the geographical differences, and induce cohesion. Various interests are aggregated through the parties. They stimulate interest in Political affairs and link together, the diverse groups in society. In generals parties or gamise major differences of opinion or interests. Around opposing programmes of action.

Political Parties perform the political recruitment functions. Both leaders and cadres are recruited by them while the leaders run the government as perform the role of the opposition, the cadres maintain day to day contacts between the people and the parties. They set agenda for national debate in or outside the legislature. Through all the effective media of communication they also act an civic educators.

As intermediaries between state and society in their capacity as agents of articulation and aggregation of interests political parties play a crucial role in a democratic political system. In fact, parties are institutionalized links between Society and the State.

In competitive electoral democracies political parties are indispensable. They organize the electoral competition by offering alternative choices of candidates, issues and Programmes to the public. After the election they step in to form the government. Through their active role in government or in the opposition they exercise control over and give direction government.

11.5 Definition of Political Party

Different political scientists have given different definitions of political parties. If several individuals agree on some of the basic social, political and economic issues of

the state and try to seize governmental power in a democratic way by campaigning for the betterment of the country based on the fundamental unity of ideology, then those group of individuals are called political parties. Edmund Burke says: 'A group of people is called a political party for the purpose of expanding national interests through a concerted effort based on certain principles. In his words: "The party is a body of men united for promoting, by their joint endeavors the national interest upon some particular principle in which they are all agreed." Earnest Barker also agreed with the view; and he says, all political parties are motivated by the national interest and seek the support of the electorate by taking comprehensive action on issues of common interest to the nation as a whole. In his book 'Principle of Social and Political Theories', Barker says, "A party is a particular body of opinion (otherwise it would not be a party), which is none the less concerned with the general national interest and which forms, and presents to the choice of the electorate a programme of general national scope and width." McIver said that an organized mass is a political party if it tries to seize power in a legitimate way based on principles and ideals. "We may define a political party as an association organized in support of some principle or policy which by constitutional means endeavors to make the determinant government," he said. According to him, the broad basis of a political party is personal or group interests, usually group interests.

According to Harold Laswell, among modern writers, a political party is an organization that sets out election programs and field candidates. Franz Neumann states that "a political party is an active organization in a certain section of the politically conscious human race that seeks to gain public power by competing with other political groups that believe in a particular ideology." Franz Neumann, in his book 'The Democratic and the Authoritarian State,' states that, "... the most important instrument for the translation of social power is the political party." E. B. Schulz argued that, "A political party is a permanent and cohesive organization of individuals or groups of specific interests, whose goal is to formulate and implement the desired policies by bringing its members into governmental power." Maurice Duverger, in his book *Political Parties the Organization and Activity in the Modern State*, states that "political parties are an organization with a definite structure." He says: "A party is a community with a particular structure."

The definition given by Alan Ball is simple and straightforward. He discussed about political parties in his renowned book 'Modern Politics and Government'. According to Ball, a mass organization is a political party if it seeks to seize and maintain political power individually or in conjunction with other parties. "Political parties may be principally defined by their common aim," They seek political power either singly or in co-operation with other political parties.

Based on the above definitions, it can be easily said that political party refers to a group of citizens who believe in the same political ideology and try to take over the government in a constitutional way to achieve political objectives.

11.6 Characteristics of Political Parties

In the light of the above discussion, following features of Parties can be identified:

- (1) A political party is made up of people who are inspired, united and organized by the same ideology. However, there may be differences among the team members regarding the details of the activities. But the fundamental unity of ideology remains present.
- (2) Every political party has a specific program. The parties operate in a systematic and constitutional manner to make this program a reality.
- (3) Political parties develop their agenda based on their respective philosophies. In order to win elections and execute their plan, they want to win over the masses.
- (4) The party tries to form public opinion in favor of its own ideology by continuously discussing the contemporary issues of the country and its people.
- (5) Political parties compete against each other for the same thing, and that is gaining the power.
- (6) The ultimate goal of every political party is to form a government by winning the elections on the basis of public support and to implement the party's ideology and objectives by formulating appropriate policies. For this reason, organizations that are established for any particular social, economic or any other purpose are not called political parties. Joseph Schumpeter says: "The first and foremost aim of each political party is to prevail over the others in order to get into power or to stay in it."

11.7 Conclusion

It has often been said in the West that political parties are in a state of decline. Actually, this has been a long-standing opinion in certain conservative circles, arising largely out of a latent hostility to parties, which are viewed as a divisive force among citizens, a threat to national unity, and an enticement to corruption and demagoguery. In certain European countries-France, for example-right-wing political organizations have even refused to call themselves parties, using instead such terms as movement, union, federation, and

centre.

In terms of size and number, however, political parties are not declining but growing. At the turn of the 20th century they were confined mainly to Europe and North America; elsewhere they were quite weak or non-existent. In the early 21st century, parties were found practically everywhere in the world. And in Europe and North America there were generally far more people holding membership in parties than prior to 1914. Parties of the early 21st century were larger, stronger, and better-organized than those of the late 19th century. In the industrialized countries, especially in western Europe, parties have become less revolutionary and innovative, and this factor may explain the rigid and worn-out image that they sometimes present.

The growth of parties into very large organizations may be responsible for the feelings of powerlessness on the part of many individuals involved with them. This is a problem experienced by people who find themselves part of any large organization, whether it be a political party, business enterprise, corporation, or union. The difficulties involved in reforming or changing political parties that have become large and institutionalized, coupled with the next-to-impossible task of creating new parties likely to reach sufficient strength to be taken seriously by the electorate, have resulted in much frustration and impatience with the party system. But it is difficult to imagine how democracy could function in a large industrialized country without political parties. In the modern world, democracy and political parties are two facets of the same reality, the inside and outside of the same fabric.

11.8 Summing Up

- i) The term party has since come to be applied to all organized groups seeking political power, whether by democratic elections or by revolution.
- ii) However, political parties in the modern sense were formed in England in the seventeenth century.
- iii) The role of political parties is essential to conduct modern political activities and the originality and significance of this role is universally acknowledged.
- iv) The broad basis of a political party is personal or group interests, usually group interests.
- v) A political party is a special means of gaining political power. The party acts as a way for the individual or group to gain political power.
- vi) According to Lenin, the struggle of the political party is the most comprehensive and precise manifestation of the most objective purpose of the political struggle of the classes.

11.9 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions:

- i) Discuss the major functions of the Political Parties.
- ii) Define Political Party and indicate its basic characteristics.

Long answer type Questions:

- i) In what way Political Parties promote democracy?
- ii) Account for the decline of Political Parties in the west.

Short Questions:

- i) What are the defining characteristics of the Political Party?
- ii) What is the reason for the feeling of powerlessness of the party of the party members?

11.12 Further Readings

1. Abedi, A. (2002). Challenges to established parties: The effects of party system features on the electoral fortunes of anti-political-establishment parties. *European Journal of Political Research* 41, 551-583. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
2. Benoit, K. & Laver, M. (2006). *Party policy in modern democracies*. London: Routledge. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
3. Birch, S. (2003). *Electoral systems and political transformation in post-communist Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)
4. Conti, N., Hutter, S. & Nanou, K. (2018). Party competition and political representation in crisis: An introductory note. *Party Politics* 24(1), 3-9. [CrossRefGoogle Scholar](#)

Unit 12 □ Types of Political Party System: Bi-Party System in USA & UK

Structure

- 12.1 Objective**
- 12.2 Introduction**
- 12.3 Classification of Political Parties**
- 12.4 Bi-party System**
- 12.5 Merits of a Bi-party System**
- 12.6 Arguments against Bipartisanship**
- 12.7 Bi-party Systems in USA & UK**
- 12.8 The American two-party System**
- 12.9 The British two-party System**
- 12.10 Conclusion**
- 12.11 Summing Up**
- 12.12 Probable Questions**
- 12.13 Further Reading**

12.1 Objective

After the study of this unit, learners will be able to :

- Understand the Classification of Political Parties
- Discuss the Bi-party system
- Explain merits and demerits of Bi-party system
- Understand the Bi-party system in USA and UK

12.2 Introduction

Political parties are important not only because of the different functions they perform but also because of the various functions they perform but also because the complex interrelationships between and among parties are crucial in structuring the way. Politics system work in practice.

Clarification of Party system

The network of relationships is called a party system. It is said that in an age of Position dealignment are volatile voting pattern, Party systems are losing their systemic character. As a result it becomes difficult to distinguish one system from another.

Giovanni Sartori's "A Typology of Party Systems," (1976) provides two specific rules for determining the relevance of a particular party. The first rule argues "a minor party can be discounted as irrelevant whenever it remains over time superfluous, in the sense that it is never needed or put to use for any feasible coalition majority." In this sense a party should not be counted for classification purposes if it fails to exhibit coalitional potential. The second rule argues that "a party qualifies for relevance whenever its existence, or appearance, affects the tactics of party competition and particularly when it alters the direction of the competition." Here a party is not counted for classification unless it demonstrates blackmail potential. In Sartori's view, a party only needs to exhibit one of these qualities to be considered relevant.

The most familiar way of distinguishing between different types of parties competing for power. Using this criteria Maurice Duverger distinguished "one party" two party and multi party systems.

Using the percentage of legislative seats as criteria, Ware outlines four main types of party systems: (1) two-and-a-half party systems, (2) systems with one large party and several much smaller ones, (3) systems with two larger parties and several much smaller ones, and (4) even multiparty systems. This approach "assumes that the behavior of a party system is likely to be influenced by the size of a party's opponents in relation to its own size." In essence, the structure of competition and cooperation should vary across the different type of systems, thus highlighting a need for consideration of relative size.

A final way of conceptualizing party systems can be found in Robert Dahl's "Party System and Patterns of Opposition" (1966). In an effort to combine the issues of "number of important parties" and "internal unity of party," Dahl offers four categories: (1) two party systems with a high degree of internal party unity, (2) two-party systems

with relatively low internal party unity, (3) multiparty systems with relatively high internal party unity, and (4) multiparty systems with low internal party unity. Once again the structure of competition seems to be the main focus. The argument is that the competitiveness of opposition within a system is a function of both the number and nature of parties, i.e. "the extent to which opposition is concentrated (1966).

Classifying a party system appears, prima facie, no more difficult than counting the number of parties in a polity and classifying the system accordingly: two parties, a two-party system; three parties, a three-party system; more than three parties, a multi-party-system. However, there are difficulties associated with such a task. We have to with question related to the appropriate definition for party and party systems, factors determining a parties' inclusion in the count, criteria for a parties' relevance or credibility, and the roles of behaviour, competition and party unity. These issues often lead to very distinct typologies of party systems. Hopefully continued research and discussion of the issues listed above will lead to the development of adequate typology that incorporates the view of all sides.

12.3 Classification of Political Parties

Political scientists have generally divided political parties into three groups on the basis of numbers. These are (i) one-party system, (ii) two-party system and (iii) multi-party system respectively.

One-Party System

In a one-party system, there is no competition in this system. Here, the lone party nominates the candidates and the voters have only two choices i.e.

- Not to vote at all or
- write 'yes' or 'no' against the name of the candidates nominated by the party

Such a political system has been prominent in authoritarian regimes and communist countries such as China, North Korea, and Cuba. Before the collapse of communism, this system was also prevalent in USSR.

Two-Party System

In a two-party system, the power shifts between two major, dominant parties. So, for winning the elections, the winner will have to get the maximum number of votes. However, please know that maximum number of votes is not equivalent to a majority of votes.

So, the smaller parties tend to merge with the bigger parties or they drop out of elections. Such a parliamentary system prevails in Canada and Great Britain, in which there are two parties holding the maximum numbers of seats.

Multi-Party System

The third and the most common form of government is the multi-party system. In such a system, there are three or more parties which have the capacity to gain control of the government separately or in a coalition.

In case, no party achieves a clear majority of the legislative seats, then several parties join forces and form a coalition government. Countries like India, follow a multi-party system. Some people are of the view, that a multi-party system often leads to political instability in a country.

12.4 Bi-party System

A Bi-party system does not mean that a country has only two parties, and there is no third party. It means there are only two major parties and the rest of the parties are less important. For example, there are more than two parties in England, viz. Conservative Party, Labour Party, Liberal Party, Fascist and Communist Party. But in politics, only two parties are essential, i.e., the Conservative and the Labour Party. Sometimes the Conservative Party and, at other times, the Labour Party forms the Government. The Communist and the Fascist Party have obtained no seat. In the House of Commons, the Liberal Party has only a few seats.

Similarly, though many parties like the Communist Party, the Republican Party, and the Democratic Party, only Republican and Democratic Parties are essential and form the Government. The Communist Party has no importance in politics. Thus, there is a bi-party system in Great Britain and the U.S.A. Where there is a multiparty system, there are more than two essential parties in politics. This system prevails. France, West Germany, Italy, and certain other countries of Europe.

12.5 Merits of a Bi-party System

Arguments in favour of bi-party system:

Political scientists have made the following important arguments in favour of bipartisan system.

- (1) **Stability of government:** Bi-party system is especially useful for parliamentary system of government. If there are two political parties in the country, one party will be able to get an absolute majority in the elections and the majority party will be able to form a strong and powerful government. This will ensure the stability of the government and the ruling party government will be able to devote itself to the overall welfare of the people.
- (2) **Role of the Opposition:** In a bi-party system, a party that becomes a minority in an election may make a constructive criticism of the government's activities as a strong opposition party. As a result, the arbitrariness of the government can be effectively prevented. Opposition parties have stated they will not run in the by-elections, but will seek to form a new government if the ruling party resigns. Laski says: "It makes known and intelligible the result of its failure. It brings an alternative government into immediate beings. "
- (3) **Benefits of Policy and Candidate Selection:** If the election is held on the basis of bi-party system, there is competition between the nominated candidates of the two parties on the basis of two clear alternative policies and programs. This makes it easier for the electorate to set policies and select candidates. Barker says: "The citizen will choose the most freely ... when he has a clear choice between two alternatives."
- (4) **Lasky's view:** According to Lasky, the political system which is formed on the basis of mutual opposition of the two major political parties is more satisfactory. He says: "... a political system is the more satisfactory, the more it is able to express itself through the antithesis of two great parties."
- (5) **Protection of national interest:** In a bipartisan system, the ruling party and the opposition are responsible to the people for their respective responsibilities. Therefore, both the parties have to be careful about safeguarding the national interest. As a result, there is no room for individual, group or group narrow-mindedness or selfishness in any party.

12.6 Arguments against bi-party system

Despite the existence of the above advantages, various arguments are put forward against the bi-party system.

- (A) **Different opinions are not reflected:** If there are only two political parties in the country, not all the statements and opinions of the people can be properly reflected.

Those who do not support the policy of either of the two political parties in the country do not get a chance to vote for the party candidate of their choice. That is why it is said that in a bipartisan system, the opportunity to express the views of the people is limited. It is not democratic to limit the choice of the people to the policies, ideals and programs of only two political parties.

- (B) **Autocracy of the Cabinet:** In a bi-party system, one-party rule is established and Parliament becomes obedient to the one-party cabinet. As a result, there is a danger of the cabinet becoming autocratic. Ramsay Muir shows how cabinet dictatorship has been established in Britain's bipartisan system of government. The British monarchy has established a monopoly on the key areas of government, such as policy-making, income-expenditure control, and legislation, based on a two-party system. This has led to the creation of a 'New Depotism'.
- (C) **Vested interests:** vested interests are created in a two-party system. The ruling party establishes the interests of a class. But there are many interests in the whole country. Once a party wins a majority in an election and comes to power, it exercises government power in the narrow party and vested interests. As a result, there is a danger of neglecting the larger interests of the country and its people.
- (D) **Party intolerance arises:** In a bipartisan system of governance, the ruling party, supported by the majority, considers all its decisions as infallible and implements them indiscriminately. By misleading the masses through propaganda, the ruling party continues to try to maintain its dominance and authority in any way. Opposition criticism is not taken lightly. There is a kind of intolerance of the ruling party towards the opposition. But tolerance and dialogue are essential for the success of democratic governance.

12.7 Bi-party systems in USA & UK

A comparison may be made between the two-party system as it is found in the United States and as it is found in Great Britain. Although two major parties dominate political life in the two countries, the system operates in quite different ways.

12.8 The American two-party System

The American party system has generally always been a two-party system, especially at the national level. This kind of system ensures that minority viewpoints can't control the government. There are no actual explicit legal prohibitions against third parties in America,

but most governmental institutions require a plurality, and that has generally resulted in two-party domination. The actual parties in control have changed several times over the course of history, and currently they are the Democrats and the Republicans.

The first American party system involved the Republicans of Thomas Jefferson's time and a party called the Federalists. The Republicans were interested in states' rights and individual freedom. The Federalists believed in a strong central government and using government power to maintain control over the populace. On the **foreign policy** front, the Republicans favored keeping a good relationship with the French, while the Federalists were sympathetic to Britain.

Those parties eventually died and were replaced in the early 1800s by the second American party system involving the Democrats and the Whigs. At that time, the Democrats were basically conservative and populist. They favored states' rights and old-fashioned values. The Whigs were the party of strong governmental power and progressive thought, or the equivalent in that time. They also sometimes favored restricting individual freedoms through alcohol bans.

In the mid-1800s during the ramp up to the **Civil War**, there was a total breakdown of the party system followed by a short period of chaos. At the end of that period, the remaining parties were the Democrats and the Republicans, which have been the two parties ever since. In those days, the Republicans were the party opposed to slavery, while the Democrats were the party in favor of it, and this was the main thing that separated the two. Over time, these parties have changed and evolved in many different ways.

In the current American party system, the Democrats are the party of liberal thought. They tend to favor things like social programs, financial regulation, and strict enforcement of **civil rights**. The Republicans are the party of small government and conservative thought. They generally favor states' rights, low taxes, and maintenance of a strong military. When it comes to social issues, the roles are often reversed, with the Democrats favoring lessened government involvement, while the Republicans often favor a more active government role in maintaining traditional values.

American parties are different from their counterparts in other Western countries. They are not tied in the same way to the great social and ideological movements that have so influenced the development of political life in Europe during the last two centuries. There have been socialist parties at various times in the history of the United States, but they have never challenged the dominance of the two major parties. It can be argued that the main reason for the failure of socialist parties in America has been the high degree of upward mobility permitted by a rich and continually expanding economy. The consequence of this mobility has been that class consciousness has never developed in the United States in a manner that would encourage the formation of large socialist or communist parties.

In comparison with European political movements, therefore, American parties have appeared as two varieties of one liberal party, and within each party can be found a wide range of opinion, going from the right to the left.

The American parties have a flexible and decentralized structure, marked by the absence of discipline and rigid hierarchy. This was the structure of most of the cadre-type parties of the 19th century, a structure that most liberal parties have retained. Federalism and a concern for local autonomy accentuate the lack of rigid structure and the weakness of lines of authority in the parties. Organization may be relatively strong and homogeneous at the local level, but such control is much weaker on the state level and practically non-existent on the national level. There is some truth to the observation that the United States has not two parties but 100—that is, two in each state. But it is also true that each party develops a certain degree of national unity for the presidential election and that the leadership of the president within a party gives the victorious party some cohesion.

The lack of rigid party structure has historically encouraged bipartisanship between Republican and Democratic members of Congress. Through the 20th century, liberal Republicans and Democrats tended to ally against conservative Republicans and Democrats. Yet neither bloc was stable, and the alignment varied from one vote to another. As a consequence, despite the existence of a two-party system, no stable legislative majority was possible. In order to have his budget adopted and his legislation passed, the president of the United States was forced to carefully gather the necessary votes on every question, bearing the wearisome task of constantly forming alliances. The American two-party system was thus a pseudo-two-party system, because each party provided only a loose framework within which shifting coalitions were formed. Against this general tendency, however, voting has become increasingly partisan since about the first decade of the 21st century.

12.9 The British two-party system

Another form of the two-party system is operative in Great Britain. The history British two-party system generated from The English Civil War (1642-1651), fought between royalists who supported the absolute monarchy that reigned at the time, and parliamentarians who supported a constitutional monarchy. In a constitutional monarchy, the monarch's powers are bound by a constitution, a set of rules by which a country is governed. The parliamentarians also wanted a parliament with the power to make the country's legislation.

The English Civil War was also fought to decide how the three kingdoms of Ireland, Scotland, and England should be ruled. At the end of the war, parliamentarian Oliver Cromwell replaced the monarchy with the Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, unifying the isles under his personal rule. This move consolidated the rule of Ireland

by a minority of English landowners and members of the Protestant church. In turn, this further split Irish politics between Nationalists and Unionists.

Cromwell's commonwealth was a republican system that lasted until 1660 when the monarchy was reinstated. However, the English Civil war and the commonwealth were crucial in establishing the precedent that the monarch will need the parliament's support to govern in the UK. This principle is called "parliamentary sovereignty".

This set of events led to the emergence of the first political parties. These were the royalist Tories and the parliamentarian Whigs.

It wasn't until the 19th century, following the Representation of the People Acts of 1832 and of 1867, the two parties clarified their political positions to attract the new voters' support. The Tories became the Conservative Party, and the Whigs became the Liberal Party.

The Representation of the People Act of 1832 introduced changes in the electoral system of England and Wales. These included defining a "voter" as a "male person" for the first time and extending the vote to land and business owners and those who paid a yearly rent of at least £10.

The Representation of the People act of 1867 further extended the right to vote, and, by the end of 1868, all male heads of a household could vote.

The system of political parties, which existed in one form or another since at least the 18th century, has become a central element in the working of the constitution. Since the Second World War, all the Governments in the UK have been formed by either the Labour Party or the Conservative Party. From 1931 until 1974 Britain could be seen as having a two party system with the Conservative and Labour parties receiving over 85% of the votes in each general election and alternating in government.

From the February 1974 general election, when the Liberal Party received 19% of the vote and the two main parties' share of the vote fell to 75%, Britain could be said to have what political scientists have called a two and a half party system.

The Liberals became significant as their success in gaining votes from the other two parties could decide who won the general election and, in 1974 and, again, in 1977, when neither party had a majority in Parliament the Liberals decided who formed the Government.

This two and a half party system continued to the 2005 and 2010 general elections when the Liberal Democrat share of the vote was 22-23% and the two main parties' share fell further to 65-67% and this helped to bring the Liberal Democrats into Government after 2010.

Great Britain has had two successive two-party alignments: Conservative and Liberal prior to 1914 and Conservative and Labour since 1935. The period from 1920 to 1935

constituted an intermediate phase between the two. Britain's Conservative Party is actually a Conservative-Liberal Party, resulting from a fusion of the essential elements of the two great 19th-century parties. Despite the name Conservative, its ideology corresponds to political and economic liberalism. A similar observation could be made about the other major European conservative parties, such as the German Christian Democratic Party.

The British two-party system depends on the existence of rigid party discipline; that is, parties in which there is effective discipline regarding parliamentary voting patterns. In every important vote, all party members are required to vote as a bloc and to follow to the letter the directives that they agreed upon collectively or that were decided for them by the party leaders. A relative flexibility may at times be tolerated, but only to the extent that such a policy does not compromise the action of the government. It may be admissible for some party members to abstain from voting if their abstention does not alter the results of the vote. Thus, the leader of the majority party (who is at the same time the prime minister) is likely to remain in power throughout the session of Parliament, and the legislation he or she proposes will likely be adopted. There is no longer any real separation of power between the executive and legislative branches, for the government and its parliamentary majority form a homogeneous and solid bloc before which the opposition has no power other than to make its criticisms known. During the five years for which a Parliament meets, the majority in power is completely in control, and only internal difficulties within the majority party can limit its power.

Since each party is made up of a disciplined group with a recognized leader who becomes prime minister if his or her party wins the legislative elections, these elections perform the function of selecting both the legislature and the government. In voting to make one of the party leaders the head of the government, the British assure the leader of a disciplined parliamentary majority. The result is a political system that is at once stable, democratic, and strong; and many would argue that it is more stable, more democratic, and stronger than systems anywhere else.

This situation presupposes that both parties agree regarding the fundamental rules of a democracy. If a fascist party and a communist party were opposed to one another in Great Britain, the two-party system would not last very long. The winner would zealously suppress the opponent and rule alone.

The system, of course, does have its weak points, especially insofar as it tends to frustrate the innovative elements within both parties. But it is possible that this situation is preferable to what would happen if the more extreme elements within the parties were permitted to engage in unrealistic policies. The risk of immobility is in fact a problem for any party in a modern industrial society, and not just for those in a two-party situation. The problem is related to the difficulties involved in creating new organizations capable of being

taken seriously by an important segment of the population and in revitalizing long-standing organizations encumbered by established practices and entrenched interests.

12.10 Conclusion

The organization and structure of parties crucially influence the distribution of power within society at large. Party democracy can be promoted either by a wide dispersal of power within the party by the concentration of power in the hands of the parties elected and publicly accountable member oligarchic tendencies may be arise an inevitable consequences of organization or they may arise from the need for party unity and electoral credibility.

12.11 Summing Up

A party system is a network of relationships through which parties interact and influence the political process. In one party systems, a ruling party electively function as a permanent government. In two party system power alternates between two major parties. In multiparty systems, no party is large enough to rule alone, leading to a system of coalition government.

12.12 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions :

- i) Discuss the bi-party system in UK.
- ii) Make comparative study of the party system in UK and USA.

Long answer type Questions :

- i) How would you claim party system.
- ii) What are the major arguments against bi-party system?

Short Questions :

- i) What is meant by bipartisanship?
- ii) Why is U.S. two party system called pseudo two party system?

12.13 Further Reading

1. Armingeon, K., Wenger, V., Wiedemeier, F., Isler, C., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D. & Engler, S. (2017). *Comparative Political Data Set 1960–2016*. Bern: Institute of Political Science, University of Berne. [Google Scholar](#)
2. Bakker, R., deVries, C., Edwards, E., Hooghe, L., Jolly, S., Marks, G., Polk, J., Rovny, J. Steenbergen, M. & Vachudova, M (2015). Measuring party positions in Europe: The Chapel Hill expert survey trend file, 1999–2010. *Party Politics* 21(1), 143–152. [CrossRef](#) [Google Scholar](#)
3. Baumgartner, F. R. & Jones, B. D. (1993). *Agendas and instability in American politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Google Scholar](#)
4. *Encyclopedia Britannica*
5. In Manow, P., Palier, B. & Schwander, H., eds., *Welfare democracies and party politics: Explaining electoral dynamics in times of changing welfare capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Unit 13 □ Uni-party System: China

Structure

- 13.1 Objective
- 13.2 Introduction
- 13.3 Uni-party System or Single-party Systems
- 13.4 Single-party System in China
- 13.5 Communist Party of China
- 13.6 Conclusion
- 13.7 Summing Up
- 13.8 Probable Questions
- 13.9 Further Reading

13.1 Objective

After going through this unit, learner should be able to: / After the study of this unit, learners will be able to:

- Understand the meaning of Uni-party system
- Discuss the Uni-party system
- Explain the Uni-party system in China
- Discuss the organizational structure of Communist party in China.
- Discuss the role of Communist party in China.

13.2 Introduction

In a party a single party enjoys a monopoly of power through the exetention of all other parties. mono politics parties effectively function as permanents with no meeharisin through which they can be removed from power.

They invariably develop an estrenched relationship with the state machine. These states are classified as one party state and their machinery is seen as a fissed Party-

state apparatus. One party state proclaim its own brand of philosophy and a Peculiar way of fire to which the whole society is forced to confirm. What the party specaks is truth and an everything else is fallehood. Such a situation spells a grave danger democracy.

13.3 Uni-party System or Single-party Systems

In a one-party system, a state controlled by a political party is a type of single state where only one political party has the right to form a government, usually on the basis of existing constitution.

In a one-party system, patronage is shown towards a specific goal, ideology and doctrine. In this situation it becomes impossible to develop multi-faceted thoughts of social life. Distortion is seen in the case of social thought. Citizens' personality development and expression of originality are hindered. In a one-party system, emphasis is placed on artificially creating like-minded people and common vision. His diverse ideology is destroyed. For this reason, according to many, the one-party system is in fact a form of dictatorship. In fact, the one-party system is considered anti-democratic in terms of liberal democratic ideology.

Two differnt types of one party system can be identified. The first type is found in state socialist regimes where rulling communist parties have directed and controlled virtuality all the institutions and aspects of society. The second type of one party system is associated with anto colonial nationalism and state colosiladation in the developing world. In ghana, Tanvania and Zimbabwe, for example the rulisng party proclaimed the overriding need for nation-building and economic development; one party system in these countries have useually bulit around the dominant role of a charismatic leader.

13.4 Single-party System in China

China is a state with unitary political system. In other words, there is not a division of legislative power between the central government and the provincial governments in China. The national legislative power is exercised by National People's Congress (NPC) and the Standing Committee of National People's Congress. Among which: NPC is in charge of making the criminal law, the civil law, state organ laws and other basic laws. The politics of the People's Republic of China take place in a framework of a single-

party socialist republic. The leadership of the Communist Party is stated in the Constitution of the People's Republic of China. State power within the People's Republic of China (PRC) is exercised through the Communist Party of China, the Central People's Government and their provincial and local counterparts. Under the dual leadership system, each local Bureau or office is under the coequal authority of the local leader and the leader of the corresponding office, bureau or ministry at the next higher level. People's Congress members at the county level are elected by voters. These county level People's Congresses have the responsibility of oversight of local government, and elect members to the Provincial (or Municipal in the case of independent municipalities) People's Congress. The Provincial People's Congress in turn elects members to the National People's Congress that meets each year in March in Beijing. The ruling Communist Party committee at each level plays a large role in the selection of appropriate candidates for election to the local congress and to the higher levels.

13.5 Communist Party of China

The more than 80-million-member Communist Party of China (CPC) continues to dominate government. In periods of relative liberalization, the influence of people and organizations outside the formal party structure has tended to increase, particularly in the economic realm. Under the command economy system, every state-owned enterprise was required to have a party committee. The introduction of the market economy means that economic institutions now exist in which the party has limited or no power. Nevertheless, in all governmental institutions in the PRC, the party committees at all levels maintain an important role.

The Chinese Communist Party was founded in 1921 and formed the People's Republic of China's first government in 1949. It remains the country's sole governing political party and pervades all aspects of society. The CCP was founded as both a political party and a revolutionary movement in 1921 by revolutionaries such as Li Dazhao and Chen Duxiu. Those two men and others had come out of the May Fourth Movement (1919) and had turned to Marxism after the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Revolution of 1917. In the turmoil of 1920s China, CCP members such as Mao Zedong, Liu Shaoqi, and Li Lisan began organizing labour unions in the cities. The CCP joined with the Nationalist Party in 1924, and the alliance proved enormously successful at first. However, in 1927, after the Nationalists under Chiang Kai-shek (Jiang Jieshi) turned violently against the communists and ousted them from Shanghai, the CCP was driven underground.

Many of the CCP cadres, such as Mao, then abandoned their revolutionary activities among China's urban proletariat and went to the countryside, where they were so successful in winning peasant support that in 1931 the Chinese Soviet Republic, with a population of some 10 million, was set up in southern China. That entity was soon destroyed by the military campaigns of the Nationalists, however, and Mao and the remnants of his forces escaped in the Long March (1934-35) to Yan'an in northern China. It was during the march that Mao achieved the leadership position in the CCP that he held until his death in 1976. Other important leaders who supported him in that period were Zhou Enlai and Zhu De.

In 1936 in the Xi'an (Sian) Incident, Chiang Kai-shek was forced to call off his military campaigns against the CCP and instead enter into a United Front with it against increasing Japanese military aggression in China. While Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist forces basically sat out the war in Chongqing, the CCP tremendously expanded its strength by fighting the Japanese invaders. By the end of the war (1945), the party controlled base areas of some 100 million people and had an experienced army and a workable political program of alliance between peasants, workers, the middle class, and small capitalists.

The civil war recommenced in 1946, and the CCP's land-reform program increased its peasant support. Meanwhile, the Nationalists' ineptitude and demoralization cost them what little support they had. In 1949, after the Nationalists had been decisively defeated and retreated to Taiwan, the CCP and its allies founded the People's Republic of China.

In the next several years the life of the CCP was taken up with serious disagreements over the course of the country's development. At first the CCP adopted the Soviet model for development and closely allied itself with the Soviet Union. However, the CCP and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) soon found themselves increasingly at odds over foreign policy and ideology, and, as the 1950s ended, the CCP and CPSU broke their close ties with each other. Internally, the CCP attempted to hasten China's industrial development with bold but sometimes harmful programs, most disastrously with the Great Leap Forward (1958-60).

In 1966 Mao, who remained in serious disagreement with several other CCP leaders over the course of China's future economic and social development, launched the Cultural Revolution, and there followed a period of turbulent struggles between the CCP's radical wing under Mao and the more pragmatic wing led by Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping. Liu, Deng, and several other pragmatist leaders fell from power during the Cultural Revolution. An uneasy truce between radicals and pragmatists held from 1971 until 1976, when Zhou Enlai and Mao himself died. Almost immediately the radical

group known as the Gang of Four, including Mao's widow, were arrested, and soon afterward the frequently purged and frequently rehabilitated Deng Xiaoping reappeared and assumed paramount power. The Cultural Revolution was formally ended, and the program of the "Four Modernizations" (of industry, agriculture, science/technology, and defense) was adopted. Restrictions on art and education were relaxed, and revolutionary ideology was de-emphasized. After Mao's death Hua Guofeng was party chairman until 1981, when Deng's protege Hu Yaobang took over the post. Hu was replaced as the party general secretary (the post of chairman was abolished in 1982) by another Deng protégé, Zhao Ziyang, in 1987. Zhao was succeeded by Jiang Zemin in 1989, and Hu Jintao was elected general secretary in 2002. Hu was then followed as general secretary by Xi Jinping, who was elected to the post in 2012.

Party structure:

With more than 85 million members, the CCP is one of the largest political parties in the world. It is a monolithic, monopolistic party that dominates the political life of China. It is the major policy-making body in China, and it sees that the central, provincial, and local organs of government carry out those policies.

The CCP's structure is as follows. Once every five years or so, a National Party Congress of some 2,000 delegates (the number varies) meets in plenary session to elect a Central Committee of about 200 full members, which in turn meets at least once annually. The Central Committee elects a Political Bureau (Politburo) of about 20-25 full members; that body is the ruling leadership of the CCP. The Political Bureau's Standing Committee of about six to nine of its most-authoritative members is the highest echelon of leadership in the CCP and in the country as a whole. In practice, power flows from the top down in the CCP.

The CCP's Secretariat is responsible for the day-to-day administrative affairs of the CCP. The general secretary of the Secretariat is formally the highest-ranking official of the party. The CCP has a commission for detecting and punishing abuses of office by party members, and it also has a commission by which it retains control over China's armed forces. The CCP has basic-level party organizations in cities, towns, villages, neighbourhoods, major workplaces, schools, and so on.

Organisation of the Communist Party of China:

The Communist Party of China is a well-structured party organised on the basis of the principle of democratic centralism. The party admits 'democracy' by providing for the election of all party organs, as well as by accepting the principle of free discussions before decisions are taken.

Further, each lower-level party organ participates in the election of its higher-level organ. 'Centralism', however, also stands incorporated by the adoption of the principle that all obey the decisions of the Communist Party, and each lower organ carries out the commands of its higher organ. The party is a disciplined party and each person obeys the decisions of the party even over and above the decisions of the state.

1. Membership of the Communist Party:

The membership of the Communist Party is open to all citizens of China who have attained a minimum age of 18 years. However, securing of party membership is a difficult and complex affair. A person wishing to become its member has to submit an application for this purpose. This application has to be endorsed by two regular members who know the candidate, his ideology, character and personal history.

In case the application is found complete and fit, the candidate is put on probation for one year. Thereafter if he is found to be capable, he is admitted as a member. In case he is found deficient, his probation can be extended by one year and in case he still fails to satisfy the party, he is rejected and the party membership is denied to him.

The qualities of the probationers are judged by their work, by their acceptance of the party programmes and ideology, by their devotion towards the party work assigned to them, by their willingness to pay membership dues and by their faithfulness in carrying out the directives of the party.

A member can at any time resign his membership, but this is never done by him for it can mean an end to his political ambitions and career. The party can expel any member on charges of violating the ideology or policies of the party or on grounds of anti-party and counter-revolutionary activities.

Now rich businessmen can also become members of the CPC. It has been decided to make it an all-people party representing all ethnic groups.

2. Organisational Structure of the Communist Party:

The Communist Party of China is a tightly organised party. It stands organised on the basis of the principle of Democratic Centralism.

Cell or Primary Party Organisations (PPOs):

At the lowest level of party organisation are Cells or Primary Party Organisations which are located in factories, offices, schools, streets or bazaars. A cell generally consists of 20 members. The PPOs work for cementing the ties of the workers and peasants with the party and its leading bodies.

They do the propaganda work among the masses. They organize study circles for understanding and propagating properly the ideology of Marxism-Leninism as interpreted, applied and supplemented by Maoism.

A PPO with a membership of 100 or above, and acting with the consent of the next higher level committee, can hold a general membership meeting for electing a primary party committee which manages the activities of the concerned PPO.

3. Party Congress at the County Level:

All the PPOs of a county, or autonomous county or municipality work under the supervision of a Party Congress (PC). The Party Congress is elected by the general meeting or delegate meeting of all PPOs which are at work in a county.

The PC is elected for a term of two years. It meets once a year for discussing policy matters of local nature. It elects the delegates to the next higher level body-the Provincial Party Congress. It also elects its Party Committee which acts as its executive committee.

4. The Party Congress at the Provincial Level:

At the provincial/autonomous region or municipality (directly under the central control) level, there is the Provincial Party Congress (PPC). It is elected for a period of three years by the Party Congresses working within the province.

It meets thrice a year for discussing and deciding matters of regional importance. It supervises and guides the Party Congresses the province or region. It elects delegates to the National Party Congress. It also elects its party committee which acts as its executive.

5. National Party Congress:

The National Party Congress is the highest organ of the Communist Party of China. It is elected by the principal/regional party congresses for a term of five years. It is expected to meet at least once a year. In actual practice, its meetings are held after long intervals.

It determines the party policies and line of action. To receive and examine the reports of its Central Committee and other central organs of the party is its important function. It alone can amend or revise the party constitution. It carries out its work through its central committee.

6. Central Committee:

The Central Committee is elected by the National Party Congress for a term of five years. It has 198 full members and 158 alternate members (November 2002). It is

continuously at work because of the rule that a Central Committee goes out of office only when a new central committee succeeds it.

It has the responsibility to carry out the party work during the interval between the two sessions of the National Party Congress. The Central Committee has the responsibility to elect the chairman and other officials of the Communist Party of China. It also appoints various central organs of the party.

The Party constitution states that the Central Committee guides and supervises the work of the various branches of the Central Government **"through leading party members' groups within them."** It conducts relations between the Communist Party and other mass organisations and democratic parties operating in China.

It directs the work of the party units in the armed forces. All provincial and regional party organisations are responsible before the Central Committee.

7. Politburo and Standing Committee:

In the hierarchy of the Communist Party, the really powerful organ is the Politburo which is appointed by the Central Committee in its plenary session. It has now 24 members. Along with it, a Standing Committee, a General Secretary (initially called the chairman), a Central Commission and the Secretariat are also appointed by the Central Committee.

When the Central Committee is not in session, its powers are exercised by the Politburo and the Standing Committee. The Standing Committee is the real centre of power because it always consists of the top ranking seven leaders of the Communist Party. It is always in session and takes all decisions, which, however, are subject to the approval of the Politburo and the Central Committee.

The General Secretary is the top leader and his ideology/views/ideas always have a big influence on the decisions of the Standing Committee. During his life time, Mao remained the Chairman of the Party and wielded supreme power in the Chinese political system.

However, after the emergence of the concept of collective leadership in the Post-Mao period, other members of the Standing Committee also started playing an active role.

After the political leadership upheavals of the post-Mao years, Mr. Deng Xiaoping emerged as the top leader and continued to be at helms of the affairs of the Chinese Communist Party (CPC) till his death on February 20, 1997.

After his death Jiang Zemin emerged as his successor and controlled the party till 2002. In November 2002, the 16th National Congress unanimously elected Hu Jintao as

the General Secretary of CPC and it meant the retirement of Jiang Zemin.

8. The Central Commission and the Secretariat of CPC:

The Central Commission has the responsibility to maintain discipline among the members. It has 17 regular and 4 alternate members and it works through several Control Commissions. The Secretariat looks after the routine work of the party administration and works under the direction of the Politburo, the Standing Committee and the General Secretary.

The Communist Party of China is a well organised political party. We can call it a tightly organised party-organised on the basis of the principle of Democratic Centralism. Its structural organisation reflects an arrangement of wheels within a wheel. Further, the governmental organisation also follows closely its pattern of organisation.

Despite the separation made between the Party and the Government by the 1982 Constitution, the Communist Party of China continues to be fully involved in the working of the government. The decisions are definitely first made at the party level and then got legalized from the Government which again is under the thumb of the party.

Role of Communist Party of China:

(A) Role in the Making of Revolution:

Originating in 1921 as a very small group of just thirteen members who held their first meeting in Shanghai, the Communist Party of China registered a spectacular rise, particularly after 1935 when Mao emerged its leader. From 1921 to 1935, the Party had to live with a weak structure and a limited role. In 1927, it received a big setback when the Soviet representative Borodin was expelled from China and Chiang-Kai-Shek decided to control firmly the growing 'Communist menace' in China.

However, the march of events resulting from the Japanese threat to the sovereignty, independence and integrity of China, and the outbreak of the Second World War created conditions in which Chinag's Kuomintang accepted 'Cooperation with the Communists' for safeguarding Chinese national interests and integrity.

Further, the emergence of Mao-Tse- Tung as the undisputed and dynamic leader of the Communist Party, helped the party not only to revitalize its organisational network but also to capture the attention and support of the Chinese people, particularly the peasants working in the rural areas. Mao's strategy of first spreading 'Communism' in the rural areas and then surrounding the cities through guerilla tactics paid rich dividends. The whole-hearted support

that the (erstwhile) Soviet Union gave to the Communist Party enabled Mao to be in a position to challenge Chiang's regime.

By the time the Second World War ended, Mao was successful in bringing China to the verge of socialist revolution through a war of people's liberation which finally broke out in 1945. Within four years, the 'liberation' was achieved. Chiang-Kai-Sheik, along with his followers was forced to flee to Formosa.

The mainland China came under the Communists and on October 1, 1949, China came to be the People's Republic of China. A People's Democratic Dictatorship was established by the Communist Party under the leadership of chairman Mao Tse-tung. Thus, within fourteen years of his leadership, Mao was successful both in revitalizing the Communist Party as well as in staging through it a successful socialist revolution in China.

(B) Role of the Communist Party of China After the Revolution (1949-1954):

After 1949, the Communist Party of China, acting as the highest form of class organisation, started playing a core role in every aspect of country's life. Its leadership of the people as the vanguard for securing the gains of the revolution in the post-1949 period, was acknowledged by one and all.

On the one hand, the Communist Party started acting as the defender of the revolution, the leader and guide of the people, the supreme educator and the body responsible for initiating the process of nation-building in China.

On the other hand, it began exercising all power and authority on the basis of a common programme and the organic law as formulated by the party under the supreme guidance and direction of Mao.

Between 1949-54, China was governed by a provisional government with one organ-the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference. This body consisted of 662 delegates who represented all the political parties including the Communist Party, several mass organisations, the People's Liberation Army and the overseas Chinese.

It was, however, dominated by the Communist party and it worked on the basis of the Organic Law for realising the 'Common Programme' as conceived and formulated by Mao Tse-tung.

1. Role of the Communist Party under the 1954 Constitution:

The organisation and role of the Communist Party of China in the post-1954 period can be discussed either by dividing it in two parts-

- (i) Role and organisation in the Mao period, and
- (2) Role and organisation in the Post-Mao period or by analysing its positions under different constitutions.

In 1953, a committee headed by Mao Tse-Tung was constituted for drafting a constitution for the People's Republic of China. The Communist Party played a key role in drafting the constitution. This Constitution came into force in 1954.

The Constitution of 1954 did not give constitutional recognition to the Communist Party. Nevertheless, its role was clearly recognized in the deliberations held in connection with the drafting of the constitution.

Liu Shah-Chi clearly stated in his report before the drafting committee that the leadership of the Communist Party was essential not only for the Chinese people's democratic revolution, but also for the realization of socialism.

Its leadership and core role in the Chinese political system was accepted by one and all. Its ideology-Marxism- Leninism as defined and supplemented by Maoism was adopted as the ideology of China. The Communist party continued to work as an extra-constitutional supreme decision-making and directing body.

Its success in overthrowing the Chiang-regime and in securing a socialist revolution provided it with a huge credibility.

Its success enabled it to work as "the highest form of class organisation committed to play a disciplined, dedicated and core leadership role in the Chinese political system." All governmental institutions, all constituent party organs, all other organisations obeyed the commands of the Communist Party.

2. Role of the Communist Party under the 1975 Constitution (1975-78)-Communist Party as the only Constitutionally Recognized Party of China:

The 1975 Constitution accepted the supreme reality of the Chinese political system by giving constitutions' recognition to the Communist Party. It declared: "**The Communist Party of China is the core of the leadership of the whole Chinese people**", and "The working class exercises leadership over the state through the vanguard of the Communist Party of China".

Even the highest organ of state power-the National People's Congress (Chinese National Parliament) was placed under the leadership of the Party. All key power holders of the state were nominated by the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the state power merely legalized the appointments thus made.

The control over the Chinese Armed Forces - the People's Liberation Army was also exercised by the party.

The Preamble of the 1975 constitution narrated the achievements of the Communist Party during the past 20 years and committed the People's Republic of China to 'the continuing revolution' under the direction of the party. It was reaffirmed that China was committed to eliminate all enemies at home and abroad through national efforts as organised, guided, directed and controlled by the Communist Party of China.

3. The Communist Party under the 1978 Constitution and Role of the Communist Party in the Post-Mao Years:

In 1978, China adopted a new constitution and this new constitution did not make any change in the status and role of the Communist Party in the Chinese political system. It maintained the constitutional status of the party. Its Preamble recounted "the heroic struggle of the Chinese people led by the Communist Party and headed by our great leader and teacher, Chairman Mao Tse-Tung."

The party was again given credit for ushering China into an era of prosperity and all-round development. It called upon the people of China to support whole heartedly the Communist Party and its policies.

Article 2 of this constitution once again described the Communist Party as "**the core of the leadership of the whole Chinese people and that the working class exercised leadership over the state - through the Communist Party of China at its vanguard.**"

Under this constitution, the state authority was exercised in accordance with the decisions and recommendations made by the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

4. The Communist Party under the 1982 Constitution or the Communist Party in the Contemporary times:

After Mao's death, a review of the working of the Communist Party was undertaken and it was found that under Mao, the party organisation had come to be a centralized organisation in which a small group of Mao loyalists-'the Proletariat headquarters'-had become all powerful.

The Cultural Revolution of the 1960s and the post- cultural revolution changes created a situation in which revolutionary committees were given all powers and the former party organs, central and local commissions were abolished. The Eleventh Party Congress held in September 1977, which met for the first time without Mao and Chou, decided to overhaul the party and restore the traditional organisational set up of the party.

It led to the revival of the central and local commissions. It involved a qualified rejection of some principles and policies of Mao. The power struggle between the

Maoist conservatives and the liberal factions of the Communist Party became a reality. The new need for socio-economic development in all spheres gave rise to a demand for liberalisation.

The 1982 Constitution, while accepting the importance and utility of 'the thoughts of Mao', introduced several subtle changes. The Preamble, while upholding Marxism-Leninism and Mao Tse-Tung's thought, also talked of 'upholding truth, correcting error and overcoming numerous difficulties and hardships'.

This Constitution secured a separation between the Communist Party and the government and did not make any mention of or give any constitutional recognition to the Communist Party. Article I of the Constitution says: "The People's Republic of China is now a socialist state under the people's democratic dictatorship led by the working class and based on the alliance of workers and peasants".

Article 2 of the 1978 constitution which gave constitutional recognition to the Communist Party got dropped. Further, the provision for the control of the party over the Armed forces was also abolished. The Chinese Premier was now not to be nominated by the Central Committee of the Communist Party.

He was to be chosen by the National People's Congress on the basis of the nomination made by the President of the Republic. The party constitution now recorded that the party is to work in accordance with the Constitution and the Law.

However, despite this separation and scaling down of the status, the Communist Party still continues to be the leader of the people and their vanguard in the march towards the national goals. The Communist Party continues to be the ruling party, and all decisions of the government are designed to carry out the commands of the party.

The role of the Communist Party in the Chinese Political System has been, continues to be, and is destined to continue in future as a formidable role as the core of leadership and vanguard of the people in their struggle to develop further in accordance with the socialist objectives that stand accepted by the principle of collective leadership in the post-Mao period.

It continues to be a monolith-a single all dominant party (other parties can exist only as its satellites), whose members accept Marxism-Leninism-Maoism as interpreted and applied by its leaders.

It is the governor and the guide, the preacher and the teacher and the decision-maker, the pleader and the executor of all decisions. The power struggle within the Communist Party in the Post-Mao period has not materially changed or nor can it change its dominant position.

The Communist Party continues to lead the Chinese in their march towards securing of their development objectives and the unity, integrity and strength of the country. It provides top leadership to the country. It governs both directly and indirectly- directly by capturing power in the state and indirectly by maintaining its popularity as the party of all the people and workers.

Even while demanding democracy and decentralization, the people do not question or challenge the role and status of the Communist Party as the maker of modern China and as the vanguard of the people in their march towards progress even in this 21st century.

China continues to be a single party system. However, under the leadership of Deng Xiaoping (1978- 97), the party underwent several changes in respect of its economic policies, and these even continue today.

These changes acted as a source of economic liberalisation of China. The leadership of Ziang Zemin also subscribed to economic liberalisation, but he preferred to describe it as socialism with Chinese characteristics or socialist-market economy. At present Hu Jintao has been controlling the affairs and policies of the party.

13.6 Conclusion

Since the essence of democracy is its hospitality to all kinds of opinion, one party system is diametrically opposite to democratic system. The monopoly of power enjoyed by one party leaves no choice for the people. The fundamental feature of democratic system is choice it gives to the electorate. By eliminating all other competitions, a one party system deprives the electorate of their right to free choice and in the process lead to the negation of freedom and democracy.

13.7 Summing up

- i) In a one-party system, patronage is shown towards a specific goal, ideology and doctrine.
- ii) The politics of the People's Republic of China take place in a framework of a single-party socialist republic.
- iii) In all governmental institutions in the PRC, the party committees at all levels maintain an important role.

13.8 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions :

- i) Discuss the structure and functions of Communist party of China.

Long answer type questions :

- i) Do you think that single party system is antithetical to democracy?
- ii) Discuss in brief the role of the Communist Party in the Post-Mao era.

Short Questions:

- i) What is Politburo?
- ii) What is meant by democratic centralism?

13.9 Further Readings

1. Kitschelt, H. (1988). Left-libertarian parties: Explaining innovation in competitive party systems. *World Politics* 40(2), 194–234. CrossRefGoogle Scholar
2. “Shi Wu Ju Xi Jie Jue Yu Shang” Sima Qian. *Shih Chi*, 101-104 BC.
3. “Five year plan” Wikipedia. Wikimedia Foundation, 24 Nov. 2014. Web. 24 Nov. 2014.
4. “Comparative Politics: Why China’s one-party system is superior to the Western multiparty system.” Song Luzheng. *Singapore united news*, March 3rd, 2010. Web. 24 Nov. 2014.

Unit 14 □ Multi-party System: France

Structure

14.1 Objective

14.2 Introduction

14.3 The reason for the emergence of multi-party system in liberal democratic system

14.4 Multi-party System in France

14.5 Conclusion

14.6 Summing Up

14.7 Probable Questions

14.8 Further Reading

14.1 Objective

After the study of this unit, learners will be able to :

- Understand the multi-party system
 - Discuss the reasons for emerging of multiparty system
 - Explain the multi-party system in France
-

14.2 Introduction

The multiparty system lies in the logic of democracy. Since hospitality to a multiplicity of opinion is the essence of democracy, every opinion must find expression through the political Parties. Multiparty System lives up to the democratic ideals and allows every opinion to organize itself. It is characterized by competition amongst more than two parties reducing the chances of single party government and increasing the likelihood of coalition.

14.3 The reason for the emergence of multi-party system in liberal democratic system

Liberal democratic system is a much-discussed topic in the discussion of modern political science. Complexity is present in the structure and nature of liberal democracy. Nevertheless, this type of political system has some common features. Alan R. Ball mentions various features of liberal democracy. One of the most important of these is the recognition of the existence of multiple political parties in a liberal democracy. Political parties compete with each other for power. These competitions are held publicly and through a number of recognized rules and procedures. In general, the main objective of all political parties is the overall welfare of the people. Political parties, however, differ in ideology and modus operandi.

There are various reasons behind the emergence of different political parties in the liberal political system:

- (A) Different political parties are formed on the basis of different economic interests: According to the socialists, the basis of formation of political parties is economic interests. The opinion of political scientists like Laski is similar. In a liberal democracy, the state does not have overall control over economic enterprise, production, distribution, etc. This led to the creation of groups with conflicting interests. The natural consequence of this is the emergence of different political parties for the purpose of nurturing different economic interests. According to socialists, political parties only play a role in representing the interests of a particular class. In a capitalist society, there are basically two opposing classes. One is called the exploiting class and the other is called the exploited class. There are various right-wing political parties for the protection of the interests of the exploiting class. And leftist parties represent the interests of the exploited class.
- (B) Multi-party system is created due to differences in working methods: In a liberal democracy, different political parties are formed due to ideological differences. Similarly, multi-party system is also created due to differences in working methods. Liberal democracy is introduced in India. There are many political parties that have no ideological or objective differences. But the teams differ from each other due to differences in approach.
- (C) Political parties are also formed on the basis of religion. Different religious groups or communities want to use political power to propagate their religion. Thus political parties were formed on religious grounds. The coexistence of different

religions is recognized in a liberal democratic system. As a result, there are opportunities and possibilities for the formation of political parties based on different religions.

- (D) In a liberal democratic system, many nations live side by side in harmony. Each nation's education-culture, history-tradition, language-literature etc. are unique. Each nation seeks to preserve and nurture its individual characteristics and individuality. There is a tendency to form political parties based on race for this purpose. For this reason, it is natural for different political parties to emerge in a liberal democratic system.

14.4 Multi-party System in France

The history of French parties prior to 1940 was one of fragmentation and regional specialisation. A complex mosaic of political factions existed during the Third Republic. On the centre and right of the political spectrum, party labels either did not exist, or signified distinct political realities in different parts of the country. More centralised, coherent and disciplined parties gradually began to emerge after 1945 - in the form of the Christian democratic Mouvement Républicain Populaire (MRP) and de Gaulle's ephemeral Rassemblement du Peuple Français (RPF) - but such parties were undermined by their internal divisions and by the corrosive effects of the Fourth Republican political environment. The situation was clearer on the left: since the Tours split in 1920, there had existed two well-organised rival parties, the Section Française de l'Internationale Ouvrière (SFIO) (PS from 1969) and the PCF. Historically speaking, these fraternal enemies of the left have experienced a relationship based on mutual distrust: long periods of internecine conflict and rivalry have been punctuated by much shorter episodes of left unity (the tripartite government of 1944-47, the 'Union of the Left' of 1972-77, the Mauroy government from 1981 to 1984 and the plural-left government from 1997 to 2002).

During the Third and Fourth Republics, the fragmented structure of the party system, along with the parliamentary basis of political power, had a direct and divisive impact upon governmental stability: no single party or coalition of parties could normally gather a lasting majority of support either within the country, or within Parliament to sustain majoritarian governments. Cabinets lasted an average of twelve months in the Third Republic, and seven months in the Fourth (Williams, 1964). This pattern changed abruptly with the creation of the Fifth Republic. After an initial period of confusion from 1958 to 1962 linked to the consolidation of de Gaulle's leadership, the party system

became simplified between the 1960s and early 1980s on account of the bipolarization process, streamlining parties into two rival coalitions of the left and the right. Beginning in earnest in 1962, the height of bipolarization occurred in the 1978 parliamentary election. The structure of the party system in 1978 was that of a bipolar quadrille. Four parties of roughly equal political strength together obtained over 90 per cent of the vote and divided voter preferences evenly between the PCF and the PS in the left coalition, and the neo-Gaullist RPR and the liberal conservative UDF on the right.

Since the mid-1980s, however, the structure of the French party system has become far less neatly balanced, giving way to a more complex pattern of uncertain and changing contours. There has been an increase in the number and a change in the nature of parties and the issues processed through the political system. The bipolar contours of the French party system have been challenged by the emergence of new political issues, such as immigration, security and the environment, and the difficulties experienced by the mainstream parties in articulating these new political demands. When observing the French party system in 2002, one is struck by the increasingly manifest opposition between a formal, bipolar and structured party system as represented in national political institutions (especially the National Assembly and municipal government) and an underlying multipolar, fragmented and constative pattern of party support. The three main developments in the past two decades have been: the emergence of a series of minor but significant parties, and in particular the breakthrough, persistence and subsequent division of the FN; the changing dynamics of factional and coalition politics, perhaps most clearly demonstrated in the decline of the PCF and the emergence of the PS as the dominant party of the left; and patterns of growing electoral instability, namely increased electoral volatility (each election since 1978 going against the incumbent government) and a certain disaffection towards traditional politics, as demonstrated in higher abstention rates and the weakening of the parties of the 1978 bipolar quadrille. Overall, while the PCF, PS, UDF and RPR obtained over 90 per cent of the vote in 1978, in 1997 and 2002 these parties obtained around 67 per cent. While there are many enduring features of party system stability, which we will explore in the final section, we are primarily concerned in the subsequent section to identify stresses and strains and to map out the important changes that occurred in the 1980s and 1990s.

France has a multi-party political system, the number of contests in which a political party is almost inevitably large enough to participate in the exercise of power must be prepared to negotiate with one or more persons in terms of forming a single party electoral alliance and / or alliance agreement. The influential French political parties are also characterized by a remarkable degree of inter-party factions, each of

which effectively forms alliances within itself. Until recently, the French government was stable instead of two:

Above is the center-left, led by a socialist party and with minor partners such as the Greens and the Radical Party of the Left.

Above center-right is a Republican (and its predecessors, the Union for the Popular Movement, the Republican Rally) and the Union of Democrats and Independents.

So far, the event was the 2017 presidential election, when Emmanuel Macron was liberal in La République en Marche! Defeated Marine Le Pen in the second round of the right-wing national assembly. This is the first time that a third party has won the presidency, and for the first time none of the major alliances have appeared in the second round of the presidential election. This was soon followed by a significant victory for LREM in the 2017 Assembly elections, gaining a majority of 350 seats. Both conventional alliances suffered major defeats.

The National Assembly (known as the National Front before the name change in 2018) also had significant success in other elections. Since 2014, the party has established itself as the third largest party, winning first place in the 2014 and 2019 European elections, as well as in the 2015 local elections.

Nature and Characteristics of French Party System:

Political parties do not find a natural breeding ground in France. Portrayals of French political culture point to inactivism, individualism and a distrust of organisations. Though these representations are overly impressionistic, a powerful strand of French republicanism has denigrated political parties as divisive, fractious organisations. This is best exemplified by the Gaullist tradition, within which the political movement facilitates a direct relationship between the providential leader and the nation, but does not presume to intervene in this privileged relationship. The distrust of parties is deeply embedded in the ideology of the republican state itself, where the state represents the general will, superior to the particularistic interests represented by parties, groups and regions. There is no natural sympathy for doctrines such as pluralism which emphasise the importance of the corps intermediaries between the citizen and the state. At the same time, French political parties perform such essential functions as political mobilisation, the aggregation of interests, organising political competition, feedback, public management and political recruitment. Our aim in this chapter is to give an overview of the evolution of the French party system in the first forty-five years of the Fifth Republic, to examine the principal changes since the 1980s and to identify the underlying continuities in the party system.

There have some important characteristics of French Party System-

1. Multi-Party System:

Like India, in France also a multi- party system is in operation. There are as many as six major political parties and several small political parties. All these parties contest elections and play a significant role in the political life of France. The French are emotional by nature and their allegiance to their respective parties is very deep. As one writer has beautifully remarked: "Politics for the Englishmen and the Americans is a game while it is a battle for the French."

2. Constitutional Recognition of the Role of the Parties:

Unlike the American Constitution which is totally silent about the role of political parties, the French Constitution accepts the role of parties and political groups. Art. 4. reads: "Parties and political groups play a part in the exercise of the right to vote. The right to form parties and their freedom of action are unrestricted. They must respect the principles of national sovereignty and of democracy."

3. The Practice of Parliamentary Groups:

Another feature of the French Party System is that after the elections, the members of the Parliament combine to form parliamentary groups. In each parliamentary group there are several members belonging to different political parties. Frequently, the members defect from one parliamentary group to another.

4. Existence of Regional Parties:

Like our own country, in France also there are present several regional political parties. They have no national organisation and they work only in their respective regions.

5. Political Defections and Frequent Changes:

In another way, the French Party- System is like the Indian party system. In France also the evil practice of political defections prevails. Frequently, the members of one political party defect to another or other political parties. A number of political parties of France have similar ideologies and that is why the members of one political party do not hesitate to defect to another political party. In the words of Dorothy Pickles, "French parties come and go in bewildering numbers, sometimes within a very short time."

6. Leftist and Rightist Parties:

Almost all the French political parties can be categorized under two heads:

(i) Leftist Parties, and

(ii) Rightist Parties.

The Leftist Parties have socialist leanings. They favour state control over industry and state intervention in the interest of planned economy. The Rightist Parties are opposed to both these measures. However, many rightist parties support state action for assisting small producers. The Communist Party and the Socialist Party belong to the first group and the Conservative Party and the Central Democratic Group belong to the second category.

7. Organisational Diversity:

The organisation and policies of different political parties exhibit great diversities. The parties cover a very large range extending from communism on the left to anti-parliamentary and even fascist groups on the extreme right. Some of the parties attach great importance to political principles and doctrines while others have no agreed principles or even coherent policies.

Some of the parties are very well organised parties, while others have loose organisations. The leftist parties are highly organised while the right wing parties have no permanent organisations outside the Assembly.

The organised leftist parties are well disciplined parties formulate their policies at the national level party congresses attended by delegates representing local federations and in the meetings of parliamentary groups. The right-wing parties are continuously changing parties. Their ideology and principles are not fixed. Their parliamentary groups take every decision.

8. Domination of the Party Leader:

Another unique feature of the French Party System is that most of the parties revolve round the personalities of their respective leaders. For popular support, the members of the party depend upon the personality of their leader or some leaders. The leader is the source of party unity. The members are united because of common allegiance to a particular leader.

The French Party System has been working with all these features. The working of the Fourth Republic was seriously limited and strained due to the defects of the multi-party system. It is a primary factor responsible for the political instability that came to dominate the French Political System under the Fourth Republic.

As a result of such a bitter experience, the framers of the Constitution of the Fifth Republic decided to reduce the role of the political parties in the French political system. Consequently, the scheme of a semi-Presidential system was chalked out in which the parliament and the cabinet were assigned a limited role in the functioning of

the government. Correspondingly, there came to be a decrease in the role of the political parties.

The French multi-party system was now made to play a relatively low profile-role in the political system-a role limited to the sphere of law-making and deliberations in the Parliament. However, the French Party System has been a rapidly changing party system and the legacy of lack of political continuity in the past continues to be a source of fluidity in the French party politics.

Major Political Parties of France:

Some of the major political parties of France are as follows:

1. The Socialist Party:

This is a major political party of France. It was established in 1905. This party believes in state control over industry and state intervention in favour of planned economy. It stands committed to uphold the democratic and republican character of the French Political System. It stands for nationalization, welfare state, planned economic investment, public housing, industrialisation, more civic liberty, municipal liberty and local welfare services.

It favors the French membership of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and of the EEC and other agencies of the European Community. This party is a well-organised party. The lowest units of this party are called Sections and these are organised in the Communes, Cantons and Arrondissements.

Several Sections combine together to form a Federation. In each Department there is a Federation. At the apex of the party organisation, is the National Congress. It consists of delegates elected by the Sections and the Federations. It works as the parliament of the party. It appoints a Directory Council and a General Secretary. These two perform the executive functions of the party.

2. Popular Republican Movement (M.R.P. i.e. Movement Republican Populaire):

The party was established in 1924 by those persons who were previously the members of the People's Democratic Party. This is a partly-liberal and partly-socialist party. It is opposed to both extreme liberal capitalism and totalitarian collectivism.

Like the Liberalists, this party also believes in the rights and liberties of the individual. It also favours liberal governmental aid for schools run by the Churches. The members of this party are committed to the Christian ideals. This party is a well-organised party having its units at local, provincial and national levels.

3. The Radical Socialist Party:

This party was established in 1936. It represents the interests of the lower classes, small shop-keepers in particular. This party is a loose group of Democratic and Socialist Resistance Unions.

4. The Conservatives (The RGR):

This party consists of a number of political groups. At the time of 1946 elections, the Independents, the Peasants, the Socialist Worker's Party and the Republican Party of Liberty merged with this party. Together, these called themselves the 'Fourth Force'. It is a rightist party and a firm supporter of the Church and Church institutions. It still calls itself a Fourth Force. It has the support of the Independents, the Peasants, the Socialists Workers' Party and the Republican Party of Liberty. In fact, these four groups together form the Conservatives or the RGR in the French Party System.

5. The Communist Party:

This party had its birth in the form of the Socialist Party in 1892. In 1920, there came a split in the Socialist Party. A majority of the members of this party decided to form the Communist Party which was to follow Marxist-Leninist ideology and programme. Between 1920- 1990, the Communist Party of France remained an active actor in French politics. Its popularity got subsequently reduced. It believes in complete state control over the means of production and distribution. It is a Marxist party working within the democratic French Political System. It is a well-disciplined and well-organised party.

The lowest units of this party are the Cells, which are organised in different factories and villages. Several Cells are grouped together to form a Section. At the Department level, there is a Federation which represents the Sections. At the national level, there is the National Congress of the Party. This Congress works as the parliament of the party.

It elects a Permanent Committee of 100 members and this Committee further elects a small committee called the Committee of the Political Control. The prominent leaders of the party are members of this committee. It is now a minor political party as it enjoys the support of around 5% voters.

6. The Union of New Republic (The U.N.R.) and the Rally for the Republic RPR:

The Union of the new Republic (U.N.R.) was established only a few weeks before the 1950 elections.

It was formed by combining the four major Gaullist movements viz:

- (1) The Socialist Republicans,
- (2) The Union for French Renewal,
- (3) The Republicans Convention and
- (4) The Workers' Committee for the support of General de Gaulle.

It was only in 1961 that the U.N.R. was in a position to formulate a policy for itself. This party has firm faith in liberal democratic principles. Its leaders often describe it as 'a Centre Party'. During the era of Gaullism in French politics, this party out rightly supported the policies of the government. It was given the name of the government party. It supports progressive reforms and is opposed to traditional conservatism. It stands for "radical social change with intense nationalism" Ideologically, it definitely stands right of the Centre.

The French Party System is a complex phenomenon characterized by continuous and rapid flux, involving alignments, realignments and counter alignments. The party scene in the National Assembly usually contains as many as twenty groups or parliamentary formations. The remarks made by Dorothy Pickles that "parties come and go in bewildering numbers, sometimes within a very short time" is an apt description of the French Party System.

The conscious attempts made by the framers of the Constitution of the Fifth Republic to reduce the menacing role of political party's bear testimony to this view. The political parties in France are far from being strong, well-structured and organised parties with definite ideological commitments.

14.5 Conclusion

The positive aspect of multi party system is that they creat internal checks and balance whithin government and exhibit a bias in favour of debate, councilination ans compromise. It ensures broad responsiveness talking into amount competing views and contending interests however, the post-election negotiations and horsetrading that take place when no single party is strong enough to rule also can take weeks or even month to complete. Coalition Government may be fraetured and unable, Parties, greater attention to squabbles among coalition pertners than to the task of governance. Another problem is that coaliltion positive is characterised by a search for common ground rather than by the politics of principle. The parties are encouraged to abasdor principles in their quest for power.

14.6 Summin Up

- i) If there are more than two organized parties in the political field of the country, it is called multi-party system.
- ii) One of the most important of these is the recognition of the existence of multiple political parties in a liberal democracy.
- iii) The influential French political parties are also characterized by a remarkable degree of inter-party factions, each of which effectively forms alliances within itself.
- iv) French Party- System is similar to the Indian party system.

14.6 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions :

- i) What are the reason for the emergence of multi-party system in liberal democratic system?
- ii) Write an essay on the merits and demerits of multiparty system.

Long answer type Questions :

- i) Discuss in brief, the ideologs and programme of the French Socialist partts.
- ii) What are the basic characteristics of French party system?

Short Questions:

- i) What is meant by the multi-party system?
- ii) What is the primary defect of the multi party system?

14.7 Further Readings

1. Franklin, M. N., Mackie, T. & Valen, H., eds. (1992). Electoral change: Responses to evolving social and attitudinal structures in Western countries. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Google Scholar
2. French political landscape. Encyclopedia
3. Häusermann, S. (2015). Electoral realignment and social policy positions of social democratic parties. Revised draft for the project 'Party competition and voter alignments in times of welfare state transformation.' EUI Florence, 18–19 June 2015.

4. In Manow, P., Palier, B. & Schwander, H., eds., *Welfare democracies and party politics: Explaining electoral dynamics in times of changing welfare capitalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. Kitschelt, H. (1988). Left-libertarian parties: Explaining innovation in competitive party systems. *World Politics* 40(2), 194–234. [CrossRef](#) [Google Scholar](#)

Unit 15 □ Party System in Post- Communist Society

Structure

15.1 Objective

15.2 Introduction

15.3 Party system in Central and East Europe

15.4 Institutional structure electoral systems and Politiece Fragmentation

15.5 Development od Party system

15.5.1 Left Parties

15.5.2 Liberal and consevative parties

15.5.3 Agrarian, Green, Etumic and Nationalist Parties

15.6 Party system in Russia

15.7 Conclusion

15.8 Summing up

15.9 Probable Questions

15.10 Further Readings

15.1 Objective

After going through this unit the learners will be Familiar with:

- the process of development of the party system in the post-communist states.
- factors inhibiting the growing of two stable party system.
- nature of the party system in the post-communist societies.

15.2 Introduction

The collapse of communism in the USSR and eastern Europe unleashed a process of democratization that drew heavily on the western liberal model. The central features of this process were the adoption of multiparty elections and the introduction of market-based economic reform. It can be argued that former communist regimes are undergoing a transition that will eventually make them indistinguishable from western liberal democracies. However, there reason for treating these system as distinct post communist system. First,

the legacy of their communist part can not be discarded overnight, second the process of transition itself has unleashed forces and generated problems quite different from, those that confront western democracies.

One feature of post communist regimes is the need to deal with the politico-cultural consequences of communist rule. The ruthless censorship and suppression of opposition that underpinned the and communist Parties' monopoly of power obstructed the development of a civic culture emphasizing Participation, bargaining and consensus. In Russia this has produced a weak and fragmented Party System that is apparently incapable of articling or aggregating the major interests of Russian society. As result, former communist Parties have often continued to provide a point of Stability.

The process of economic transition has created another set of problem. The transition From central planning to laissez - faire capitalism unleashed deep insecurity because of the growth of employment and inflation and it Significantly increased Social uninitiate. Another set of Problems result from the weakness of state power, particularly when the State is confronted by centrifugal forces effectively suppressed during the communist era. This has been most clearly demonstrated by the reemergence of ethnic and nationalist tension.

15.3 Party system in Central and East Europe

The conditions under which party Systems developed in Central and East Europe were quite different. The triple transition from communism to democracy from planned economy to market economy and from multi-national Federation to independent national States shaped Party system development, Institutional design, economic reforms and redistribution were important issues and the national question played a role in all new independent states. In the post communist regimes civil society is weak, electoral participation is low and parties are often elite clubs. Besides some countries lag behind in the consolidation of democracy as well as party systems.

Party membership is lower in post-communist Countries. very Few parties in post-communist Europe come close to the unions parties of the 20th century, with extensive Party organizations many members, and close links to trade unions, Farmers associations etc. Only the former regime Parties and early opposition parties have many members. The most important among there parties are: Croatian Democratic Union to Bulgarian Socialist Party. Polish Peasant- Party, Albanian socialism party Czech communist Party.

15.4 Institutional Structure, Electoral Systems and Political fragmentation.

Institutions are important because its design generally creates disagreement among Political elites and they constrain development of the party system. All countries except Bosnia and Herzegovina are unitary states, all have fairly rigid constitutions, constitutional courts, human rights are incorporated, and nearly all countries are parliamentary democracies. A majority of the Presidents are elected for five years by direct majority vote and no president can be rejected more than once. President's constitutional power is in most cases limited to a suspending veto which can be overturned by majority vote. Parliaments are unicameral except for Bosnia, Poland, Romania, Czech Republic and Slovenia. Senates are elected by majority vote indirectly. In central Europe and Baltic states the overall picture is one of institutional stability. Poland, however, made substantial changes in the distribution of power from the 1992 constitutions to the final 1997 constitutions. In contrast, several Balkan countries changed formal distribution of power as part of an effort to rid the country of authoritarian vestiges.

Electoral laws have been disputed in several countries. It is not very surprising that the countries with least Proportional electoral systems also have the least fragmented party systems, or that countries with large national minorities have more fragmented Party Systems. However, because electoral alliances are counted as one, the number of effective parties can be deceptive. The real number of parties is much higher than the number of effective Parties.

Development of the Party system in central and Eastern Europe

Party system in the post-Communist societies did not start from the scratch. First, although communist regimes had transformed Central and Eastern Europe from peasant societies to urbanised industrial societies, they did not eradicate all historical cleavages. In the contrary, Federalization probably helped to institutionalize national conflicts. Ethnic, religion and regional cleavages survived the communist regimes, and Socioeconomic conflicts between the winners and losers of the economic transition survived in every country, some parties and movements had a head start. Former regime parties profited from experienced elites, large memberships, newspapers, office facilities etc. The popular fronts and forums had superior democratic legitimacy but initially lacked everything else.

The effects of the economic reforms started to become noticeable in the early mid 1990. Post-communist societies saw a sharp decrease in industrial production, Gross Domestic product and exports and a sharp rise in unemployment and inflation, while wages and

person lagged behind, over time, income inequality between the rich and the poor increased, strengthening the salience of the socio-economic left-right divide, older cleavages came to the fore; countries with national minorities. have national minority parties and catholic countries have Christian democratic parties, Leftist and Center- right parties are the strongest and most numerous while agrarian, green, ethnic, regional and nationalist parties are more unevenly distributed.

15-5.1 Left Parties.

As a group, leftist parties exhibit the strongest continuity are by far the most stable of the party families. Two former communist regime parties have retained an orthodox platform and Survived as politically relevant parties: the Czech communist party and Moldovan communist Party. The only other orthodox party to ever win representation is the Slovak Communist Party, a party formed by former hardliners. in 1991.

In so far as former regime parties reformed and adopted a Social democratic platforms, they won easy victory over historical Social democratic parties in the bid for the left. The Hungarian communist party was the first to adopt a social democratic platform, followed by Lithuanian Party and the Polish Party.

All these parties have joined the party of European socialist or the socialist International and can be regarded as social Democratic parties Less successful were the economists in Slovakia, Slovenia and Croatia, however, their fate diverged dramatically after the turn of the Millenium while the Croatian and the Slovenian Social Democrats won elections in 2000 and 2008, respectively, the Slovak Democratic Left party collapsed in 2002.

15.5.2 Liberal and conservative Parties

In contrast to the left, most centre-right Parties in the region are recent formations and ideologically they combine anti- communism with liberation or conservation. In the Baltic States, liberalism has been strongest in Estonia, where market liberal the Estonian Reform Party and social liberal Center Party together polled more than election 50 percent in the 2007 election.

The strongest liberal party in the Balkans the Bulgarian National Movement for stability and Progress. Other fairly excess successful Parties are the Party Alliance. Our Moldova However, most liberal Parties in the Balkans are small.

A majority of the region's strongest and most numerous conservative parties are national conservative. They are culturally conservative and nationally oriented. Several of these parties originated in the umbrella movements of the 1990s. In the Balkan States, the People to fronts disintegrated into various ideological factions of the central European countries only Hungary has national conservative partion.

In Poland the national clerical parties have roots in the Solidarity movement, Christian democratic Parties in the region are small or medium sized. They are largely confined to catholic countries and religiously more conservative.

15.5.3 Agrarian, Green Ethnic and Nationalist parties

Ethnic and nationalist Parties thrive on national Conflicts between the 'State nation and love national minorities. Agrarian parties depend on Sizable Present population. Most of Parties and a these paties original outside the umbrella movements and regime parties and most of them are small or medium sized.

Most of the countries were peasant Societies with strong agrarian Parties in the inter-war period. Collectivization of agriculture ruined these parties potential. The Green Parties have been generally weak. Nationalism Parties have been less successful. These parties are anti-semitie, anti roman and anti minority. Ethane minority parties have the most stable electoral base in countries with sinkable minority population. Most major ehimic Parties are centrist, and they cooperate to the left as well as to the right.

15.6 Party System is Russia

In Russia the institutional framework of post-communist Politics inhibited the development of a functioning Party System. The character of the State formation following communism was crucial in establishing the context For Party development. In the Perestroika period, the nature of Political groups was determined largely by the character of State power. The role of ideas and the conviction of individual politicians is minimized, while the critical legacy of a Society thoroughly permeated by an activist state is given prominence. Post-communist Russian state building proved inimical to the conversion of the insurgent Political formation into the genuine Political Parties. In contrast to the golden age of parties form the late 19th century to the 1970, the contemporary era is made by a plhratity of competing forms of political representation; and the space in which parties operate has changed dramatically. The predominance of individuals inhibited the transformation of movements into Structured Political organization, and parties were often little more than vehicles to project the personalities of the leader. Few parties remained. unaffected by Splits.

The absence of a recognizable social bare to the new political parties was perhaps the single most important factor inhibiting the development of party politics. New parties in Russia suffered two-fold estrangement: from the social and political interests that they claimed to represent and from the coherent formulation of a forward looking policy taking into account actually existing realities rather than an Ideologist version of what should be. This double disassociation inhibited the consolidation of coherent governing coalition or an effective opposition.

There are no consolidated parties Russia developed parties without a system because they have only an indirect impact on the government. The parties with the exception of the communist - have no Stable membership, a weak organization, tendency to project the leader instead of a programme. They are present only in big cities. They hardly penetrated the rural area and the ethnic regions and republics Factionalism is developed to the extent that no stable units of parties can be traced. The necessary. division of labour between interest groups and parties hardly developed coalition building capacity is not yet demanded because of the extensive powers of the President. The huge powers of the President and the erosion of Parliamentary legislation by Presidential decrees gave Parliament and the voters much less power than they should have. Large parties are hostile to the democratic government. The Communist Party is still an anti-system party. Its political and economic agenda are fundamentally at odds with the liberal blueprint for modernization and democratization.

Post-communist political life in Russia is more fractured than the post industrial societies of the west. The extreme pluralism that might be expected to emerge in these conditions is likely to give rise to a permanently fractured party system and wretched democratic policies. The weakness of the state did not necessarily mean the strength of society but indicated a general crisis of political institutions and civil association in post-Communist Russia.

The increasingly regional character of Russian politics Suggested that conditions were lacking for the development of a mans national political party. Russian parties are not complete formations one and the same party labels could mean very different things to people in various parts of the country. No single party could hope encompass the national, regional, ethnic, class, group, elite and other in society. The sheer give of the country made it difficult to constitute genuinely national party covering not only the big cities but also provisional towns, rural area and the national republics.

The legacy of the unprecedented concentration of Political power and claims to ideological predominance by the of communist party provided an inauspicious terrain for parties to claim a share in power Post-Communist Russian Politics operate in a contest where traditional social institutions and groups try to preserve their position while challenges by new social actors. A vicious circle emerge in which parties developed but more weak become of the post totalitarian condition of Russia, while society could not be democratically integrated into the state without powerful parties.

The Parts political system remain the weakest link in the new state. There are no more than a handful of serious parties apart CPRF doubts remain over the viability of Yabloko, Russia our home and the LDPR, while most of the others are pseudo-Parties. It is often asserted that Russian political culture is hostile to the emergence of political parties because of a

popular commitment to collective value and preference for a single authoritative source of political authority. However, it is not Russia's political culture but the specific conditions under which the multi party system emerged that provided it essential characteristic.

The travails of Party development in Russia are part of the apparent general crisis of parties in European politics. The eclipsing of parties by new forms of participation such as social movements and alternative forms of political communication have given rise to a new volatility in established party system. The fluidity of existing party system has been exacerbated by the demise of the bloc Politics associated with the cold war that provided or artificial environment sustaining contiguities that might otherwise have given way to new form of voter alignment and political participation. In particular the old cleavage between left and right lost its force in the confused modern political landscape. The age of mass parties appear to be over on vehicles of public mobilization, regional and national identity, individual development and even as instrument of power.

15.7 Conclusion

Stable Party system is vital for the development of democracy. The process of establishing party system in post-communist societies that were not just made politically apathetic by decades of communist rule but that also developed through an over dependence on the state and this had strong elements of authoritarianism built into their culture, is, however, proving much more difficult. Post communist societies remain electorally volatile and fragmented, while electoral turnout, partisan identification, and party membership rates are lower. Anti party sentiment is universal, though this is often about lack of trust in parties rather than a deep-rooted hostility where antipathy towards parties is harder it is not always associated with a preference for authoritarianism, but rather for a Personalistic form of democratic leadership.

15.8 Summing up

- Post-communist societies are characterized by personalistic, candidate centred form of Presidential policy.
- The triple transition from communism to democracy, From planned economy to market economy and from multinational federation to independent nation States Shaped party development.
- These countries are associated with weakly institutionalized party organizations, low level of legislative conversion, and undue executive encroachment.

- Parties generally fail to play central roles in the articulation and aggregation of interests.

15.9 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions :

- Examine the process of development of the party system in central and East European States.
- Analyze the factors inhibiting the growth of Stable party system in Russia.

Long Questions :

- Indicate the silent features of the aprty system in central and East European states.
- Discuss, in brief the nature of party system in Russia.

Short Questions :

- Which factor obstructed the development of civic culture on the post-communist societies?
- What is the reason for the fragmented parts system in some of the countries of central and Eastern Europe.

15.7 Future Readings

- Axtrmann, Roland (ed); Balancing Democracy Continuum, London, 2001
- Heywood, Andrew Politics, Palgrave, 2003

MODULE – 4

Unit 16 □ Nation State - Meaning; Historical Evolution of Nation States in West and in the East

Structure

- 16.1 Objective**
- 16.2 Introduction**
- 16.3 Differences between the Nation and the State**
- 16.4 Meaning of Nation State**
- 16.5 Characteristics of Nation State**
- 16.6 Historical Evolution of Nation State**
- 16.7 Evolution of Nation State in West**
- 16.8 Evolution of Nation State in East**
- 16.9 Challenges to Nation State**
- 16.10 Future of Nation State**
- 16.11 Conclusion**
- 16.12 Summing up**
- 16.13 Probable Questions**
- 16.14 Further Reading**

16.1 Objective

Nation State is an important concept in the discussion of modern Political Science. After going through this unit, Learner will be familiar with:

- Difference between Nation and State.
- Meaning of Nation State.
- Characteristics of Nation State.
- Historical Evolution of Nation States in West and East.
- Challenges and future of Nation State

16.2 Introduction

The Nation State is the dominant political organization of present day world. It is so central a feature of the political landscape that it is difficult to imagine its absence. Historically considered it a comparatively recent phenomenon. It was only as late as the 19th century that the idea became widely accepted that the boundaries of the state should coincide with a given people who constituted coincide with a nation.

The people comprising a nation become the sole source from which the state would derive its legitimacy and nation become the sole legitimate object of their political allegiance. However, the very period in which the nation state has become universal is the very period when we are beginning to see the process of its erosion.

16.3 Differences between the Nation and the State

In common usage, the terms State and Nation are often used as synonyms. For example when we say African nations we are definitely talking about the states of Africa and not the nations. Again the United Nations does not mean the union of nations but in reality it is an organization of Nation – States. In fact in modern age each State is a Nation – State. In spite of such usage, there are important distinctions/differences between the State and the Nation.

1. State is a territory with its own institutions and populations but a nation is a cultural group with common psychological, emotional and political feelings.
2. Sovereignty- the supreme power over citizens, is essential for State but not for Nation.
3. The elements of State and Nation are different - the four essential elements of state are i) population, ii) territory, iii) government, iv) sovereignty but nation is a group of people having a strong sense of unity on the basis of language, religion, profession or economic interest and common historical background.
4. Nation may or may not remain within the bounds of a fixed territory, e.g. French nation extends even to Belgium or the case of the Jews who are spread all over the world, before 1948.
5. A state may have many nations e.g. Multinational country like India, People Republic of China, Switzerland etc. but nation is a single and unique identity.

6. A state can be created but nation is always the result of evolution. After Second world war West Germany and East Germany were created by separating Germany and in 1947 Pakistan was created out of India. But a nation is a unity of the people which emerges slowly but steadily.

16.4 Meaning of Nation State

In general discussion, a nation-state is variously called a “country,” a “nation,” or a “state.” But technically, it is a specific form of sovereign state (a political entity on a territory) that is guided by a nation (a cultural entity), and which derives its legitimacy from successfully serving all its citizens. In general, scholars define nation-state as “a sovereign state of which most of the citizens or subjects are united also by factors which define a nation, such as language or common descent.” The nation-state implies that a state and a nation coincide.

In other words, it can be said that, nation-state, a territorially bounded sovereign polity—i.e., a state—that is ruled in the name of a community of citizens who identify themselves as a nation. The legitimacy of a nation-state’s rule over a territory and over the population inhabiting it stems from the right of a core national group within the state (which may include all or only some of its citizens) to self-determination. Members of the core national group see the state as belonging to them and consider the approximate territory of the state to be their homeland. Accordingly, they demand that other groups, both within and outside the state, recognize and respect their control over the state. As the American sociologist Rogers Brubaker puts it in *Nationalism Reframed: Nationhood and the National Question in the New Europe* (1996), nation-states are “states of and for particular nations.”

As a political model, the nation-state fuses two principles: the principle of state sovereignty, first articulated in the Peace of Westphalia (1648), which recognizes the right of states to govern their territories without external interference; and the principle of national sovereignty, which recognizes the right of national communities to govern themselves. National sovereignty in turn is based on the moral-philosophical principle of popular sovereignty, according to which states belong to their peoples. The latter principle implies that legitimate rule of a state requires some sort of consent by the people. That requirement does not mean, however, that all nation-states are democratic. Indeed, many authoritarian rulers have presented themselves—both to the outside world of states and internally to the people under their rule—as ruling in the name of a sovereign nation.

A nation state is a political unit where the state and nation are congruent. It is a more precise concept than “country”, since a country does not need to have a predominant ethnic group. A nation, in the sense of a common ethnicity, may include a diaspora or refugees who

live outside the nation state; some nations of this sense do not have a state where that ethnicity predominates. In a more general sense, a nation state is simply a large, politically sovereign country or administrative territory.

16.5 Characteristics of Nation State

The nation-state, has the following characteristics:

- Legitimate states that govern effectively and dynamic industrial economies are widely regarded today as the defining characteristics of a modern nation-state.”
- Nation states have their own characteristics, differing from those of the pre-national states. For a start, they have a different attitude to their territory when compared with dynastic monarchies: it is semisacred and nontransferable. No nation would swap territory with other states simply, for example, because the king’s daughter married. They have a different type of border, in principle defined only by the area of settlement of the national group, although many nation states also sought natural borders (rivers, mountain ranges). They are constantly changing in population size and power because of the limited restrictions of their borders.
- The most noticeable characteristic is the degree to which nation states use the state as an instrument of national unity, in economic, social and cultural life.
- The nation state promoted economic unity, by abolishing internal customs and tolls. In Germany, that process, the creation of the Zollverein, preceded formal national unity. Nation states typically have a policy to create and maintain a national transportation infrastructure, facilitating trade and travel. In 19th-century Europe, the expansion of the rail transport networks was at first largely a matter for private railway companies, but gradually came under control of the national governments. The French rail network, with its main lines radiating from Paris to all corners of France, is often seen as a reflection of the centralised French nation state, which directed its construction. Nation states continue to build, for instance, specifically national motorway networks. Specifically transnational infrastructure programmes, such as the Trans-European Networks, are a recent innovation.
- The nation states typically had a more centralised and uniform public administration than its imperial predecessors: they were smaller, and the population less diverse. (The internal diversity of the Ottoman Empire, for instance, was very great.) After the 19th-century triumph of the nation state in Europe, regional identity was subordinate to national identity, in regions such as Alsace-Lorraine, Catalonia, Brittany and

Corsica. In many cases, the regional administration was also subordinated to central (national) government. This process was partially reversed from the 1970s onward, with the introduction of various forms of regional autonomy, in formerly centralised states such as France.

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

16.6 Historical evolution of Nation State

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

In France, Eric Hobsbawm argues, the French state preceded the formation of the French people. Hobsbawm considers that the state made the French nation, not French nationalism, which emerged at the end of the 19th century, the time of the Dreyfus Affair. At the time

of the 1789 French Revolution, only half of the French people spoke some French, and 12–13% spoke the version of it that was to be found in literature and in educational facilities, according to Hobsbawm.

During the Italian unification, the number of people speaking the Italian language was even lower. The French state promoted the replacement of various regional dialects and languages by a centralised French language, and so did, and still does, Italy. The introduction of conscription and the Third Republic's 1880s laws on public instruction facilitated the creation of a national identity under this theory.

Some nation states, such as Germany and Italy, came into existence at least partly as a result of political campaigns by nationalists, during the 19th century. In both cases, the territory was previously divided among other states, some of them very small. The sense of common identity was at first a cultural movement, such as in the Völkisch movement in German-speaking states, which rapidly acquired a political significance. In these cases, the nationalist sentiment and the nationalist movement clearly precede the unification of the German and Italian nation states.

Historians Hans Kohn, Liah Greenfeld, Philip White and others have classified nations such as Germany or Italy, where cultural unification preceded state unification, as *ethnic nations* or *ethnic nationalities*. However, “state-driven” national unifications, such as in France, England or China, are more likely to flourish in multiethnic societies, producing a traditional national heritage of *civic nations*, or *territory-based nationalities*. Some authors deconstruct the distinction between ethnic nationalism and civic nationalism because of the ambiguity of the concepts. They argue that the paradigmatic case of Ernest Renan is an idealisation and it should be interpreted within the German tradition and not in opposition to it. For example, they argue that the arguments used by Renan at the conference *What is a nation?* are not consistent with his thinking. This alleged civic conception of the nation would be determined only by the case of the loss of Alsace and Lorraine in the Franco-Prussian War.

The idea of a nation state was and is associated with the rise of the modern system of states, often called the “Westphalian system” in reference to the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). The balance of power, which characterized that system, depended on its effectiveness upon clearly defined, centrally controlled, independent entities, whether empires or nation states, which recognize each other's sovereignty and territory. The Westphalian system did not create the nation state, but the nation state meets the criteria for its component states (by assuming that there is no disputed territory). Before the Westphalian system, the closest geopolitical system was the “Chanyuan system” established in East Asia in 1005 through the Treaty of Chanyuan, which, like the

Westphalian peace treaties, designated national borders between the independent regimes of China's Song dynasty and the nomadic Liao dynasty. This system was copied and developed in East Asia in the following centuries until the establishment of the pan-Eurasian Mongol Empire in the 13th century.

The nation state received a philosophical underpinning in the era of Romanticism. The increasing emphasis during the 19th century on the ethnic and racial origins of the nation, led to a redefinition of the nation state in these terms.[25] Racism, which in Boulainvilliers's theories was inherently antipatriotic and antinationalist, joined itself with colonialist imperialism and "continental imperialism", most notably in pan-Germanic and pan-Slavic movements.

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

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

According to Andreas Wimmer and Yuval Feinstein, nation-states tended to emerge when power shifts allowed nationalists to overthrow existing regimes or absorb existing administrative units. Xue Li and Alexander Hicks links the frequency of nation-state creation to processes of diffusion that emanate from international organizations

16.7 Evolution of Nation State in West

In the Western the concept of the Nation States evolved over a long time. The major causes that led to the emergence of the Nation –States in the West were –

Military Perspective

From the begining the modern state was shaped by the fact of being essentially intended

for war making, primarily concerned with establishing and maintaining its military might. In turn, the fortunes of war played the decisive role in shaping the map of Europe. A recent, very strong statement of this statement by Charles Tilly (1992) suggest that state structures in general be understood as secondary products of ruler's efforts to provide themselves with military resources.

The Catholic Church and The Rise of The Nation-State

Newly emerging nation-states in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had a complex relationship with the predominant transnational power of the time, the Catholic Church. At times, partial nation-states were useful tools for the Catholic Church. On several occasions, for example, France and Spain intervened in Italy at the invitation of the Pope. But some monarchs wanted control over their national churches in order to get absolute power. In England, the dispute over who controlled the English church led Henry VIII to break from the Pope and establish an independent Protestant church in the 1530s. This break with the Catholic Church gave the English something to rally around, thus encouraging them to develop loyalty toward the English nation-state. At the same time, some devout Catholics in England refused to convert; their displeasure ultimately led to repression and civil war.

The Thirty Years' War and the Peace of Westphalia

The Thirty Years' War, fought throughout central Europe from 1618–1648 between Protestants and Catholics, laid the legal foundation for the nation-state. The war involved many nations of Europe, including many small German states, the Austrian Empire, Sweden, France, and Spain. Despite a brutal war, the Catholics were unable to overturn Protestantism. The treaty that ended the war, called the Peace of Westphalia, decreed that the sovereign ruler of a state had power over all elements of both the nation and the state, including religion. Thus, the modern idea of a sovereign state was born.

Centralization

Centralization, or the process by which law- and policymaking become centrally located, helped spur the development of nation-states. Final power rested with the central government, which made the laws and practices more uniform across the country. A single centralized authority, rather than many diverse local authorities, allowed nation-states to quickly develop their economies. Merchants could trade throughout the nation without worrying about local taxes and regulations. Also, the nation-state was much stronger militarily than the feudal state. Rulers were able to create national armies, which were not dependent on the nobility. The armies could receive consistent training so that all units could work well together. In many cases, the newly emerging nation-states dominated the older forms of political organization.

The Importance of Napoleon

Napoleon Bonaparte was a key figure in the development of the nation-state. Amid the chaos of the French Revolution in the late eighteenth century, most remaining medieval and feudal laws were overturned and a truly national law code was established. Similarly, a national military was created. Although not the only reason, France's status as a nation-state was a key factor in its ability to dominate feudal neighbours in Italy and Germany. Napoleon's military victories also paved the way for the emergence of nation-states in the rest of Europe: In many places, the people rallied together as a nation in order to defeat Napoleon.

16.8 Evolution of Nation State in East

In East or post colonial countries, emergence of Nation States was basically the outcome of the anti – colonial movement, in Asia and Africa.

The spread of western education and liberals thought also helped the movement for building Nation States. Though the colonial rulers took initiatives for spreading western Education for their own sake but it helped to forge a sense of nationalhood shaped by the desire for national liberation.

Growing consciousness of own culture and history among the groups of people and emotional attachment also led to the demand of the formation of Nation States.

However, Eastern nationalisms do have one important common feature: they developed largely in response to Western invasion or intrusion. Throughout the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the Western powers increasingly competed for power and influence in Asia. India, Burma, and Malaya were British colonies; the East Indies were under the Dutch; while the French colonized Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, collectively known as Indochina. The United States occupied the Philippines and used military force to open Japan to foreign trade. China escaped outright colonization but was forced to open more than one hundred ports to trade and to allow foreign settlements and concessions on Chinese territory that were, in effect, mini colonies. Foreign troops protected foreign interests, and foreign gunboats patrolled Chinese rivers. The Japanese occupation of much of East and Southeast Asia in the 1930s and the 1940s accelerated the growth of nationalism in the affected nations.

Nationalism developed earlier and faster in some Asian countries than in others. It took quite varied forms: in Japan and Thailand it was based on loyalty to a sovereign and the revival of traditional religion; in China it was strongly linked to support for a republic, to

the restoration of national sovereignty, and eventually to support for the Communist Party, and in India nationalism was based on self-rule and the ideal of a secular democracy. However, everywhere in Asia and Africa nationalism was a reaction to foreign imperialism or colonialism, and it grew out of a fear of the great powers and a determination to strengthen the nation.

In cast elites played an important part in the development of nationalism. Traditional ruling elites felt vulnerable to the advance of Western imperialism. Although they sometimes reached accommodation with colonial regimes, they also supported nationalist movements in some cases. Even more important were the new elites. The growth of trade, especially in great trading cities such as Shanghai, Guangzhou, Singapore, Bombay (Mumbai), and Calcutta (Kolkata), produced the development of the middle classes that became involved in commerce, administration, and education. These new social groups often worked in close contact with Westerners, sent their children to schools that pursued modern curricula, and read modern-style newspapers. They were conscious of national humiliations but also of what they saw as the backwardness of their countries. They perceived reform and modernization as essential for national survival. Many of them joined nationalist movements, which in countries such as Vietnam, Malaya, and Indonesia also involved active anti colonialist struggles.

In cast nationalist leaders promised not only that their nations would become stronger but also that they would make economic progress, become wealthier, and allow their peoples to escape poverty once they could control their own future. These promises undoubtedly gained them much support during independence struggles. After independence, such promises have only been partially realized, although starting from the 1960s, the "East Asian economic miracle" raised the gross national product (GNP) per capita and living standards in Japan, South Korea, and Singapore. The economies of other Asian countries, including China and India, entered a period of rapid growth in the last two decades of the twentieth century. Contemporary Asian nationalisms often derive support from economic success.

Asian and African nationalist movements felt the opposing pulls of modernization and tradition. They developed in order to defend their nations against foreign pressure or colonization. As these nations were defined in relation to a shared language, tradition, custom, or culture, nationalist movements needed to cultivate a sense of pride in national history and culture. Yet often they were led by members of new elites whose Westernized education and urban lifestyles had cut them off from many aspects of their own culture and tradition or predisposed them to reject or despise it.

16.9 Challenges to Nation States

The nation-state is one of the hallmarks of the modern era. Since the 1990s there has been a vibrant academic debate regarding whether in the era since then—which is often titled “global,” “postindustrial,” “late modern,” or “postmodern”—nation-states have lost some of their power and authority. Many scholars have argued that contemporary nation-states face unprecedented challenges to their capacity to implement policies and to maintain social cohesion within their borders.

Most current challenges to nation-states are not new, and some of them are as old as the nation-state itself. However, for several decades, accelerating processes of globalization have challenged nation-states’ capacity to contain, control, and harness flows of people, economic capital, and cultural materials and to confine politics to public spheres and institutions and to relationships with other nation-states. States in different parts of the world vary in their degree of exposure to the pressures induced by globalization, as well as in their ability to resist or adapt to such pressures. Among the pressures imposed in varying degrees on all nation-states are the following.

Immigration

The influx of migrant workers and refugees to nation-states in the global North and West has tended to increase cultural and ideological fragmentation and tension, especially in cases where the immigrants’ religion and culture are very different from those of the host society, where immigrants are concentrated in urban ethnic enclaves, and where immigrants do not assimilate. Under such conditions, tensions between the majority and minority groups emerge and intergroup violence becomes more prevalent. Among majority groups, the presence of nonassimilating minorities amplifies internal struggles over the meaning of the national collective identity, the nation’s core ideology, and the definition of national interests. In the early 21st century these phenomena were especially evident in conflicts between the ultranationalist right and the liberal left in Europe and the United States.

Global capitalism and neoliberalism

The globalization of production, consumption, and finance in the late 20th century and the concurrent growth of rich and powerful multinational corporations has reduced the capacity of states to impose national protectionist policies and limited their ability to restrict the movement of people across their borders. The global spread of neoliberalism (an ideology and policy model advocating free markets and minimal state intervention

in economic and social affairs) and the development of international institutions that reinforce this ideology (e.g., the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund) have undermined the capacity of countries to engage in long-term macroeconomic planning and regulation and to maintain collectivist social welfare regimes. Growing inequality among citizens, increased economic uncertainty, and reduced welfare security are additional crucial aspects of the neoliberal turn that have led to greater political unrest.

Minorities' challenge to nation-based citizenship

In some nation-states, ethnic minorities have challenged the traditional model of nation-based citizenship because they claim rights based on principles alternative to citizenship: that is, they rely on international conventions that recognize individual human rights or the collective rights of minorities and indigenous peoples (some scholars call this phenomenon "postnational citizenship").

National disintegration

Increasing economic inequality between regions within nation-states and the rise of identity politics since the late 20th century have increased the likelihood of national disintegration in some countries through the development of secessionist aspirations among some ethnic groups, a phenomenon sometimes called Balkanization. Evidence of Balkanization can be observed both in relatively young nation-states in the postcolonial developing world and in established Western nation-states with long traditions of republicanism (e.g., the United Kingdom and Spain). This type of struggle may spill over to other nation-states through the spread of information and images via international media channels and the new social media.

Cultural globalization

The free flow of ideas and information through the Internet, particularly social media, and the increasingly global distribution of consumer goods have eroded the role of nation-states as producers and disseminators of national ideas, norms, and tastes, collectively sometimes called "national culture." In most countries many citizens are frequently exposed to cultural materials that contrast with the core ideals of nationalism in its heyday: collectivism and sacrifice are challenged by individualism, careerism, and hedonism; heroes and iconic figures emerge not only from national history books but also from the globalized entertainment industry; nation-centred concerns for national security and other priorities now need to compete, on the one hand, with transnational environmental concerns for the future of the planet and the survival of the entire human race (see global warming) and, on the other hand, with secessionist pressures brought about by identity politics.

Global civil society

New social movements and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that highlight issues such as the rights of indigenous peoples, the rights of sexual (LGBTQ) minorities (see gay pride), animal rights, and environmentalism present two complementary challenges to nation-states. First, they demand that political conversations within the nation-state be expanded beyond the core issues of national politics (i.e., national security and resource distribution or the allocation of public goods) to include issues related to the identities and ways of life of nonnational communities—such as preserving the cultural traditions and languages of ethnic or racial groups and protecting the rights of sexual minorities—as well as issues related to cosmopolitan ideals (see also cosmopolitanism)—such as expanding human rights, developing new modes of cooperation that cut across traditional divisions, and protecting the environment. Second, such movements and organizations tend to form transnational coalitions and to use advanced media technologies to expand their struggles to the public spheres of other states and to the diffused virtual space in which a global civil society has emerged. This mode of operation challenges the traditional confinement of political struggles to the public sphere of individual sovereign states.

Global risks

Environmental problems that threaten the survival of humankind, along with the international attention these problems have attracted, contrast with the traditional tendency of nation-states to prioritize their particularistic national interests. Transitional social movements (networks of activists from different countries that are committed to act for a common cause) and NGOs that focus on global issues (currently, especially global warming) have challenged nation-states in two complementary ways: they question the authority of individual nation-states and coalitions of nation-states to make their own policies regarding environmental problems, and, more generally, they question national authority itself by discrediting the assumption that national interests should be the dominant principle of policy making in any given country.

16.10 Future of Nation State

The primary strength of the nation state is that it offers the prospect of both cultural cohesion and political unity. Nationalists believe that the forces that have created a world of independent nation states are natural and irresistible. They believe that the nation state is ultimately the only viable unit.

However, a combination of internal premises and external threats has produced what is commonly referred to a crisis of the nation state. Internally, nation states have been subject to centrifugal pressures generated by an upsurge in ethnic and regional politics. In the contemporary world all nation state embody a measure of cultural diversity. In this context politics of ethnic coherence can not but present a challenge to the principle of the nation.

External threats to the nation-state come from different sources. First advances in technology of warfare and especially the advent of the nuclear age have brought about demands that world peace be policed by supranational bodies. Second, economic life has been progressively globalized and no national government can not control its economic destiny. Third, sation are concerned mainly with their own strategic and economic interest and most pay little attention to the ecological consequences of their action. Nation state be a threat to natural environment. Finally, the emergence of a transnational culture has weakened nation states. This has been Facilitates by international tourism and dramatic growth is communication technology.

16.11 Conclusion

The most widely recognized form of political organization world wide is the nation state, which is offer seen as the sole legitimate unit of political rule. Implicit in the success of the nation state and its universality is a threefold claim that this political formation is the one most effectively able to guarantee the economic well being, the physical security and the cultural identity of the people who contribute its citizens. However, or each of these dimension, economic, military and cultural forces at work which increasingly call into question the sovereign nation state's capacity to make effective these claims. Whatever effectiveness it may have had in the past is now increasingly being called into question.

16.12 Summing up

The nation state is the dominant political formation of the contemporary world. It is so central feature of the political landscape that it is difficult to imagine its absence. Historically considered, however, the nation state a comparatively recent phenomenon. It is a historical product, not a fact of nature. In the second half of the 20th century, since the break up of the colonial empires, it has become universal across the globe. A combination of economic, military and politico cultural forces in the present day world is now working to undermine the effectiveness of the nation state.

16.13 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions :

1. Discuss the historical evolution of Nation State.
2. Account for the crisis of the nation state.

Short Questions:

1. What are the differences between Nation and State?
2. What are the Characteristics of Nation State?

Objective Questions :

1. What is by ethic nation?
 2. What are the core elements of the westphalian system?
-

16.14 FurtherReading

1. Anderson, Benedict, *Imagined Communities*. 1991.
2. Colomer, Josep M., *Great Empires, Small Nations: The Uncertain Future of the Sovereign State*, 2007.
3. Gellner, Ernest, *Nations and Nationalism*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1983.
4. Hobsbawm, Eric J., *Nations and Nationalism Since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 1992.
5. James, Paul, *Nation Formation: Towards a Theory of Abstract Community*. London: Sage Publications, 1996.
6. Khan, Ali, "The Extinction of Nation States", 1992.
7. Renan, Ernest, "Qu'est-ce qu'une nation?" ("What Is a Nation?"), 1982.
8. Malesevic, Sinisa, *Identity as Ideology: Understanding Ethnicity and Nationalism*. New York: Palgrave, 2006.
9. Smith, Anthony D., *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*. London: Basil Blackwell, 1986.
10. White, Philip L., "Globalization and the Mythology of the Nation State". In A. G. Hopkins, ed. *Global History: Interactions Between the Universal and the Local*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Unit 17 □ Post-Colonial Context of Nation and State Debate

Structure

17.1 Objective

17.2 Introduction

17.3 Orientalism and colony's self- knowledge

17.4 Colonial knowledge and the making of modern nation states in the colonies

17.5 Nature and role if the post colonial state

17.6 Conclusion

17.7 Summing Up

17.8 Probable Questions

17.9 Further Reading

17.1 Objective

After reading this unit learners will be familiar with

- meaning of orientalism and post colonialism
- colonial knowledge and its impact
- nature and role of the post colonial state

17.2 Introduction

Post colonialism, the historical period or state of affairs representing the aftermath of Western

17.3 From Decolonization to Post-Colonialism

Although there were (and are) many different kinds of imperialism and thus emergence

17.4 Meaning of Nation-State

The fundamental parts of the nation-state are the nation and the state. A State is an and

17.5 Characteristics of Nation-state

Nation-states have their own characteristics that today may be taken-for-granted factors

16.8 Conclusion

The uncertainty of the nation-state’s continued viability in light of the many effects of

17.9 Summing Up

The concept of nation-state is notoriously difficult to define. However we can sum up the

17.10 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions

1. Describe the rise of nation state.
2. How did colonialism led to the rise of nation state.

Long Questions

1. What current trends raise doubts about future of the nation state?
2. What are the characteristics and challenges of nation-state?

Short Questions

1. Can a nation exist without state?
2. Write differences between nation and state?

17.11 Further Reading

1. Barkey, Karen and Sunita Parikh (1991), “Comparative Perspectives on the State”, Annual Review of Sociology, Vol. 17, pp. 523-49.
2. Berger, Mark (2006), “From Nation-Building to State-Building: The Geopolitics of Development, the Nation State System and the Changing Global Order”, Third World

Quarterly, Vol. 27, No. 1, pp. 5-25.

3. Call, Charles (2008), "Conclusion: Building States to Build Peace?" in Charles T. Call with Vanessa Wyeth (eds.), *Building States to Build Peace*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.
4. Carnahan, Michael and Clare Lockhart (2008), "Peace-Building and Public Finance" in Charles T. Call with Vanessa Wyeth (eds.), *Building States to Build Peace*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Boulder.
5. Mann, Michael (1984), "The Autonomous Power of the State: Its Origins, Mechanisms and Results", *Archives européennes de sociologie*, Vol. 25, pp. 185-213.
6. Ayoub Mohammed (2007), "State Making, State Breaking and State Failure", In: Crocker, Chester A, Fen Olser Hampson and Pamela All (eds) *Leashing the dogs of war*. Washington, DC.
7. Sarkar kumar Anil and Sarkar Ahil (2001), (eds) "Nation State and Marginal People: Perspective and Dimensions", Concept Publishing Company Pvt Ltd (first edition).

Unit 18 □ Process of Democratization in Post Authoritarian and Post Communist Countries

Structure

- 18.1 Objective
- 18.2 Introduction
- 18.3 Meaning of Democratization
- 18.4 Theories of Democratization
 - 18.4.1 Modernization Approach
 - 18.4.2 Historical Sociology
 - 18.4.3 Transition Approach
- 18.5 International Factors
- 18.6 Impediments to Democratization process
 - 18.6.1 Ethnic Fragmentation
 - 18.6.2 Weak Government
 - 18.6.3 Legacy of Authoritarian Rule
 - 18.6.4 Lack of Economic Development
- 18.7 Conclusion
- 18.8 Summing Up
- 18.9 Further Reading

18.1 Objective

The objective of this Unit is to understand critically the meaning, trends, different approaches and phases in democratization. After going through this unit students will be able to :

- To realise the meaning of democratization
- To understand the different approaches of democratization
- To recognise various approaches to study democratization
- To find out the causes which lead to democratization

18.2 Introduction

In the last part of the 20th century world witnessed an explosive spread of democracy. Between 1974 and 1990 more than thirty countries in Southern Europe, Latin America, East Asia, and Eastern Europe shifted from authoritarian to democratic systems of government. This “global democratic revolution” is probably the most important political trend in the international arena. Observers of world politics became convinced that they were witnessing a new era in global politics. The collapse of Communism in Eastern European countries in 1989 and the pro-democracy demonstrations in China the same year led to the belief that liberal democracy was fast becoming the only legitimate political ideology. Disintegration of Soviet Union in 1991 (where ideology of communism followed for more than seven decades) depicted a new world order and success of democracy. Nevertheless, democratization followed by the Eastern European countries was generally taken as an indication of the triumph of the West in political, economic and geopolitical terms. Fukuyama thought that it would no longer be possible to posit a real alternative to either capitalism or democracy. World history, he argued, had been dominated since the nineteenth century by material and ideological conflicts between capitalism and democracy and socialism and communism. The defeat of communism marked the end of this long-running contest. It was hoped that the new world order would give birth the security and prosperity a long standing aspiration of the people under the umbrella of democracy.

18.3 Meaning of Democratization

Democracy is a widely accepted ideology all over the world. Democratization is the process through which power is vested in the hands of the people. It means simply a transformation of the political system from non-democracy towards accountable and representative government. Democratization is also defined as a process which leads to more open, more participatory and less authoritarian society. As democratization developed, it became evident that although some countries successfully made a transition to democracy, others collapsed and many more fell – and remain – in the category of problematic democracies. The result was a shift in academic interest towards identifying those factors that make new democracies endure and those that, conversely, make for fragility or weakness. Democratization may be also described as a multifaceted and multidimensional concept. An increased interest is noticed among the academics, policy makers and activists in studying democratization due to its positive outcomes from respect for human rights to economic prosperity to security.

Three phases can be mentioned for understanding democratization as a process. These three phases are introduction, transition and consolidation of democracy in a nondemocratic regime. The first phase is known as introduction phase where democracy is introduced in a non-democratic regime due to collapse of the non-democratic government. Total failure of the non-democratic government means government becomes illegitimate. This loss of legitimacy may be caused as a result of economic recession or absence of loyalty of the armed forces. In the 1980s many developing countries in Latin America and Africa crashed into a profound recession. The debt crisis in the developing world had its origins in the problem of external debt repayments in the face of zooming global interest rate rises. Latin American and African economies collapsed, production almost halted, imports ended and credit dried up. In both regions, a majority of the governments at this time were not democratic. In Latin America, political turmoil developed in many authoritarian regimes and ultimately these regimes were replaced with civilian and elected government. Second is the transition phase in which transition process is oriented around the undermining of an authoritarian regime and the emergence of nascent democratic institutions and procedures. In this phase existing authoritarian structures and agencies become obsolete and negotiation over a new constitution rules and regulations for introducing competitive politics are taken. This phase depicts that transition occurs when a democratic opposition becomes strong and united enough to oppose the authoritarian regime, and the authoritarian regime appears too fragile and divided to control the situation, either by co-opting the democratic opposition or cracking down by using. Three general modes of transition are noticed. These three transitions include pact or agreement transition, bottom up transitions and top down transitions. In pacted transitions moderate members of a weakened authoritarian regime negotiate the conditions with the of a transition with the moderate members of a pro democracy movement. old and new. Spain in 1977 and Chile in 1990 belong to this type of transition. Secondly there is another type of transition known as Bottom –up transition where authoritarian regime is weakened due to popular movement which ultimately forces the regime to give up power. Democratic transitions in Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic are exact examples of bottom up transition. In top-down transition, leaders of an authoritarian regime implement the democratic reforms as it appears to them that reforms will act as necessary tool for survival of its rule.

18.4 Theories of Democratization

Theories of democratization are related basically with causation and the identification of the main factors that lead to the emergence of democracies. Most explanations of democratization advocate three distinct approaches : modernization theory; historical

sociology (sometimes called structuralism); and transition theory (also known as agency theory). These different approaches are described below and examined how they have been used in the literature on contemporary democratization.

18.4.1 Modernization Approach

According to Giddens modernity invariably leads to globalization that means it spreads across the world creating one uniform culture. Seymour Martin Lipset impressed by the modernization theory shared the opinion of Max Weber that democracy is an outcome of capitalism. According to Lipset capitalism is the heart of democracy because it produced wealth. It associates economic growth in a causal relationship with progress. Modernization is also predictive: democracy appears in those societies are able to 'replicate the original transition' to capitalism. Lipset argued that a wealthy nation has better chances to sustain democracy. Some noted that democratization is the final stage of modernization process. Fundamental argument is that economic progress gives birth an educated and business oriented middle class. Thus, Socio-economic development strengthens the civil society as well as middle class who act as promoters of democratic values. A large middle class is widely viewed as a stabilizing that guards against authoritarian tendencies. Through rule of law they always eager to protect their political, economic and social rights. Middle class pressures for democratic reforms and such type of pressures play an important role for democratization in different places like the UK, the United States, South Korea, the Philippines, and Latin America. Middle class do not always support democracy, it can also support authoritarianism when this regime serves their interest like in countries such as China in at the beginning of the 21st Centuries Germany in 1930s, Chile in the 1970s. Another argument is that experience with capitalism promotes democratization as economic freedom creates pressure on the state authority for political freedom. Capitalism gives rise to a new business class with interests separate from the state. This business class raises demands before the state for particular issues which effect their interests like taxation and property rights. On the other hand, the absence of economic freedom reduces the scope of political freedom making authoritarianism more likely. In countries like United States and Great Britain industrialization led to democratization. But there are some countries like Germany, Japan and Russia where Industrialization coincided with authoritarianism. A hybrid regime model emerged in the countries like China Singapur Mexico, Chile, Argentine and the Philippines where the business class supported authoritarian leaders who respected private enterprise. It would be pertinent to mention here that development does not always sustain democracy. At the time of cold war democracy faced setback and ultimately collapsed in many countries of Latin America like Argentine, Chile and Uruguay. However, These countries witnessed a high degree of development. At present China has been

regarded as the second largest economy of the world by permitting private enterprise and economic freedom, while imposing strict control on political freedom. This internal policy of China contradicts the notion that economic liberalization will necessarily lead to political liberalization. However, the existence of wealthy authoritarian regimes in countries like China and Saudi Arabia indicate that wealth is neither necessary nor sufficient for democratization to occur.

18.4.2 Historical Sociology

Historical sociology is a kind of ‘macrohistory’ in which history is ‘the instrument by which structures are discovered. This approach is sometimes called structuralism as emphasis on structures are given.

In the study of democratization ‘historical sociology’ and ‘structuralism’ are often used interchangeably.

It is because of this emphasis on structures that the approach is sometimes termed ‘structuralism’. ‘Historical sociology’ and ‘structuralism’ are often used interchangeably in democratization studies. An important strand of historical sociology has been the search to identify different trajectories of state development or paths to modernity, through, for example, war or revolution. The historical/sociological approach to democratization has two particular intellectual origins. In part, it arose out of a reaction to the excessively society-based accounts of political change implicit in behaviouralism in the 1960s, and offers instead a state-centered view. It is therefore part of the intellectual labour of ‘bringing the state back in’ to politics.. It also drew explicitly on a critique of the short-termism and causal simplicity of modernization as an explanation of democratization. It is, inevitably, a much more diffuse approach to democratization than modernization theory, with a primary interest in explaining, not predicting, outcomes. Barrington Moore’s work ‘On Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy’ is regarded as a significant milestone for historical/sociological understanding of democratization. Moore made a comparative study of eight countries Britain, France, the US, Germany, Russia, Japan, China and India through the nineteenth century and twentieth century. According to Moore outcome (whether a country would choose a path of democracy or not) that depended on the interactions between the three important classes – the peasantry, the landed upper class and the bourgeoisie. Essentially, democracy took place when :

- the ‘peasant question’ was solved by the gradual elimination of peasant agriculture and the rise of opportunities for transforming the peasantry into urban workers through the expansion of towns and industrial employment opportunities; and
- the landed class was defeated and transformed in its struggles for control of the state by the rising bourgeoisie.

However, Historical and Structural approaches have been subject to a number of criticisms. The major critiques of structuralism have therefore been both ontological and epistemological : its view of the world is too simple . Post modernists argue that power is too diffused a concept to be understood in a static way. Historical Sociology and Structuralism give importance to the historical change in the long run but failed to explain the onset sudden democratization in the erstwhile communist countries in the East and Central Europe and the former Soviet republics where there was little evidence of class struggle or demand for democracy. External factors played an important role in democracy building in these regions. The discontinuation of the Brezhnev Doctrine by Gorbachev further in respect of regional policy weakened the communist regime in European countries. The reforms introduced by Gorbachev in the Soviet Union, and especially the beginning of Perestroika, were important catalysts for democratization in East and Central Europe. The satellite nations of Soviet Union were left in a state of turmoil as no help was extended to normalize the crisis. Linz and Stepan have argued that the ‘domino-like collapse’ of Communism in East and Central Europe was very swift and in some countries, such as Czechoslovakia, Romania and Bulgaria even in absence of significant domestic pressure for change , transition towards democracy was driven simply by the regional wave. The most important democratic function that civil society can perform is its engagement with the state as a force for change. The capacity of civil society organizations to press for reform and to engage with the state is perhaps a key for understanding whether democratic consolidation takes place. Civil society played a key role in democratization process in Central and Eastern Europe. It also took initiative in the struggle for democratization in Asia, Africa and Latin America. In particular, women’s movements, labor movements, community organizations and indigenous associations can be identified as engaging with the state in pro-democracy struggles.

18.4.3 Transition Approach

The transition approach, also known as the agency approach, advocates process of change from a non-democratic to a democratic regime. The transition approach depicts that democracy is created by conscious, committed actors, providing that they possess a degree of luck and show a willingness to compromise. The question of waiting for mature economic condition which may lead to democracy does not arise. According to transition approach both modernizationists and structuralists give too much emphasis on economy, history and developmental factors in determining political outcomes. According to structuralists and modernization school democracy may be regarded as an exceptional outcome which has emerged only in few parts of the world. Both these schools argue that democracy may be originated only in an atmosphere of required level of development or where class or social structure is favourable. Agency perspectives suggest that

democracy can be created independent of the structural context. Therefore, the transition approach presumes that the chances for expansion of democracy in the contemporary world order are good. This approach observes that if elites can learn the right way to proceed then there will be successful outcome of democracy. D A Rustow wrote an article in 1970 entitled ‘Transitions to Democracy Toward a Dynamic Model ‘ which may regarded as intellectual starting point of Transition approach. Rustow argues that the defect of modernization theory is that it mistakes to realize the functional features of mature democracies –what brings them into being. He opines that a unified nation state is the only condition for democracy where the citizens should not possess any mental reservations about their belonging to their political community. Rustow hypothesizes that the democratization is a dynamic process which passes through three stages – a preparatory phase, a decision phase(in which the choices and negotiations of ‘a small circle of leaders’ play a particularly crucial role) and a habituation phase in which citizens and leaders fully adapt to the new system. These stages were later transformed into liberalization, transition and consolidation. The book entitled *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule* became the key reference for transition studies. In this book the authors examined interactions, pacts and bargains struck between democratic opposition and authoritarian leaders. Successful transition is the result of an agreement between elites of both sides. This approach has been criticized for its too much emphasis on elitism. Another criticism is it is excessively empirical and voluntaristic. It is argued that the transition approach separates democracy from its indispensable meanings rule by the people and conceptualizes it principally as the establishment of a set of governing institutions.

18.5 International Factors

Today research is focused on national and international factors responsible for democracy building. Until 1990s, most research works are focused on democratic factors in respect of democracy building. Some significant research works started in 1960s for identifying the international dimension to political change began in 1960s. As the time of decolonization, a large number of studies focused on political and economic leakage and dependencies and dependencies between developed and less developed states. It was advocated that international political and economic structures create influence beyond the state boundaries and provided link between powerful and less powerful actors. It is further argued that third world countries were influenced by rich countries in west based on an unjustified and unequal world economic structure. States are open systems vulnerable for penetration and developed and powerful states could have a political impact on democracy building. In the

1990s the debate about the international dimension came predominance ,into lime light in the scholarly works on globalization. Economic, technological, cultural and political transformations across borders of intensification of interactions, exchanges and meetings led to a de- territorialization of politics. Globalization and Global politics have enhanced interdependence and as a result global charges were cutting through state borders by challenging the domestic political, economic and cultural domestic structures which led by decreasing geographical distances around the world.

Research on the international dimension on democracy building has been also focused by the studies on globalization after the end of Cold War. This appeared in the conceptualization of the international dimension to democracy in democratic diffusion and democratic promotion. It was argued that the expansion of democracy was facilitated by political, cultural and economic salience often provided by geographical proximity. Diffusion of democracy was one important dimension of globalization – aside from the spread of economic liberation and technology. Another international dimension factor for building democracy has been democracy Promotion. Studies during the 1990s emphasized that democracy promotion led to democratization through some powerful actors such as European Union, the organization of security and cooperation in Europe and the United States among others and the declining power of Soviet Union. These actors promoted democratic ideas and encouraged to launch democratic reforms. Geoffrey Sridham in his book ‘ Encouraging Democracy : The International Context of Regime Transformation in Southern Europe’ argued that international factors played a significant role in democracy building. He also analyzed how such factors had an increased role in explaining the transitions to democracy in Europe from 1970s to the 1990s. White lead’s book ‘The International Dimension of Democratization’ – Europe and Americas’ is an impressive study on the international factors for democratization. White lead has given three types of international factors. First one is contagion which implies a mode of non-coercive impact where domestic democratic reforms are a result of the spirit of time. contagion was seen during the third wave of democratization, first in South Europe, followed by Latin America, former communist countries in central and East Europe and finally in Sub-Saharan Africa. Control implies change of a regime by coercive political, economic and/or military methods. Such a mode of influence could include intervention and isolation to enforce the transition to democratic institutions. On the other hand consent operates where an understanding between domestic and external countries to democratization.

Steven Lewinsky and Luann Way have argued that close ties to the west increased the likelihood of democratization after the end of Cold War. The American influence in Latin America offers a good example in role of external factors in democratization process.

During the Cold War, the US intervened directly or indirectly in Latin American countries if its economic or political interests were threatened by the Cold War politics. Washington even supported authoritarian regimes to protect its own interests as in cases of Guatemala (1954), Chile (1973) and Uruguay (1973). After the Cold War, the US practice shifted towards promotion of liberal democracy. Western donors attach strings to their aid and promote democracy and human rights through their developmental model in countries ranging from Asia, Africa to Latin America. The US, during the Cold War, used its democratic values as soft power to undermine the influence of Soviet Union. It has successfully used soft power in democracy promotion in post-Communist states in Eastern Europe. Democratization has been a sore point in the US-Russia geopolitical rivalry starting with the 21st century. There have been various civil society inspired movements in some former Soviet Republics to overthrow authoritarian and corrupt leaders. Also called colour revolutions, these movements aspired for democracy in countries like Ukraine (Orange Revolutions, 2004), Georgia (Rose Revolution, 2003) and Kyrgyzstan (Tulip Revolution, 2005). Russia has accused the Americans of using the civil society as a tool to topple pro-Russian leaders and increase their influence in former Soviet republics. Democratization in post-Soviet countries is seen with suspicion by Russia due to American and European Union's influence. For example, in Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan), democratic institutions exist but opposition is largely marginalized and single-leaders dominate their political scene. It is for this reason that some describe the regimes in Central Asian countries as façade democracies. The ruling elites in the region know that their survival would be at stake if they loosen their grip over power. They very well remember failure of Gorbachev's political and economic reforms which were an important factor in disintegration of Soviet Union. The ruling elites are supported by Russia and China who are against any West-inspired attempts to install democracy in the region.

18.6 Impediments to Democratization Process

There are several factors which create hindrances in democratization process. These factors can be discussed in brief.

18.6.1 Ethnic Fragmentation

Ethnic fragmentation may create a huge challenge to democracy. Such ethnic divisions have created a great threat to the stability of democratic system in Africa because clash of diverse cultural traditions foster political tensions between groups in Africa, challenging the democratic system. Problems created by such fragmented societies may even result

in civil wars like in Somalia, creating social and political chaos and making democratic governance impossible.

18.6.2 Weak Government

The colonial powers in Africa imposed a Western model of democracy which is unfamiliar to the African people. This Western model of democracy appeared as superfluous and as a result democracy ruined in many African countries like Ghana, Uganda or Nigeria. The process of democratization faced challenges due to illegitimacy and weakness of many African states. The democratic relationship between the state and the society is usually based on a social contract which means obedience of the society in exchange of protection from the state. But some African countries have failed to provide necessary security and as a result progress of democracy has become hampered to a great extent. Citizens of these countries often do not feel loyalty to the inefficient and weak governments which provide a minimum level of security and a low standard of living. The model of the modern democratic state which was imposed on the African countries, lacks the necessary legitimacy for democratic progress.

18.6.3 Legacy of Authoritarian Rule

Authoritarian legacy plays a major role in creating obstacles towards the process of democratization. The past becomes an important part of culture and ideology of the state. Latin American countries represent a good example in this regard. The people of this region often follow the tradition of a strong man which has led to the rise of populist presidents. Now it is very much difficult to change the culture of governance and political tradition that prefers populism, clientelism and macho depiction of leaders. However, previous authoritarian and army ruled states like Brazil, Colombia, Peru, Ecuador, Paraguay, Chile are facing troubles in establishing democracy due to issues such as income inequality, corruption, weak rule of law and frequent violence.

18.6.4 Lack of Economic Development

There are two hindrances in obtaining the trust of the citizens and security for democracy. One is the weak performance of the economy and other is the corruption. Acute economic problems play a major role in political instability, creating hurdles in transitional process of democracy. In South Africa, a good proportion of people prefer strong, non elected leader. In many African countries in the present day social problems like debt, poverty, refugee problems, crime, unemployment, diseases, inflation are receiving priorities than the transformation to democracy. Bratton argues that “ordinary Africans do not separate political democracy from economic democracy or for that matter from economic well being.” According to the African people democratic reforms should lead to the

employment opportunity. Another factor responsible for creating obstacles in economic development is illiteracy. Illiteracy has caused for the dislocation, participation and understanding that the African people have for politics and democracy. Illiteracy represents practical hurdles for democratization process because educated people have the capacity to face problems that emerge from democracy. Economic development is urgently needed before there can be sustainable democracy. However, it is argued that economic reforms produce new fundamental bias for democracy like increasing social inequalities. Further, economic reforms may lead to weakening democratization as government may try to avoid opposition by bypassing parliament and declare presidential decrees.

18.7 Conclusion

To-day democratization has become an issue of global concern that has led to change in non-democratic countries. Even authoritarian elites have been forced to hide under a cover of democracy and searching for a new ideological bases for domination. It would be worthwhile to say that democratization has had dramatic effects on the international system, on the foreign policies of major Western states. In other words democratization is a means to establish a capitalist global market which serves global capitalists. Further, the opportunity for democratization has been created by the collapse of the authoritarian rules particularly in the eastern European states and Latin American countries. After 1989 democracy became central value of the new global order and it has been confidently predicted that democratization would successfully spread all over the world.

18.8 Summing Up

Democratization means a transformation of the political system from non-democracy towards accountable and representative government. Democratization is a multidimensional approach that related to different subjects like sociology, political science, international relations ,economics, political economy and other studies. These studies adopt a process oriented approach, concentrating on identifying the mechanisms or paths that lead to democratization. There are various approaches to study democratization modernization, historical sociology, transition and the international factors. History of democratization shows that democratization does not follow only one way and has varied across time and space. In the Eastern European countries several factors led to democratization . Former Soviet Union had lost its control over its republics and allied nations which hastened the process of democratization. There are some powerful actors like European Union, the organization

of security and cooperation in Europe and the United States which also play a crucial role in the process of democratization. These actors promoted democratic ideas and tried to influence for democratic reforms. In Latin American countries proximity of the neighbouring countries particularly United States play a major role in the process of democratization. In these countries influence of the US on political change in 1980s and 1990s can not be understated. Equally, in African countries process of democratization has been subject to a variety of external influences most important of which are the international financial agencies, although the US and European countries have played a key role.

18.9 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions :

1. Discuss the different theories of democratization.
2. Discuss two approaches to the study of democratization.

Long Questions :

1. What is the meaning of democratization?
2. Describe the international factors responsible for democratization.
3. What are the impediments to democratization?

Short Questions

1. What factors are responsible for democratization in former communist countries in Eastern Europe?
2. What is Transition approach ?

18.10 Further Reading

1. Grugel, J. 2002. Democratization —A Critical Introduction . New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Schumpeter, Joseph A. 1947. Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy. New York : Harper.
3. Burnell , Peter. 2013. Democratization Through the Looking –glass . Manchester : Manchester University Press.
4. Huntington, S. P. 1968. Political Order in Changing Societies. New Haven , CT: Yale University Press.

5. Fukuyama, F. 1992. *The End of History and the Last Man*. New York: Penguin.
6. Imam Ayesha. July 1992. Democratization Process in Africa: Problems and Prospects. *Economic and Political Weekly*, PP.102-105.
7. Bratton, Michael, and Robert Mattes. 2007. "Learning About Democracy in Africa: Awareness, Performance and Experience," *American Journal of Political Science*, 51 (1): 192-217.

Unit 19 □ Historical Context of Federation and Confederation

Structure

- 19.1 Objective
- 19.2 Introduction
- 19.3 Meaning of Federation
- 19.4 Meaning of Confederation
- 19.5 Similarities between Federation and Confederation
- 19.6 Differences between Federation and Confederation
- 19.7 Conclusion
- 19.8 Summary
- 19.9 Probable Questions
- 19.10 Further Reading

19.1 Objective

This unit highlights the concept of Federation And Confederation. Covering this unit learners will be able to :

- Explain the meaning and concept of federation and confederation
- Understand the features of federal system and confederation
- Realise the difference between federation and confederation

19.2 Introduction

Federalism is often regarded as a philosophy, doctrine and ideology. It depicts a distinct territorial pattern of government, one that combines the centralization of some political powers and the decentralization of others. In other words, in a federation, political power

is divided between the central and provincial governments so that each government can independent of the other within its own sphere. The Governing political system of federalism is the basis of the federation. Several countries of the world have adopted federal form of government. But the nature and characteristics of the federalism varies from one country to other. An in depth study of the federal form of governments in the countries like United States, Canada, Australia, India (India is often described as quasi federal state) Hungary show that variations among these countries exist. In fact, federalism in each country has its own characteristics depending upon its historical evolution. It is important to mention that “federations” are sometimes described as “federal political systems.” where political systems are not explicit. Some argue, for example, that “union states,” such as the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Kingdom of Spain, and the Republic of India, are in practice “federal political systems”. These union-states are certainly examples of “territorial pluralism”. Centralization of sovereignty and centralization tendencies are creating obstacles in defining these countries as legally federations. Non-centralization or decentralization is an important phenomenon in a federation because non- centralization or decentralization emphatically distinguishes between federation and the devolution or delegation of authority.

The terms federation and confederation refer to similar phenomenon yet both are not similar concepts. Confederations are formed with the sovereign states for certain common purposes, such as defence, foreign relations, internal trade or currency. In a confederation member states retain their sovereignty and create a weak central government which fails to provide an effective executive authority. Member states typically retain their separate military establishments and separate diplomatic representation; and members are generally accorded equal status with an acknowledged right of secession from the confederation. The nature of the relationship among the member states of a confederation varies considerably. Some looser and weak confederations have similarities to international organizations. Other confederations with strict rules and regulations are becoming like federal systems. In a confederation decisions are taken by consensus and not by majority. These decisions are not treated as laws and it is difficult on the part of the central government to direct the citizens of the member states to follow such decisions.. Here assistance of the member states are utmost necessity for implementation of such decisions. Due to such practical problems political pressure tends to build over time for the transition to a federal system of government. United States of America, Swiss and German federations represent appropriate examples in this regard.

19.3 Meaning of Federation

A federation is a political system comprising of at least two territorial levels of government and where both share sovereign constitutional authority over their respective division and joint share of law-making powers. Generally, the states having large territories and numerous provinces accept the concept of federation. The decision of entering a federation of state can be voluntary, but in most cases, it is the result of a long historic process or the transformation of a confederation (i.e. temporary and voluntary agreement) into a federation. The balance of power between the constituents and the central government is laid out in a written constitution. Provinces and states members of a federation do not entirely lose their power, and can enjoy a certain degree of independence. Individual states can maintain separate laws, traditions and habits, but the central government has the authority over some important matters related to the security and economic phenomena of the country. These are defence and security matters, foreign policy, international relations and diplomacy, decision to declare or end a war, national currency and military. In addition, the central government can interfere on the legal and economic aspects of the member states/provinces. Policies and regulations approved by the central government apply to the federation members – in line with the provisions laid out in the constitution – and constituents are legally bound to respect such regulations. Federations are quite common today: the United States, Canada and Switzerland are just few of the most common examples, although Switzerland retained the title “confederation” even after becoming a federation. In the United States, the federation is formed of fifty individual states, while in Canada and Switzerland provinces are tied together under the umbrella of the central government.

19.4 Meaning of Confederation

A confederation is a system of governance, in which the constituents (states or provinces or cantons) come together for political, economic, security or administrative reasons. Entering a confederation is entirely voluntary and depends on the government of every individual states – or on the local authority in the case of provinces. Once entered the confederation, the constituents maintain their sovereignty and their powers (almost entirely), and there is no superior, unified, central government. Depending on the structure of the confederation, there might be a weak central body, appointed by all constituents, created to speed up bureaucratic processes and facilitate communication. In a confederation there is no unitary budget or Common military or common foreign policy strategy, or common diplomatic representative, or Common legal system.

The United States started as confederation and later turned into a federation once the constitution was created, signed and ratified by all members. The concept of confederation is similar to the principles on which international organizations stand. For instance, the European Union has similar structure, even though it is not officially defined as such, in particular because there are legally binding documents that prevent states to enter and exit the union as they please. The European Union is formed of various countries that willingly decided to give up part of their independence – but still maintaining their sovereignty – in order to create an international body and present a united front on the international scale. All international governmental organizations – like the United Nations – follow the concept of confederation. States decide to create a union, but maintain their power and are only subject to international laws and norms if they decide to ratify treaties and covenants.

19.5 Similarities between Federation and Confederation

Federation and confederation have some similarities in common that can be described in the following manner;

- In both cases, various states, countries or provinces come together to create a new entity for matters of political, economic and security convenience. Federations and confederations only exist if there is a common agreement among constituents. Indeed, members need to adopt a common constitution to become part of the federation, while entering a confederation is not binding.
- In both cases, being part of the federation or the confederation should benefit member states. In the first case, constituents give up part of their sovereignty in order to receive protection, security and economic or political advantages. In the second case, states and provinces enter the confederation to create a stronger entity and enjoy administrative and economic advantages without losing power or authority.

19.6 Differences between Federation and Confederation

Federation and confederation are political and strategical agreements among countries or provinces, created in order to enable the constituents to enjoy political and economic benefits. In spite of some similarities, there are differences between Federation and Confederation.

- Federation is a creation of new state, but confederation does not create a new state.
- The member states in a federation lose their sovereignty and are controlled by the

central authority . But the member states in a confederation retain their sovereignty even after their union.

- The membership in a federation is mandatory while membership in a confederation is voluntary to the states. Therefore, the members of a confederation can leave the union at any time they wish.
- Federation has a written constitution while confederation does not have a written constitution.
- The resolutions passed by the federations concern the laws made by the federal government and member states are bound to obey and enforce them. On the contrary, the resolutions passed by the Confederation do not hold the status of law thus not binding and member states are not bound to implement them.
- The extent of the association in a confederation is not as deep as in a federation. In other words is a rigid union while confederation is more or less a loose union.

19.7 Conclusion

Confederation and federation are two government systems in which states or provinces come together for political, economic, social, or security reasons. Even though they are often confused, they are quite different. In a confederation there is no new central government and constituents maintain their autonomy, independence and sovereignty. Conversely, members of a federation are subject to laws and regulations created by the federal government, although they maintain a certain degree of autonomy. Today, the number of existing confederations is limited, while the number of federations is quite high. The main difference between the two is the constitution (absent in the case of a confederation), which creates legal ties among member states and sets the balance of power between central and local authorities.

19.8 Summary

Federations and Confederations are two forms of government systems in the world. We can see the federation system in states consisting of large territories with several provinces and regions while the confederation is usually among autonomous states with common political and economic objectives. The main difference between federation and confederation lies in the sovereign status of their members after the formation of confederation.

19.9 Probable Questions

Essay type Questions :

1. Describe in brief the historical context of federation and confederation.
2. Do you think that the Indian federation has a strong centralizing tendency? Argue your case.
3. Write a critical essay on Indian federation.

Long Question :

1. Differentiate between federation and confederation.
2. Mention the key features of federation and confederation.

Short Questions :

1. Define confederation.
2. Mention two essential features of us federation.

19.10 Further Reading

1. Baogang He,(et.all),(2007), Federalism in Asia, Edward Elgar,UK,USA,Mary
2. Mary Hawkesworth&Maurice Kogan(ed.),(2002), Encyclopaedia of Government and Politics, volume 1, Routledge, London and Newyork,
3. K.K.Misra,(2007), Select Constitutions, New Delhi,
4. Andrew Heywood,(2004), Third Edition, Political Theory an Introduction, Palgrave Macmillan,UK,USA,
5. Aaron Wildarsky (ed.), (1967) , American Federalism in Perspective , Little Brown and Company , Boston.
6. Sharada Rauth, (1984) , Federation To-day,Sterling, New Delhi.

Unit 20 □ Debates around the Territorial Division of Power

Structure

- 20.1 Objectives
- 20.2 Introduction
- 20.3 Meaning of Federalism
- 20.4 Historical Concept of Federalism
- 20.5 Characteristics of Federalism
- 20.6 Meaning of Confederation
- 20.7 Differences between Federalism and Confederation
- 20.8 What is territorial power sharing?
- 20.9 Debates Around the Territorial Division of Power
- 20.10 Conclusion
- 20.11 Summing up
- 20.12 Probable Questions
- 20.13 Further Reading

20.1 Objective

Federalism and the territorial division of power are considered important in the discussion of modern political science. After going through this unit, Learner will be familiar with

- Meaning , historical Concept and Characteristics of Federalism.
- Meaning of Confederation.
- Difference between Federalism and Confederation.
- Territorial power sharing and Debates Around the Territorial Division of Power.

20.2 Introduction

To get an idea of the Debate Around Territorial Division of Power, one needs to first understand federalism. Because as part of federalism, there is a clear idea about the discussion of the debate of Territorial Division of Power.

It is most commonly used to denote an organizational principle of a political system, emphasizing both vertical power-sharing across different levels of governance (centre-region) and at the same time, the integration of different territorial and socio-economic unit, cultural and ethnic groups in a single polity.

Federal political systems are often viewed as combining ‘unity with diversity’. Federal political systems come in different forms : i) ‘from below’ through the consent of the constituent units such as, in the United States of America and Switzerland etc. and ii) ‘from above’ through imposition from the ‘centre’ or outside forces like Germany after the Second World War, post-Franco Spain or Belgium etc.

Territorial power sharing can be understood as the sharing and delegation of the central government’s powers and responsibilities to geographical units. It can include restructuring from a centralised to a federal state, or moving decision-making power from a central government to regional or local governments. It can also include delegation of forms of political, fiscal, or administrative self-governance to regional or local groups who make claims to govern a particular area of territory.

Territorial power-sharing is often used in peace processes, to accommodate the competing interests of conflict parties to territorial control, including competing claims to unitary statehood and to secession. Like other forms of power-sharing it can offer greater inclusion in the form of self-government for groups who have been contesting the state’s marginalization of them. However, territorial power-sharing can in turn cause other forms of inclusion and exclusion which require to be anticipated and addressed.

20.3 Meaning of Federalism

Federalism: The term “Federalism” is derived from the Latin word ‘foedus’ meaning compact, covenant, agreement. Federalism is a system of government in which the same territory is controlled by two levels of government. Generally, an overarching national government is responsible for broader governance of larger territorial areas, while the smaller subdivisions, states, and cities govern the issues of local concern.

Federalism is a mixed or compound mode of government that combines a general government (the central or “federal” government) with regional governments (provincial, state, cantonal, territorial, or other sub-unit governments) in a single political system, dividing the powers between the two. Federalism in the modern era was first adopted in the unions of states during the Old Swiss Confederacy.

It can also be said that, federalism, mode of political organization that unites separate states or other polities within an overarching political system in a way that allows each to maintain

its own integrity. Federal systems do this by requiring that basic policies be made and implemented through negotiation in some form, so that all the members can share in making and executing decisions. The political principles that animate federal systems emphasize the primacy of bargaining and negotiated coordination among several power centres; they stress the virtues of dispersed power centres as a means for safeguarding individual and local liberties.

20.4 Historical Concept of Federalism

In the early seventeenth century, an initial concept of federalism was conceived by Johannes Althusius in direct contrast to Jean Bodin's theory of absolute sovereignty (for which unitary Government is an inevitable element). Althusius advocated a multi-layer polity with family and kinship, guilds and states. He is regarded as the "Father of modern Federal Political Thought."

The modern concept of federalism was originated from the theory of Separation of Powers by Montesquieu. The USA federal system is considered as the first modern federal government (1789) but it was neither planned nor having any structure defined by the constitution. In fact, the structure of American federal system has evolved over a period of time as a result of the Supreme Court's interpretation of the provisions of the constitution dealing with federal and state power.

20.5 Characteristics of Federalism

The following are the important characteristics of federalism also known as federal form of government.

- **Supremacy of the Constitution an important Feature of Federalism**

A federation is an agreement between two or more sovereign states to create a new state in which each will exercise specific powers. This agreement is in the shape of the constitution. The constitution defines and explains the powers and the jurisdiction of each government. For this purpose the constitution is considered to be the supreme law in the federation. No central or provincial, which is against the constitution, can be enforced. Similarly if a change is desired in the constitution, it must be according to the method provided by the constitution. Supremacy of the constitution means:

1. **A Written Constitution:** Since it is an agreement, it must be in the written

form so that there are no doubts about the powers and functions of each set of government. A written thing is generally very clear.

2. **Rigid Constitution:** It means that there should be a definite and difficult method of amending the constitution. In this way it will remain supreme.
3. **Sovereignty of the Amending Body:** Since both the federal and the provincial government derive their powers from the constitution, neither can be sovereign. So sovereignty lies with the body which has the power to amend the constitution.

- **Distribution of Powers**

In federalism the powers are divided between the federal and the provincial governments. There is no uniform method for the distribution of powers. The general and the basic principle is that matters of local importance are given to the provinces and that of national importance to the federal government. Besides this there are the following three methods of distribution of powers commonly used in the world today:

1. **American Method :** Under this method powers of the central government are written down and the remaining powers known as the residuary powers are given to the provinces. The aim behind this method is to keep the center weak and the provinces strong. This method is used in the USA.
2. **Canadian Method :** This is just opposite of the American method. Under this system the powers of the provinces are written down in the constitution and residuary powers are given to the federal government. The idea is to make the center strong. This method is used in Canada.
3. **Indian Method :** This method was introduced in India under the Act of 1935. Under this method three lists are drawn. One contains the powers of the federal government called the Federal List. Similarly there is the Provincial List and then there is the third list, which is, called Concurrent List containing the powers, which can be exercised by both the governments. In case of conflict between the federal and provincial law regarding the concurrent subject, the central law will prevail.

- **Supremacy of Judiciary**

Constitution is an important document and the basic law of the country. A federation can remain intact only when the constitution remains inviolable. For this purpose there must be an agency to seek and judge whether or not the two governments have violated the constitution. This agency is called the judiciary. It can perform this

function only when it remains supreme. This means that the judiciary has to perform the following function:

1. Whenever there is a dispute regarding any provision of the constitution judiciary has to interpret it.
2. It has the duty to declare any law whether central or provincial as unconstitutional if it is in conflict with the constitution. This is called the power of judicial review.
3. Since the formal method of amending the constitution is normally very difficult, it is the judiciary, which by its liberal interpretation of the provisions of the constitution makes it flexible and workable. This is called the Doctrine of implied powers.

- **Bicameral Legislature**

A federal state has two kinds of governments having different interests and rights. There is, therefore, a need for the protection of these rights and interests. This can be done only when there is a bicameral legislature. The two houses represent the two interests. Normally the Lower House represents the interests of the nation and the upper house represents the interests of the provinces. Normally representation in the Lower House is based on population and for the upper house the principle of parity is followed that is whether a state is small or large it will have equal number of seats. This method is followed in USA and in Pakistan.

20.6 Meaning of Confederation

Confederation is a union of groups of states where the central government is weak but the state governments are strong. In a confederation, the state or local government enjoy supreme power or sovereignty whereas the national government only wields power granted by the states. Even most of the confederations have allowed the local governments to nullify a federal law within its own territory.

Commonwealth of independent states, union state, European union are the examples of present confederation.

Most of the confederations gradually turned into federations, Swiss Canton turned into Switzerland, Modern German Federation preceded by German confederation, Articles of Confederations (1781 -89) gave birth to the constitution of United State.

20.7 Differences between Federalism and Confederation

The following differences between Confederation and Federalism are considered important.

1. Confederations are voluntary associations of independent states. In other side federation of states is formed when a group of states united /motivated by political, economic or cultural issues.
2. The states are united to secure common interest. But regional similarity or uniqueness is often act as a guiding force to form federalism.
3. Units of confederations are agreed to certain limitations on their freedom of action. But units or States of Federalism do not enjoy sovereignty.
4. States under confederation are bound to consult with others before taking decision. In other side, central or national government acts as the machinery to implement important policies or to supervise joint activities.
5. Confederation allows its units to maintain Defence and Foreign policy independently. But both central and state governments enjoy independent areas of administration.
6. Confederations often turn into federations. But units of Federalism are bonded by written constitution.

20.8 What is territorial power sharing?

Territorial power sharing can be understood as the sharing and delegation of the central government's powers and responsibilities to geographical units. It can include restructuring from a centralised to a federal state, or moving decision-making power from a central government to regional or local governments. It can also include delegation of forms of political, fiscal, or administrative self-governance to regional or local groups who make claims to govern a particular area of territory.

In deeply divided societies experiencing conflict, territorial power sharing is often understood to provide a form of group accommodation – particularly in societies fragmented along ethnic, national, religious, linguistic, or cultural markers. It is frequently suggested as an option for state re-design in states experiencing conflict fought along such identity cleavages, when majority and minority groups are territorially concentrated. Territorial control and group identity are often intrinsically linked in ways that territorial power-sharing acknowledges. Further, territorial power-sharing acknowledges that different groups have diverging ideas as to the legitimacy of the state and its government, and are contesting ownership of the same territory.

For these reasons, territorial power-sharing is often seen as a mode of compromise in secessionist conflicts. Rather than changing the international borders of the state, or endorsing the status quo, territorial power-sharing offers states and non-state actors a mechanism of compromise, although precisely because it is a compromise, the means of agreeing on and implementing territorial power-sharing can be fraught and prolonged. Although predominant in identity conflicts, conflicts to which questions of identity are less salient may also see non-state armed groups located only in particular regions or locales, reaching for a form of state-rebel accommodation, also turning to territorial power-sharing arrangements as a means of securing an end to conflict. Here territorial power-sharing can aim to accommodate competing ideologies and interests as to the future nature of the state.

There are various different forms of territorial power sharing. Federalism, confederalism, autonomy, devolution, and decentralization all entail different approaches to territorial self-governance. In reality, many states use complex combinations of multi-level governance to share territorial power.

Degrees of power-sharing vary across different country-contexts, with different powers devolved and retained by the centre. The division of powers may pertain to just one part of a state, or across several territorial entities, depending on the context. In states where multiple entities have devolved powers, territorial power sharing can be symmetric, with each entity having the same powers devolved in the same way, or asymmetric with entities all having varying degrees of decision-making power over the same policy areas.

Terminology can be difficult to pin down, as in deeply divided societies, the choice of terminology can itself be highly contested. Different groups may associate different meanings and expectations to the same concept. For some, territorial autonomy offers self-governance and protection for minority groups; for others, it implies the fragmentation and break-up of the state.

20.9 Debates Around the Territorial Division of Power

We know that federalism is the division of power between different levels of government, mainly between national and state governments. But there is disagreement among theorists as to who will have more power. There are two views of the public and thinkers on this controversial issue:

One group of theorists thinks the center needs to be given more power. Their views are as follows:

- a. The existence of a state is paramount and we know that the national government is responsible for national security and integrity, so the central government should be given more power.

- b. The federal unit has more jurisdiction than the regional units, thus requiring more resources and powers to carry out its responsibilities.
- c. The Federal Unit ensures uniformity in policy, programmer and law, which will further promote unity, peace and harmony among nations.
- d. More power and autonomy in the regional units will lead to a sense of regionalism, the antithesis of nationalism, which can deal with the unity of the nation, so it is wise to give more power to the national government.
- e. In the age of globalization, we are in a society at risk of globalization and there are problems like epidemics, terrorism and environmental problems. Therefore, it is time to give more power (revenue) to the national government.

Another group of theorists thinks the state needs to be given more power. Their views are as follows:

- a. Regional units are closely connected with the people, know the needs of the people, so more power should be given at the state level.
- b. More power at the state level, more participation of the people, is good for democracy.
- c. Power is corrupt and absolute power is absolutely corrupt so we should give more power to the state government than the national government.
- d. Autonomy of the State Government will not promote regionalism but will satisfy regional aspirations, which will promote unity.
- e. Globalization is therefore a challenge for the state government also. So, states need to be given more power.

The structure and existence of the federal political system depends on the division of power. “The division of power between the member units and the center in the federal political system is discussed in detail in ‘Federalism’.

We noted above that federal governments have two or more tiers of governments. But a vast country like India cannot be run only through these two-tiers. States in India are as large as independent countries of Europe. In terms of population, Uttar Pradesh is bigger than Russia, Maharashtra is about as big as Germany. Many of these States are internally very diverse. There is thus a need for power sharing within these States. Federal power sharing in India needs another tier of government, below that of the State governments. This is the rationale for decentralisation of power. Thus, resulted a third-tier of government, called local government.

When power is taken away from Central and State governments and given to local government, it is called decentralisation. The basic idea behind decentralisation is that there

are a large number of problems and issues which are best settled at the local level. People have better knowledge of problems in their localities. They also have better ideas on where to spend money and how to manage things more efficiently. Besides, at the local level it is possible for the people to directly participate in decision making. This helps to inculcate a habit of democratic participation. Local government is the best way to realise one important principle of democracy, namely local self-government.

The need for decentralisation was recognised in our Constitution. Since then, there have been several attempts to decentralise power to the level of villages and towns. Panchayats in villages and municipalities in urban areas were set up in all the States. But these were directly under the control of state governments. Elections to these local governments were not held regularly. Local governments did not have any powers or resources of their own. Thus, there was very little decentralisation in effective terms.

A major step towards decentralisation was taken in 1992. The Constitution was amended to make the third-tier of democracy more powerful and effective.

Namely, the division of power in federalism is not limited to the center and the states. There are many states where the division of power extends from the center-state to the local level. That is why there is so much disagreement among the theorists as the issue of division of power is so complex. However, if the disagreement is constructive, then it is considered good for any federalism.

20.10 Conclusion

Territorial power sharing, in theory, offers the opportunity to reach political settlements that foster greater inclusion of social groups, particularly ethnic or national minorities and indigenous peoples. In practice, however, this approach entails complex sets of institutions and principles, which in themselves can become contested and difficult to implement. Our data suggests that different contexts will provoke unique narratives from differently placed groups, regarding the capacity for territorial power sharing to diffuse or accelerate further conflict during settlement negotiations, and that these narratives can shape the choices that parties and mediators make during peace processes.

Whilst devolution of power to a sub-state entity may be intended to be the primary mechanism for promoting inclusion of minority groups, there are aspects of territorial power sharing which could potentially be used to push for greater inclusion of women or non-aligned minorities within these settlements, when combined with other forms of power sharing at different levels of governance. Territorial power-sharing arrangements also create their own inclusion and exclusion dilemmas at multiple levels of governance, and non-

20.14 Further Reading

1. Broschek, Jorg, “*Federalism in Europe, America and Africa: A Comparative Analysis*”2016.
2. Cf, Kyle Scott, *Federalism: A Normative Theory and its Practical Relevance*, New York, London: continuum, 2011.
3. Elazar, D.J., *Exploring Federalism*. Tuscaloosa, Ala.; London: University of Alabama Press, 1987
4. Henry Sidgwick, cit. in Michael Burgess, *Comparative Federalism: Theory and Practice*, London/New York: Routledge, 2006.
5. Norris, P., *Driving Democracy: Do power-sharing institutions work?* , New York; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008
6. Salisbury, P., *Federalism, conflict and fragmentation in Yemen*, Saferworld: London, 2015.
7. Töpferwien, N., *Federalism and Peace Mediation*, Zurich: swisspeace/CSS ETH-Zurich,2009.
8. William Riker, *Federalism: Origin, Operation, Significance*, Boston: Little Brown, 1964.

মানুষের জ্ঞান ও ভাবকে বইয়ের মধ্যে সঞ্চিত করিবার যে একটা প্রচুর সুবিধা আছে, সে কথা কেহই অস্বীকার করিতে পারে না। কিন্তু সেই সুবিধার দ্বারা মনের স্বাভাবিক শক্তিকে একেবারে আচ্ছন্ন করিয়া ফেলিলে বুদ্ধিকে বাবু করিয়া তোলা হয়।

— রবীন্দ্রনাথ ঠাকুর

"Any system of education which ignores Indian conditions, requirements, history and sociology is too unscientific to commend itself to any rational support".

— Subhas Chandra Bose

ভারতের একটা mission আছে, একটা গৌরবময় ভবিষ্যৎ আছে, সেই ভবিষ্যৎ ভারতের উত্তরাধিকারী আমরাই। নূতন ভারতের মুক্তির ইতিহাস আমরাই রচনা করছি এবং করব। এই বিশ্বাস আছে বলেই আমরা সব দুঃখ কষ্ট সহ্য করতে পারি, অন্ধকারময় বর্তমানকে অগ্রাহ্য করতে পারি, বাস্তবের নিষ্ঠুর সত্যগুলি আদর্শের কঠিন আঘাতে ধূলিসাৎ করতে পারি।

— সুভাষচন্দ্র বসু

Price : ₹ 475·00

(Not for sale to the Students of NSOU)