PREFACE

With its grounding in the "guiding pillars of Access, Equity, Equality, Affordability and Accountability," the New Education Policy (NEP 2020) envisions flexible curricular structures and creative combinations for studies across disciplines. Accordingly, the UGC has revised the CBCS with a new Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes (CCFUP) to further empower the flexible choice based credit system with a multidisciplinary approach and multiple/ lateral entry-exit options. It is held that this entire exercise shall leverage the potential of higher education in three-fold ways – learner's personal enlightenment; her/his constructive public engagement; productive social contribution. Cumulatively therefore, all academic endeavours taken up under the NEP 2020 framework are aimed at synergising individual attainments towards the enhancement of our national goals.

In this epochal moment of a paradigmatic transformation in the higher education scenario, the role of an Open University is crucial, not just in terms of improving the Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) but also in upholding the qualitative parameters. It is time to acknowledge that the implementation of the National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) National Credit Framework (NCrF) and its syncing with the National Skills Qualification Framework (NSQF) are best optimised in the arena of Open and Distance Learning that is truly seamless in its horizons. As one of the largest Open Universities in Eastern India that has been accredited with 'A' grade by NAAC in 2021, has ranked second among Open Universities in the NIRF in 2024, and attained the much required UGC 12B status, Netaji Subhas Open University is committed to both quantity and quality in its mission to spread higher education. It was therefore imperative upon us to embrace NEP 2020, bring in dynamic revisions to our Undergraduate syllabi, and formulate these Self Learning Materials anew. Our new offering is synchronised with the CCFUP in integrating domain specific knowledge with multidisciplinary fields, honing of skills that are relevant to each domain, enhancement of abilities, and of course deep-diving into Indian Knowledge Systems.

Self Learning Materials (SLM's) are the mainstay of Student Support Services (SSS) of an Open University. It is with a futuristic thought that we now offer our learners the choice of print or e-slm's. From our mandate of offering quality higher education in the mother tongue, and from the logistic viewpoint of balancing scholastic needs, we strive to bring out learning materials in Bengali and English. All our faculty members are constantly engaged in this academic exercise that combines subject specific academic research with educational pedagogy.We are privileged in that the expertise of academics across institutions on a national level also comes together to augment our own faculty strength in developing these learning materials. We look forward to proactive feedback from all stakeholders whose participatory zeal in the teaching-learning process based on these study materials will enable us to only get better. On the whole it has been a very challenging task, and I congratulate everyone in the preparation of these SLM's.

I wish the venture all success.

Professor Indrajit Lahiri
Vice Chancellor

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY
Four Year Undergraduate Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes

Course Type: Discipline Specific Elective (DSE)
Course Title: Comparative Politics
Course Code: NEC-PS-02

NETAJI SUBHAS OPEN UNIVERSITY

Four Year Undergraduate Degree Programme
Under National Higher Education Qualifications Framework (NHEQF) &
Curriculum and Credit Framework for Undergraduate Programmes

Course Type: Discipline Specific Elective (DSE)
Course Title: Comparative Politics
Course Code: NEC-PS-02

: Board of Studies :
Members

Dr. Barnana Guha Thakurta (Banerjee)
Director, School of Social Sciences
Professor and Head
Department of Political Science
School of Social Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Professor Sobhanlal Dattagupta
Retd. Surendranath Chair Professor
University of Calcutta

Professor Krityapriya Ghosh
Retd. Associate Professor
Presidency College (WBES)

Professor Amitava Ray
Retd. Associate Professor
Gurudas College

Dr. Manoj Kumar Haldar
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Professor Sital Prasad Nag
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Dr. Narayan Chandra Datta
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Professor Utathya Banerjee
Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

: Course Writers :

Module - 1   **Pratip Chattopadhyay**
Assistant Professor of Political Science, University of Kalyani

Module - 2   **Dr. Utathya Banerjee**
Professor, Department of Political Science, NSOU

Module - 3   **Rudra Prasad Roy**
Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science
Amdanga Jugal Kishore Mahavidyalaya

: Editing :

Module-1: Unit-1&2   **Arundhuti Bhattacharyya**
Associate Professor of Political Science
University of Burdwan

Module-1: Unit-3,4,5   **Dr. Barnana Guha Thakurta (Banerjee)**
Professor
Netaji Subhas Open University

Module-2&3   **Professor Sital Prasad Nag**
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science, NSOU

: Editorial Assistance, Formatting, Language Editing & Coordination :

Unit-1&2 : Dr. Narayan Chandra Datta
Associate Professor
Department of Political Science
Netaji Subhas Open University

Notification

NETAJI SUBHAS
OPEN UNIVERSITY

Comparative Politics
NEC-PS-02
(New Syllabus)

Course Title : Comparative Politics
Course Code : NEC-PS-02

Module - 1

Module - 2

Module - 3

MODULE - 1

Unit 1 ❑ Comparative Politics: Nature and Scope

Structure:

1.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

- Know that Comparative politics has evolved from comparative government
- Know that comparative government is a Pre-Second World War based understanding
- Know that comparative politics is contemporary in nature
- Understand the nature and scope of comparative politics

1.2 Introduction

Comparative politics is a corollary of international relations as while international relations focuses on the interstate relations comparative politics highlights the intricacies of the internal political system of various countries. In doing that it clearly delineates the line of difference between the European and Third World realities. The nature of comparative politics is to compare and contrast between existing political systems of the world to emphasise which political system suits what conditions.

9

The scope of comparative politics is vast in nature with focus on developing world and to understand the uniqueness of each political system. This unit tries to give an evolutionary sketch of the subject matter of comparative politics.

1.3 Definition of Comparative Politics

The often encountered notion that comparative politics involves a study of governments arises, asserts Ronald Chilcote, from 'conceptual confusion'. Unlike comparative government whose field is limited to comparative study of governments, comparative politics is concerned with the study of all forms of political activity, governmental as well as nongovernmental. The field of comparative politics has an 'all encompassing' nature and comparative politics specialists tend to view it as the study of everything political. Any lesser conception of comparative politics would obscure the criteria for the selection and exclusion of what may be studied under this field. (Ronald Chilcote, Introduction, Theories of Comparative Politics, p.4)

For a long time comparative politics appeared merely to look for similarities and differences, and directed this towards classifying, dichotomising or polarising political phenomena. Comparative political analysis is however, not simply about identifying similarities and differences. The purpose of using comparisons, it is felt by several scholars, is going beyond 'identifying similarities and differences' or the 'compare and contrast approach' as it is called, to ultimately study political phenomena in a larger framework of relationships. This, it is felt, would help 'deepen our understanding and broaden the levels of answering and explaining political phenomena'. (See Manoranjan Mohanty, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third World Sensitivity', Teaching Politics, Nos. 1 & 2, 1975)

In how far does existing terminology adequately encompass the changes in empirical reality? Do tenus and categories require new definitions? Let us consider Sartori's question of how far 'concepts can travel', without causing 'conceptual stretching' (Sartori 1970). For example, tenus and conceptions of state and civil society, democracy and the rule of law originated and evolved in the occident.

We must differentiate between two aspects:

(1) Within an empirical application, it is possible that these tenus are confronted with findings which do not correspond to the sum of experiences encountered

hitherto. Correspondingly, it is possible that in certain African, Latin American or Asian countries, the search for civil society according to the western understanding of the term would provide only little empirical gain. It therefore makes no sense to extend our understanding of the term simply to include a large mass of empirical findings. This is the case for example, when violent actors are counted within a civil society. In so doing, the empirical findings are indeed more comprehensive, however there is a clear case of conceptual stretching. The original concept is no longer recognizable and becomes distorted. The development of sub-terms and regular and lesser sub-types provides an adequate opportunity to apply the term to contexts which are not entirely suitable. Applied to democracies, this could mean the application of terms such as 'deficient' and 'working' democracies.\ In the area of systems of government, the fact that many presidential systems of government are taking on parliamentary characteristics at an increasing rate, and thus no longer correspond suitably to the existing understanding of the term, has resulted in the formulation of a new subtype, that of 'parliamentary presidential systems' (Kropp/Lauth 2007). Furthermore, when applying a concept to an unknown context, it is vital to proceed in terms which are sensitive to the context. When searching for civil society actors; it\ would be insufficient to look : only within the spectrum of those who are formally registered or at least formally constituted. This would mean excluding a wide spectrum of actors, who are constituted informally, but who across the board correspond to the characteristics of civil society. In such cases, in which only formal institutions are investigated, we speak of there being a *western bias*.

(2) Besides empirical implications, we must also consider normative and/ or theoretical consequences. In this way, the inappropriate application of a concept in an unknown context can lead to the original concept being called into question and rethought. The result can be the further refinement of the concept (such as the relationship between state and democracy) or its change. For example, problems encountered when communicating an understanding of development through modernisation theory have modified the core idea of development and, amongst other things, integrated the

aspect of sustainability within the framework of a global order 2. A term introduced within a western context can however encounter differing interpretations in other regions. An acceptance of democracy can be observed worldwide, however perceptions thereof can differ considerably. This is also observed within the western hemisphere itself. As however, comparative research must insist upon a term, which has the same meaning across all comparisons, it is bound to an argumentative justification of the chosen understanding of the term in question. The boundary between it and political philosophy becomes blurred. In the formation of categories and types, and in their application, more allowance has been made up to now for the empirical fact that often, the effect of formal institutions is only gradual. Consequently, it is a matter of the difficult mediation between gradual findings and relatively rigid typological classifications. As failing to use typologies in Comparative Politics would prove to be virtually counter-productive, it is vital to find methodological solutions.

1.4 Evolution of Comparative Politics

For a proper understanding of the nature, scope and utility of a comparative study of politics, one has to look at the latter's development historically and see how its attributes evolved with changing contexts and concerns. The nature and scope of comparative politics has been determined historically by changes in the (a) subject matter (b) vocabulary and (c) political perspective. To understand where, why and how these changes took place we have to look at what is the focus of study at a particular historical period, what are the tools, languages or concepts being used for the study and what is the vantage point, perspective and purpose of enquiry. As the term itself points out, comparative politics is about comparing political phenomena. The emphasis is on both the method of inquiry i.e., comparative, and the substance into which inquiry is directed i.e., political phenomena. Within the discipline of Political Science thus the specificity of comparative political analysis is marked out by its conscious use of the comparative method to answer questions which might be of general interest to political scientists.

In its earliest incarnation, the comparative study of politics comes to us in the form "of studies done by the Greek philosopher Aristotle. Aristotle studied the constitutions of 150 states and *classified* them into a *typology of regimes,* His classification was presented in terms of both descriptive and normative categories i.e., he not only *described* and *classified* regimes and political systems in terms 'of their types e.g., democracy, aristocracy, monarchy etc., he also distinguished them on the basis of certain *norms of good governance.* On the basis of this comparison he divided-regimes into good and bad - ideal and perverted. These Aristotelian categories were acknowledged and taken up by Romans such as Polybius (201-120 B.C.) and Cicero (106-43 B.C.) who considered them in formal and legalistic terms. Concern with comparative study of regime types reappeared' in the 15th century with Machiavelli (1469-1527). The preoccupation' with philosophical and speculative questions concerning the 'good order' or the 'ideal state' and the use, in the process, of abstract and normative vocabulary, persisted in comparative studies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries signified the period when *liberalism* was the reigning ideology and European countries enjoyed dominance in world politics. The 'rest of the world' of Asia-Africa and Latin America were either European colonies or under their sphere of influence as ex-colonies. Comparative studies during this period (lames Bryces's *Modem Democracies* (1921), Herman Finer's *Theory and Practice of Modem Governments* (1932) and Carl J. Friedrich's *Constitutional' Government and Democracy* (1937), Roberto Michels, *Political Parties* (1915) and M. Duverger, Political Parties (1950)) were largely concerned with a comparative study of institutions, the distribution of power, and the relationship between the different layers of government. These studies were Eurocentric i.e, confined to the study of institutions, governments and regime types in European countries like Britain, France and Germany. It may thus be said that these studies were in fact not genuinely comparative in the sense that they excluded from their analysis a large number of countries. Any generalisation derived from a study confined to a few countries could not legitimately claim having validity for the rest of the world.

It may be worth remembering that the comparative study of governments till the 1940s was predominantly the *study of institutions,* the legal-constitutional principles

regulating them, and the manner in which they functioned in western (European) liberal-democracies. In the context of the above stated developments, a powerful critique of the institutional approach emerged in the middle of 1950s. The critique had its roots in behavioralism which had emerged as a new movement in the discipline of politics aiming to provide scientific rigour to the discipline and develop a science of politics. Known as the behavioural movement, it was concerned with developing an enquiry which was quantitative, based on survey techniques involving the examination of empirical facts separated from values, to provide value-neutral, non-prescriptive, objective observations and explanations, The behaviouralists attempted to study social reality by seeking answers to questions like 'why people behave politically as they do, and why as a result, political processes and systems function as they do'. It is these *'why* questions' regarding *differences in peoples behaviours* and their implications for *political processes* and *political systems,* which changed the focus of comparative study from the legal-formal aspects of institutions. Thus in 1955 Roy *Macridis* criticised the existing comparative studies for privileging formal institutions over non-formal political processes, for being descriptive rather than analytical, and case-study oriented rather than genuinely comparative. (Roy Macrid is, *The Study of Comparative Government,* New York, Random House, 1955). Harry Eckstein points out that the changes in the nature and scope of comparative politics in this period show a sensitivity to the changing world politics urging the need to reconceptualise the notion of politics and develop paradigms for large-scale comparisons. (Harry Eckstein, 'A Perspective on Comparative Politics, Past and Present' in Harry Eckstein and David Apter eds., *Comparative Politics:* A *Reader,* New York, Free Press, 1963.) The broadening of concerns in a geographic or territorial sense was also accompanied by a broadening of the sense of politics itself, and in particular, by a rejection of what was then perceived as the traditional and narrowly defined emphasis on the study of formal political institutions. The notion of politics was broadened by the emphasis on 'realism' or politics 'in practice' as distinguished from mere' legalism'. This included in its scope the functioning of less formally structured agencies, behaviours and processes e.g. political parties, interest groups, elections, voting behaviour, attitudes etc. (Gabriel Almond, Political Development, Boston, 1970). The end of the Second World War, a number of 'new nations' emerged on the

world scene having liberated themselves from colonial domination. The dominance of liberalism was challenged by the emergence of communism and the powerful presence of Soviet Union on the world scene. The concern among comparativists changed at this juncture to studying the diversity of political, behaviours and processes which were thrown up, however, within a single overarching framework. The concept of 'systems' and 'structures-functions' came in vogue. These frameworks were used by western scholars particularly those in the United' States to study phenomena like developmentalism, modernisation etc. While the political elite of the newly independent countries found concepts like development, nation- building and state building attractive, in many cases they evolved their own ideological stances and chose to remain non-aligned to either ideological blocs. In the late 1980s focus on studying politics comparatively within an overarching framework of 'system' declined and regional systemic studies assumed significance. The focus on state in these studies marked a resurgence of the study of power structures within civil society and its political forms, 'which had suffered a setback with; the arrival of systems and structures-functions into comparative politics'.

1.5 Nature and Scope of Comparative Politics

The nature and scope of comparative politics has varied according to the changes which have occurred historically in its subject matter. The subject matter of comparative politics has been determined both by the *geographical space* (i.e. countries, regions) which has constituted its field as well as the *dominap ideas* concerning social reality and change which shaped the approaches to & comparative studies (capitalist, socialist, mixed and indigenous). - different historical junctures the thrust or the primary concern of the studies kept changing. In its earliest incarnation, the comparative study of politics comes to us in the form of studies done by the Greek philosopher Aristotle. Aristotle studied the constitutions of 150 states and *classified* them into a *typology of regimes*. His classification was presented in terms of both descriptive and normative categories i.e., he not only *described* and *classified* regimes and political systems in terms 'of their types e.g., democracy, aristocracy, monarchy etc., he also distinguished them on the basis of certain *norms of good governance*. On the basis of this comparison he divided regimes into good and bad -

ideal and perverted. The preoccupation with philosophical and speculative questions concerning the 'good order' or the 'ideal state' and the use, in the process, of abstract and normative vocabulary, persisted in comparative studies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It may be worth remembering that the comparative study of governments till the 1940s was predominantly the *study of institutions,* the legal-constitutional principles regulating them, and the manner in which they functioned in western (European) liberal-democracies. In the context of the above stated developments, a powerful critique of the institutional approach emerged in the middle of 1950s. with the cliange of emphasis to actual practices and functions of institutions, the problems of research Game to be defined not in terms of what legal powers these institutions had, but what they actually did, how they were related to one another, and what roles they played in the making and execution of public policy. This led to the emergence of structural-functionalism, in which certain functions were described as being necessary to all societies, and the execution and performance of these functions were then compared across a variety of different formal and informal structures (Peter Mair, 'Comparative Politics: An Overview', p. 315) Towards the 1970s, developmentalism came to be criticised for favouring abstract models, which flattened out differences among specific political social cultural systems, in order to study them within a single universalistic framework. These criticisms emphasised the etbnocentricism of these models and focussed on the Third World in order to work out a theory of underdevelopment. They stressed the need to concentrate on solutions to the backwardness of developing countries. During the later 1970s and into the 1980s, still reflecting the backlash against developmentalism, number of theories and subject matters emerged into the field of comparative politics. These included bureaucratic-authoritarianism, indigenous concepts of change, transitions to democracy, the politics of structural *adjustment, neoliberalism* and privatisation. While some scholars saw these Approaches developments as undermining and breaking the unity of the field which was being dominated by developmentalism, others saw them as adding healthy diversity, providing alternative approaches and covering new subject areas. Globalisation refers to a set of conditions, scientific, technological, economic and political, which have linked together the world in a manner so that occurrences in one part of the world are bound to affect or be affected by what is

happening in another part. It may be pointed out that in this global world the focal point or the centre around which events move worldwide is still western capitalism. In the context of the so called triumph of capitalism, the approaches to the study of civil society and democratisation that have gained currency give importance to civil society defined in terms of protection of individual rights to enter the modem capitalist world.

There is, however, another significant trend in the approach which seeks to place questions of civil society and democratisation as its primary focus. If there are on one hand studies conforming to the contemporary interest of western capitalism seeking to develop market democracy, there are also a number of studies which take into account the resurgence of people's movements seeking autonomy, right to indigenous culture, movements of tribal, dalits, lower castes, and the women's movement and the environment movement. These movements reveal a terrain of contestation where the interests of capital are in conflict with people's rights and represent the language of change and liberation in an era of global capital. Thus concerns with issues of identity, environment, ethnicity, gender, race, etc. have provided a new dimension to comparative political analysis. (See Manoranjan Mohanty, Contemporary Indian Political Theory, 2000) A significant aspect and determinant of globalisation has been the unprecedented developments in the field of information and communication technology viz., the Internet and World Wide Web. This has made the production, collection and analysis of data easier and also assured their faster and wider diffusion, worldwide. These developments have not only enhanced the availability of data, but also made possible the emergence of new issues and themes which extend beyond the confines of the nation-state. These new themes in turn form an important influential aspect of the political environment of the contemporary globalised world.

While comparisons form an implicit part of all our reasoning and thinking? Most comparativists would argue that a comparative study of politics seeks to make comparisons consciously to arrive at conclusions which can be generalised i.e. held true for a number of cases. To be able to make such generalisations with a degree of confidence, it is not sufficient to just collect information about countries. The trend in comparative political analysis, is on *theory-building* and *theory testing* with the

countries acting units or cases. Social scientists who emphasise scientific precision, validity and reliability, see comparisons as indispensable in the social sciences because they offer the unique opportunity of 'control' in the study of social phenomena. (Giovanni Sartori, 'compare, Why and How' in Mattei Dogan and, Ali Kazancigil eds., *Comparing Nations, Concepts, Strategies, Substance,* -1 Black well, Oxford, 1994). The nature and scope of comparative study of politics related to its subject matter, its field of study, the vantage point from which the study is carried out and the purposes towards which the study is directed. 'These have, however, not been static and have changed over time. While the earliest studies concerned themselves with observing and classifying governments and regimes, comparative politics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was concerned with studying the formal legal structures of institutions in western countries.

1.6 Conclusion

While comparisons form an implicit part of all our reasoning and thinking, most comparativists would argue that a comparative study of politics seeks to make comparisons consciously to arrive at conclusions which can be generalised i.e. held true for a number of cases. To be able to make such generalisations with a degree of confidence, it is not sufficient to just collect information about countries. The trend in comparative political analysis, is on *theory-building* and *theory testing* with the countries acting units or cases. Social scientists who emphasise scientific precision, validity and reliability, see comparisons as indispensable in the social sciences because they offer the unique opportunity of' control' in the study of social phenomena. (Giovanni Sartori, 'compare, Why and How' in Mattei Doganand, All Kazancigil eds., *Comparing Nations, Concepts, Strategies, Substance,* -1 Black well, Oxford, 1994). The nature and scope of comparative study of politics related to its subject matter, its field of study, the vantage point from which the study is carried out and the purposes towards which the study is directed. These have, however, not been static and have changed over time. While the earliest studies concerned themselves with observing and classifying governments and regimes, comparative politics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century was concerned with studying the formal legal structures of institutions in western countries.

1.7 Summing up

- While the political elite of the newly independent countries found concepts like development, nation-building and state building attractive, in many cases they evolved their own ideological stances and chose to remain non-aligned to either ideological blocs.

- In the late 1980s focus on studying politics comparatively within an over-arching framework of 'system' declined and regional systemic studies assumed significance.

- The focus on state in these studies marked a resurgence of the study of power structures within civil society and its political forms, 'which had suffered a setback with; the arrival of systems and structures-functions into comparative politics.

- The petering out of Soviet Union in the same period, provoked western scholars to proclaim the 'end of history' marking the triumph of liberalism and capitalism. Globalisation of capital, significant feature of the late nineteen eighties, which continues and makes itself manifest in technological, economic and information linkages among the countries of the world, has also tended to influence comparativists into adopting universalistic, homogenising expressions like. 'transitions to democracy', the 'global market' and 'civil society'. Such expressions would have us believe that there do not in fact remain differences, uncertainties and contests which need to be explained in a comparative perspective. There is, however, another way to look at the phenomena and a number of scholars" see the resurgence of civil society in terms of challenges to global capitalism which comes from popular movements and trade union activism through out the world.

1.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the evolution of comparative politics.
2. Analyse the changing nature and scope of comparative politics.

Short Questions

1. Describe the development of comparative politics from comparative government.

2. Explain the various attempts to theory building in comparative politics.

Objective Questions

1. Who wrote 'Theory and practice of Modern Government'?

2. Mention a book authored by Gabriel Almond.

1.9 Further Reading

1. Chilcote, Ronald H., Part I: Introduction, in Ronald H. Chilcote, *Theories of Comparative Politics: The Search for a Paradigm Reconsidered,* Westview Press, Boulder, 1994 (Second Edition).

2. Landman, Todd, *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics: An Introduction,* Routledge, London, 2000.

3. Mair, Peter, 'Comparative Politics: An Overview', in R.E. Goodin and B. Klingemann eds., *The New Handbook of Political Science,* Oxford University Press, Oxford; 1996.

4. Wiarda, Roward J. 'Is Comparative Politics Dead? Rethinking the Field in the Post-Cold War Era', *Third Worla Quarterly, Vol.* 19, *no.5.*

Unit 2 ❏ Methods of Comparative Politics

Structure:

2.1 Objective

By studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

● Know that comparative politics has evolved from comparative government

● Know that comparative government is a Pre-Second World War based understanding

● Know that comparative politics is contemporary in nature

● Understand the nature and scope of comparative politics

2.2 Introduction

One aspect which is firmly gaining ground in the solving of methodological questions is the theoretical conception of comparative study. Using this approach, not only are the core independent and dependent variables defined, but the context is also shaped. The latter of these is decisive when applying a *most different cases design* or *a most similar cases design.* At the same time, the typological choice, itself closely related to theory, allows us to define to what degree investigations must be specified. Despite numerous efforts made over recent years, also in German-

21

speaking countries, the body of comparative political theory still shows itself to be in deficit in many areas (Berg- Schlosser/Müller-Rommel 1997; Helms/Jun 2004; Lauth 2006). A glance at available theories also illustrates the possibilities of and limits to causal statements. The complementarity of theories in Comparative Politics cannot be taken for granted, as a simple glance at the two theoretical 'waves' shows, with which Comparative Politics has been confronted in recent decades. In the 1960s, Behavioralism reshaped the political debate; since the late 1980s, the *Rational Choice approach* has taken over. The transformation of institutional approaches reflects dearly this development. Although practically superseded in their classical form by the behavioralist revolution, with the neo-institutionalists they returned to the fore, *inter alia* in connection with rational choice models. At the same time, it is equally evident that the theoretical landscape has remained pluralist, as a simple glance at sociological and historical institutionalism shows (Kaiser 2007). The complexity and extrapolation of the theoretical debate points to the necessity of linking Comparative Politics in more closely with Political Theory (cf. Holmes 2003). In the same way as in the discussion concerning methods, we must be careful not to lose sight of the subject focus of Comparative Politics. In this area, we are not concerned with debating theoretical principles, but with developing empirically well founded, medium-range theories dealing with certain political aspects. Alongside the outlined classification strategy, the empirical testing of theories would be a further step towards proving their plausibility and usefulness. Here also, the need for research is considerable.

2.3 Methods of Comparative Politics

Method as we know from our experiences, is a useful, helpful and instructive way of accomplishing something with relative ease. A piece of collapsible furniture, for example, comes with a manual guiding us through the various steps to set it up. While studying a phenomenon, method would similarly point to ways and means of doing things. We may not, however, unlike our example of the collapsible furniture, know the final shape or results of our explorations at the outset. We may not also have a precise instruction manual guiding us to the final outcome. We will simply

have the parts of the furniture and tools to set it up in other words, 'concepts' and 'techniques'. These concepts (ideas, thoughts, notions) and techniques (ways of collecting data) will have to be used in specific ways to know more about, 'understand or explain a particular phenomenon. Thus, it may be said, that the organisation of ways of application of specific concepts to data is 'method'. Of course the manner of collection of data itself will have to be worked out. The concepts which are to be applied or studied will have to be thought out. All this will eventually have to be organised so that the nature of the data and the manner in which it is collected and the application of the concept is done in a way that we are able to study with a degree of precision what we want to study. In a scientific inquiry much emphasis is placed on precision and exactness of the method. A number of scholars, however, do not feel that there should be much preoccupation with the so called 'scientific research'. Whatever the beliefs of scholars in this regard, there is nonetheless a 'method' in thinking, exploring and research in all studies. Several methods, comparative, historical, experimental, statistical etc. are used by scholars for their studies. It may be pointed out that all these methods may use comparisons to varying degrees. The comparative method also uses tools of the historical, experimental and statistical methods.

Whereas in physical sciences comparisons can be done in laboratories under carefully controlled conditions, precise experimentation in social sciences under conditions which replicate laboratory conditions is not possible. If, for example, a social scientist wishes to study the relationship between electoral systems and the number of political parties, s/he cannot instruct a government to change its electoral system nor order people to behave in a particular way to test his/her hypothesis. Nor can slhe replicate a social or political phenomenon in a laboratory where tests can be conducted. Thus, while a social scientist may feel compelled to work in a scientific way, societal phenomena may not actually permit what is accepted as 'scientific' inquiry. S/he can, however, study 'cases' i.e., actually existing political systems and compare them to chalk out a way to study their relationship as worked out in the hypothesis, draw conclusions and offer generalisations.

Experimental Method - Although the experimental method has limited application in social sciences, it provides the model on which many comparativists aspire to

base their studies. Simply put, the experimental method aims to establish a causal relationship between two conditions: In other words the objective of the experiment is to establish that one condition leads to the other or influences the other in a particular way. If, for example one wishes to study explain why children differ in their ability to communicate in English in large-group setting, a number of factors may be seen as influencing this capability viz., social background, adeptness in the language, familiarity of surroundings etc. The investigator may want to study the influence of all these factors or one of them or even a combination of factors. S/he then isolates the condition factors whose influence she wants to study and I thereby make precise the role of each condition. The results of the experiment would enable the investigator to offer general propositions regarding the applicability of her/this findings and compare them wi!h other previous studies. Case Study - A case study, as the name suggests' focuses on in-depth study of a single case. In that sense, while the method itself is not strictly comparative, it provides the data (on single cases) which can become the basis of general observations. These observations may be used to make comparisons with other 'cases' and to offer general explanations. Case studies, however, may, in a disproportionate manner emphasise 'distinctiveness' or what are .called 'deviant' or unusual cases. There might be a tendency, for example, among comparativists to explore questions like why United States of America does not have a socialist party rather than to explore why Sweden along with most western democracies has one. Alexis de Tocqueville's classic studies of 18th century France (The Old Reginte and the French Revolution, 1856) and 19th century United States (Democracy in America: Vol I, 1835; Vol 11, 1840) to show how comparative explanations can be made by focussing on single cases. Toequeville unique case study of individual cases was effectively a study of national contrasts and similarities within a complex model of interaction of historical forces to explain the divergent historical courses taken up by France and U.S.A.

Statistical Method - The statistical method uses categories arid variables which are quantifiable or can be represented by numbers, e.g., voting patterns, public expenditure, political parties, voter turnout, urbanisation, population growth. It also offers unique 'opportunities to study the effects or relationships of a number of variables simultaneously. It has the advantage of presenting precise data in a compact and visually effective manner, so that similarities and dissimilarities are visible

through numerical representation. The fact that a number of variables can be studied together also .gives the unique opportunity to look for complex explanations in terms of a relationship. The use of the statistical method also helps explain and compare long term trends and patterns and offer predictions on future trends. A study, for example, of the relationship of age and political participation can be made through an analysis of statistical tables of voter turnout and age-categories.

Focussed Comparisons - These studies take up a small number of countries, often just two (paired or binary comparisons), and concentrates frequently on particular aspects of the countries' politics rather 'than on all aspects. Comparative studies of public policies in different countries have successfully been undertaken by this method. Lipset distinguishes twokinds of binary or paired comparison: the implicit and explicit. In the implicit binary comparison, the investigators own country, as in the case of de Tocqueville study of America, may serve as the reference: Explicit paired comparisons have two clear cases (countries) for comparison. The two countries may be studied with respect to their specific aspects e.g., policy of population control in India and China or in their entirety e.g., with respect to the process of modernisation. The latter may, however, lead to a parallel study of two cases leaving little scope for a study of relationships.

Historical Method - The historical method can be distinguished from other methods in that it looks for causal explanations which are historically sensitive. Eric Wolf emphasises that any study which seeks to understand societies and causes of human action could not merely seek technical solutions to problems stated in technical terms. 'The important thing was to resort to an analytic history which searched out the causes of the present in the past. Such an analytic history could not be developed out of the study of a single culture or nation, a single culture area, or even a single continent at one period in time, but from a study of contacts, interactions and 'interconnections' among human populations and cultures. Historical studies have concentrated on one or more cases seeking to find causal explanations of social and political phenomena in a historical perspective. Single case studies seek, as mentioned in a previous section, to produce general statements which may be applied to other cases. Theda Scokpol points out that comparative historical studies using more than one case fall broadly into two categories, 'comparative history' and 'comparative historical analysis'.

2.4 Comparative Method

The comparative method has been seen as studying similarities and differences as the basis for developing a 'grounded theory', testing hypotheses, inferring causality, and producing reliable generalisations. Many social scientists believe that research should be scientifically organised. The comparative method, they believe, offers them the best means to conduct 'scientific' research i.e, research characterised by precision, validity, reliability and verifiability and some amount of predictability. The American political scientist James Coleman, for example, often reminded his students, 'You can't be scientific if you're not comparing'. Swanson similarly emphasised that it was 'Unthinkable' to think of 'scientific thought and all scientific research' without comparisons. (Guy E.Swanson, 'Frameworks for Comparative Research: Structural Anthropology and the Theory of Action' in Ivan Val lier ed., Comparative Methods in Sociology, Berkeley, 197 1, p. 145). Whereas in physical sciences comparisons can be done in laboratories under carefully controlled conditions, precise experimentation in social sciences under conditions which replicate laboratory conditions is not possible. If, for example, a social-scientist wishes to study the relationship between electoral systems and the number of political parties, that cannot instruct a government to change its electoral system nor order people to behave in a particular way to test his/her hypothesis. Nor can s/he replicate a social or political phenomenon in a laboratory where tests can be conducted. Thus, while a social scientist may feel compelled to work in a scientific way, societal phenomena may not actually permit what is accepted as 'scientific' inquiry. S/he can, however, study 'cases' i.e., actually existing political systems and compare them, chalk out a way to study their relationship as worked out in the hypothesis, draw conclusions and offer generalisations. Thus the comparative method, though scientifically weaker than the experimental method, is considered closest to a scientific method, offering the best possible opportunity to seek explanations of societal phenomena and offer theoretical - propositions and generalisations. The question you might ask now is what makes comparative method, scientific. Sartori tells us that the 'control function' or the system of checks, which is integral to scientific research and a necessary part of laboratory experimentation, can be achieved in social sciences only through comparisons. He goes further to propose

that because the control function can be exercised only through the comparative method, comparisons are indispensable in social sciences. Because of their function of controlling/checking the validity of theoretical propositions, comparisons have the scientific value of making generalised propositions or theoretical statements explaining particular phenomena making predictions, and also what he terms 'learning from others' experiences. In this context it is important to point out that the nature of predictions in comparative method have only a probabilistic causality. This means that it can state its results only in terms of likelihoods or probabilities i.e., a given set of conditions are likely to give an anticipated outcome.

Comparative methods make up the core identity of Comparative Politics, which equally, however, is defined and refined by the focus on political subjects. We make a conscious effort to speak in the plural, as various comparative methods must be considered. Let us differentiate between two strands: (1) Studies designed to investigate similarities and differences in the systematic analysis of dependent variables. The core elements of these go back to John Stuart Mill's Method of Difference. Even single case studies can be classified under this strand, provided that they are embedded in the corresponding theoretical contexts. In Qualitative Comparative Analysis (QCA), these approaches have experienced systematic development (Ragin 1987, 2000), whilst the most recent development of the fuzzy set QCA us capable of overcoming the rigidity of binary condification. (2) The other strand of comparative methods is based upon statistics and works with individual and/or aggregate data. With the help of different techniques, it attempts to define more precisely the relationship between dependent and independent variables through quantification.

2.5 Use of Methods in Comparative Politics

Emile Durkheim, the renowned German Sociologist affirms that the comparative method enables (sociological) research to 'cease to be purely descriptive'. (Emile Durkheim, The *Division of Labour in Society*, 1949, p. 139) Even descriptions, however, points out Smelser, cannot work without comparisons. Simple descriptive words like 'densely populated' and 'democratic', he substantiates, 'presuppose a universe of situations that are more or less populated or more or less democratic' and one situation can be stated described only in relational comparison to the other.

(Neil J. Smelser, *Comparative Methods in the Social Sciences,* Englewood, 1976, p.3) It is this 'presupposition of a universe' in which a descriptive category can be placed, within a set of relationships, helps us to analyse it better, feel quite a number of scholars. Manoranjan Mohanty therefore seeks to emphasise relationships rather than looking merely for similarities and dissimilarities among phenomena. The latter or the 'compare and contrast approach' as he calls it would ultimately become 'an exercise in dichotomisation, an act of polarising'. In other words, such an exercise would lead to classification of likes in groups of isolated compartments so that a comparative exercise would become nothing more than finding similarities within groups and dissimilarities among them. For the identification of relationships of unity and opposition, one must modify one's questions. This would mean that the questions asked should not be such as to bring out answers locating merely similarities and dissimilarities but 'the relationship which exists between them'. Only then shall one be able to understand the comparability of political systems like the United/States of America (U.S.A) and United Kingdom (U.K), for instance which differ in their forms of government (Presidential and Cabinet forms, respectively).

Research designs are recommended which combine the comparative techniques of the first strand with those of the second. In certain combinations of cases, these should not only be organised along complementary but also along competitive lines. In this way, the benefit of various methodological approaches in tangible cases would become clearer. Finally, let us reiterate that to the suggestion of combining methods, the combining of quantitative and qualitative methods is also linked, in the way these exist in triangulation techniques. In a nutshell, in order to be able to identify and apply comparative strategies suitable to specific cases, comparative research requires more than the comprehensive methodological knowledge as known hitherto. At the same time, it should also be noted that methodological debates are not conducted as an end in themselves, but rather to increase the cognitive benefit of nomothetically aligned comparative political research.

2.6 Conclusion

In a nutshell, in order to be able to identify and apply comparative strategies suitable to specific cases, comparative research requires more than the comprehensive

methodological knowledge as known hitherto. At the same time, it should also be noted that methodological debates are not conducted as an end in themselves, but rather to increase the cognitive benefit of nomothetically aligned comparative political research.

2.7 Summing up

- Studying with comparisons is important for understanding and explaining political and social phenomenon.

- A comparative method helps us to go beyond mere descriptions towards looking for ways in which political and social processes can be explained and based on such explanations general theoretical propositions can be made.

- It reminds us of the network of interconnections that exist among social, political, economic and cultural phenomena which help us understand better the changing nature of our environment.

2.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the rationale for comparison in comparative politics.

2. Analyse the various methods of comparative politics.

Short Questions

1. Describe the comparative method to comparative politics.

2. Explain the various utilities of comparison in comparative politics.

Objective Questions

1. Mention a method of comparative politics.

2. What is the full form of QCA?

3. Who wrote 'The Division of Labour in Society'?

2.9 Further Reading

1. Hague, Rod, Martin Harrop and Shaun Bresl in, *Comparative Government and Politics,* Macmillan, London, 1993, third edition.

2. Mohanty, Manoranjan, 'Comparative Political Theory and Third World Sensitivity', *Teaching Politics*, No. 1&2, 1975.

3. Sartori, Gibvanni, 'Compare, Why and How', in Mattei Dogan and Ali Kazancigil (ed.), *Corlarittg Nutions, Concepts, Strategies, Substunce, B lackwel I,* Oxford, 1994.

4. Smelser, Neil J., *Contparative Methods in the Social Sciences,* Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1976.

Unit 3 ❑ Eurocentrism in Comparative Politics

Structure:

3.1   Objective

3.2   Introduction

3.3   Meaning of Eurocentrism

3.4   Eurocentricism in Comparative Politics

3.5   Effect of Eurocentrism in Comparative Politics

3.6   Conclusion

3.7   Summing up

3.8   Probable Questions

3.9   Further Reading

3.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

- Know the meaning and nature ofEurocentricism
- Know the influence of eurocentricism in comparative politics
- Know the effects ofEurocentrism in comparative politics
- Know the Anti-eurocentric turn in comparative politics

3.2 Introduction

Eurocentrism as an idea that all knowledge emerged in Europe in the context of European modernity. Thus, it entails a linear conception of time which suggested that this knowledge has produced through the values and institutional systems that were universalized in Europe in the past 500 years, in its backyard. This narrative incorporates two master narratives: the superiority of Western civilization (through progress and reason) and the belief in the continuous growth of capitalism

(through modernisation, development and creation of new markets). These master narratives are all ethnocentric in nature. It needs to be understood that European knowledge saw itself to be superior to the other which wasto be colonised, turned into an object of control and through which it became modern. Under this, Europe saw itself as the origin point of modernity, which became the point of reference for other cultures and civilisations. Europe and the West were painted in terms of the master civilization that had modernity, reason, culture and science while the East was painted as inferior, which was enclosed in space, nature, religion and spirituality. The binary created was one of modernity and tradition. The western European countries were all torchbearers oftbe modern while the countries of the East were traditional and backward.

The twentieth century that came into shape at the conclusion of the Second World War would, to a scholar from the global South, have had some other distinctive features, often overlooked by those who write world histories. From the standpoint of colonized nations, the second half of the twentieth century was most significantly marked by the fact of decolonization. Indonesia. India, and Ceylon were among the countries that gained independence in the near aftermath of the end of hostilities between Japan and the United States, and, throughout the 1950s, liberation struggles continued to free countries from the grip of colonial powers. At the same time, the new geopolitical order that was coming into shape saw much of the world coming under the sway of American culture, even in countries where the reach of Marxist ideology was not insignificant. The case of India is illustrative in this respect: though Jawaharlal Nehru, who became free India's first Prime Minister and held on to that position through several general elections until his death in 1964, had committed the country to a position of non-alignment, he continued to entertain the hope that the Soviet Union would show the way to genuine socialism. The relations between \India and the United States remained testy, and under Mrs. Indira Gandhi India, which suspected that the Americans had much of the same attitude towards India as displayed by its former colonizers, unquestionably showed signs of leaning towards the Soviet Union. Yet, even though the Soviet Union made a concerted attempt to win over the Indian middle class and intellectuals by marketing in nearly all ofIndia's cities highly subsidized editions of Mar X, Lenin, Pushkin, Gorky, and

other Russian writers, India's educated elites had long since gravitated towards the ideals associated with the West. It is not only that ~e American Center, the cultural wing of the American Embassy, was more successful in the aggressive promotion of American consumer goods, ideas of success, or notions of liberty.

Whatever limited works on the non western societies were available; it apparently displayed the bias against them. The institutional preoccupation was so deep that differences in cultural settings and ideological frameworks of different countries were completely ignored. Also, most of the scholars studying the field downgraded the colonised people, their society and culture in their work. They took some countries of the West as the reference point and judged the non western categories based on them. So the institutions of Britain, France and Germany served as the archetypes for the world. This bias towards the western civilization, race, culture and presumption of its superiority denotes ethnocentrism. At times, it amounted to being insensitive to the history, culture, traditions and colonial legacies of those societies. Third world creatively responded to this western hegemony with 'third world perspective' that proposed their way of looking and engaging with the world. It was felt that in order to grapple with the world; one must know the nature of distribution of power, privileges and recourses in one's society and how they manifest. Second, post colonial societies must analyse the alternative futures.

3.3 Meaning of Eurocentrism

Eurocentrism is seen to be dividing knowledge between the West and the non-West. Here the idea that human civilizatio~ originated in the European experience of modernity becomes important. It makes Europe the centre of the narrative and also the analysis of growth. It was due to Europe's superiority and its control of the world that provided the conditions for Europe's ascendance and also created a scientific language that legitimized this perspective and made it into a universal truth. This truth creation becomes important as it emerged as the standard for understanding all forms of realities in different parts of the world. The two important foundations ofEurocentrism are: i) Evolutionism: The belief that Western societies evolved higher than the non-Western societies. It follows the logic established by Charles

Darwin in *On the Origin of Species* that looked into how species have progressed over the years. The logic embedded in his writing is of the survival of the fittest. ii) Dualism: It stresses on the idea of Europe and the West being the fountainhead of knowledge, making them more powerful, which in turn is highlighted against the non- West. which was traditional. Thus, we see the creation of binary oppositions which is hierarchised leading to the formation of a dualism of the "self" and the "other". In the arena of colonial history, and in the study of colonial forms of knowledge, where Said's influence was most perceptible, Said was among those who laid bare the presumptions ofEurocemrism. Orientalist scholars appear as the wise and knowing subjects who represent the Orie~t not merely to the West but to the Orient itself: those who cannot represent themselves must be represented by others. Said himself had anticipated a yet more profound problem, to which he gave the term "second-order Orientalism". A vast edifice of knowledge was created under the rubric of colonialism, giving rise to institutional modalities - in the case ofIndia, for example, the Trignometric Survey, the Geological Survey, the Archaeological Survey, and many others - as well as grammar and dictionaries ofIndian languages, besides, of course, histories, ethnographies, revenue studies, catalogues of native customs, and much else. Indian scholars inherited many of the assumptions with which the colonial state and its functionaries worked, replicating them in their work - even when they assumed that they were contesting such assumptions. In the meanwhile, two other developments came to the fore: while scholars working on India, Africa, and Latin America began to show an awareness of the acute complicity between imperialist and nationalist histories, in the West itself there would be a resurgence of "world history". Some scholars argue that world history is the best antidote to both colonial and nationalist histories: indeed, the very enterprise, taking the "world" as the object of inquiry, seems dressed in the language of ecumenism, and some of its most well-known advocates are certain that a judicious practice of world history is one way of working towards a more equitable world.

3.4 Eurocentricism in Comparative Politics

The Global South are generally the economicalJy less developed countries, which consists of a variety of states with diverse levels of economic, cultural

and political influence in the international order. As mentioned earlier, these countries have remained poor due to the enforcement of centuries of colonialism and imperialism. Hence, Europe and the West are directly responsible for their 'subaltern' position, a process that still continues. Their subordinate position is also reflected in them being not studied in the theories of comparative politics. The absence of the perspectives from the Global South in comparative political studies is a grave injustice as it means turning a blind eye to the voices of the majority of the global population. There is a strong need to broaden the field of comparative political studies and incorporate the voices of the Global South so as to bring about a more just and representative understanding of comparative politics . According to scholars comparative political studies simply emphasises on concepts that do not reflect the reality in many Global South states. Their perspectives are absent or under-theorised in mainstream scholarship. Still, in the present age, colonial dominations profoundly shape the spite of the current global order, which is not attributed in comparative political studies . Under this, issues of race and empire are missing from mainstream theories despite the presence of postcolonial and post-structural studies. It needs to be understood that the non-West or the Global South are able to build their own understandings of comparative political studies based on their histories and social theories. A form of indigenous theory from the Global South that has played a prominent role in contributing to comparative political studies are 'subaltern studies'. The works ofHomi Bhaba on subaltern studies and Arjun Appadurai on globalization are seen to be rebelling against OrientaJism and Western dominance. Postcolonialism is seen as attempting to dismantle relativism and binary distinctions as seen in the form of centre and periphery, First World - Third World and North-South. However, as Aijaz Ahmad writes, postcolonialism is seen to be not producing fresh knowledge about the Third World, instead, it restructures existing bodies of knowledge into the poststructuralist paradigm. It then occupies sites of cultural production outside of'Euro-American zones by globalizing concerns and orientations originating at the central sites of Euro-American cultural production. Hence, non-Western attempts are seen to be heavily influenced by the West. This is due to the non- Western attempts basically framed within the cultural discourses originating from the West.

The universal/global assumption of comparative political studies is also seen to be reflected in policies that shape international politics. An important way through which this is seen to be happening is through assumptions that originate in Western modes of thinking. An example of this is seen in the context of' development i_a word that has the power to dictate national and international policies and attract vast sums of money. One of the ways through which Western notions of development and economic progress gets imposed in the non-West is through the United Nations' Millennium Development Goals and their successors, the Sustainable Development Goals. These global initiatives are based on an understanding of development that sees many countries in the Global South as not having achieved the economic progress of the north. They involve targets that every country in the world agree to strive towards and to fund. Under this, there is an imposition of Western values and understandings regarding development and progress in the non- West. There have been strong challenges towards this Western understanding of development as an organizing principle in international politics. This is seen to be emerging from the dependency theory, which is a major contribution from Latin American scholars in comparative political studies. It emphasizes that underdevelopment and poverty are the results of political, economic and cultural influences exerted on the Global South from outside. The relationship between the Global South and Global North is termed as exploitative and unfair, This is due to the ways the Global South has been incorporated into the world economic system through capitalist development, which has exploited human and material resources and disrupted indigenous modes of production. The current economic relations between the Global South and Global North will not help the South to develop at all. Instead, the Global South will be poorer than the North. The Dependency theorists' stress on the need for a complete restructuring of the entire international economic system to deliver economic justice for the world's poor. One sees a continuation of colonisation in the Global South, which is termed as neocolonialism. Scholars have stated that in the final years of formal colonialism, the departing colonial powers brought a set of new policies and programmes that led to the establishment of domination over Global South economies.

3.5 Effect of Eurocentrism in Comparative Politics

In the present circumstances, the enterprise of world history, from whatsoever angle it is attempted, must be disowned and repudiated, certainly viewed far more critically than it has been so far. But let me push the argument further: keeping in mind the enormous inequities in the world system, the vastly different conditions under which research is conducted and produced in the North and the South, and the dominance of modem knowledge systems, there can be no more desirable outcome than to reduce *certain* contacts between cultures and reject *certain* kinds of conversations and exchanges. In the totalizing conditions of modem knowledge, perhaps best encapsulated now in the primacy accorded to historical knowledge, the intellectual and political imperative must remain one of increasing incommensurability. The intclJcctual project of the disciplines runs contrary to this dissenting politics, and to aim at a better knowledge of the world from within the framework of the categories deployed by the modem sciences is to do little more than to ripen the conditions under which oppression takes place. Even the most radical historians arc unable to write the history of the ahistorical except as a form of pre-history, primitivism, or irrational myth-making, just as the most radical economists, while attentive to considerations of distributive justice, minimum wages, and the like, are unable to bring themselves to an acceptance of the view that the entire paradigm of "growth" may have to be rejected.

3.6 Conclusion

If there is a prognosis for the social sciences in the twenty-first century, which might introduce into the dominant frameworks some dissent that has not already been rendered captive by numerous models that are posturing as dissent, it is this: the historical mode may have to be compelled to pave way for the mythic and the ahistorical; the formalized platitudes of the social sciences will, at the very least, have to be brought into an engagement with folk, vernacular, subjugated, and recessive forms of knowing; and the claims of Western forms of universality will have to be adjudged not only against the strengths of local knowledge systems, but against competing universalisms which are content With

a less totaiizing reach. Thus might the stranglehold ofEurocentrism on which is taken as "knowledge" be broken. The model of state-building in the West is in the form of the Westphalian nation- state, which has its origins in Europe. There has been an export of the same model throughout the world, with ideas of state interaction such as realism, liberalism or Marxism emerging from knowledge, traditions in the West. Even the criticisms against the Western comparative political studies are coming from Western social, political theories. In response to these, the unit. Still, in conclusion, there is a steady rise in voices from the Global South which is highly important as it is needed to bring about notions of equity and justice in comparative political studies.

3.7 Summing up

- In fact till I 980s most of the works in Comparative Politics revolved around the political institutions of American and some European nations considered the archetypes. This preoccupation of the comparative politics with the west that at best ignored and sometimes also derided the developing societies is known as Euro centrism.

- It has been the influence of Cultural Relativism, Post modernism, Multiculturism and such other critical theories that compelled an anti-eurocentric turn of the discourse to become sensitive, diverse, open and iclusive.

- Looked into the so-called Perspectives from the Global South, which has remained scattered and somewhat incoherent.

If there is a prognosis for the social sciences in the twenty-first century, which might introduce into the dominant frameworks some dissent that has not already been rendered captive by numerous models that are posturing as dissent, it is this: the historical mode may have to be compelled to pave way for the mythic and the ahistorical; the formalized platitudes of the social sciences will, at the very feast, have to be brought into an engagement with folk, vernacular, subjugated, and recessive forms of knowing; and the claims of Western forms of universality will have to be adjudged not only against the strengths of local knowledge systems, but

against competing universalisms which are content with a less totalizing reach. Thus might the stranglehold ofEurocentrism on what is taken as 'knowledge" be broken.

The model of state-building in the West is in the form of the Westphalian nation-state. which has its origins in Europe. There has been an export of the same. model throughout the world, with ideas of state interaction such as realism, liberalism or Marxlsni emerging from knowledge traditions in the West. Even the criticisms against the Western comparative political studies are coming from Western social, political theories. In response to these, the unit looked into the so-called Perspectives from the Global South, which has remained scattered and somewhat incoherent. Still, in conclusion, there is a steady rise in voices from the Global South which is highly important as it is needed to bring about notions of equity and justice in comparative political studies. In fact till1980s most of the works in Comparative Politics revolved around the political institutions of American and some European nations considered the archetypes. This preoccupation of the comparative politics with the west that at best ignored and sometimes also derided the developing societies is known as Euro centrism. It has been the influence of Cultural Relativism, Post modernism, Multiculturism and such other critical theories that compelled the discourse to become sensitive, diverse, open and inclusive.

2.7: Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the effect of Eurocentrism in comparative politics.

2. Analyse the various ways in which Eurocentrism developed

Short Questions

1. Describe the ways in which non-West tried to resist Eurocentrism

2. Explain the contribution of Third World leaders in highlighting Eurocentism in comparative politics.

Objective Questions

1. Mention the important foundation of Eurocentrism

2. Mention one feature of Eurocentrism

3. Name one proponent of 'subaltern studies'.

3.9 Further Reading

1. Grovogu, Siba. (2011). 'A Revolution Nonetheless: The Global South in International Relations'. *The Global South.* 5 (1), 175-190.

2. Patel, Sujata. (2015). 'Beyond divisions and towards Internationalism: Social Sciences in the Twenty-first Century' in Carol Johnson, Vera Mackie and Tessa Morris-Suzuki (eds) *The Social Sciences in the Asian Century.* Australia. Australia National University Press.

3. Said, Edward. (1979). *Orientalism.* London. Routledge.

4. Abu-Lughod, J. L. (1989). *Before European hegemony: The world system A.D. 1250-1350.* New York: Oxford University Press

Unit 4 ❑ Going Beyond Eurocentrism

Structure:

4.1 **Objective**

4.2 **Introduction**

4.3 **Eurocentrism and beyond**

4.4 **Beyond Eurocentrism in Comparative Politics**

4.5 **Non-West and Comparative Politics**

4.6 **Conclusion**

4.7 **Summing up**

4.8 **Probable Questions**

4.9 **Further Reading**

4.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

- Know the. ways and means by which comparative political studies went beyond eurocentnsm.

- Know the methodological issues involved therein

- Know the viewpoint of third world countries towards comparative studies

4.2 Introduction

Methodological Eurocentrism bears first an epistemological consequence as it suppresses alternative modes of knowledge - indigenous, local, or non-Western - thereby universalizing itself. On an institutional level, Western academia pool resources to the West and delcgitimizes non-Western knowledge as 'unscientific'. Non-Western students at home and abroad study 'foundational texts' from Plato to Max Weber without questioning their history and in turn look to their society

through such ideas. Their incongruence with non-Western realities notwithstanding; their continued perpetuation could result in certain 'self-fulfilling prophecies' wherein Western perceptions and theories are internalized by those with power to shape non-Western societies, thus reinforcing their 'universal' veneer. Whereas Western scholars before 'Orientalized' non-Western subjects, these subjects now Orientalize themselves: The (nationalistic) reaffirmation of a Chinese identity as Confusian or Indian identity as Hindu, despite their initial European construction through the texts of missionaries and ethnographers.

4.3 Eurocentrism and beyond

An understanding ofEurocentrism (and its methodological variety) requires some background into the disparate scholarship that valorized it: Postcolonial studies. Despite its deliberate heterogeneity and refusal of definition, there are common elements that can be identified. Postcolonial studies have a deconstructionist mode of analysis that transcends conventional disciplinary boundaries, with traceable inspirations from poststructuralist and postmodern authors like Foucault and Derrida, Methodological Eurocentrism refers to the idea that social science remains deeply Eurocentric, in that concepts and theories developed in Western historical settings and by Western academics can be universally apply everywhere to produce value-free knowledge. Western scientific knowledge is understood as true, universal, and objective. Analytically, methodological Eurocentrism goes beyond the general/ specific dichotomy and cuts across disciplinary debates of structure/agency or materialism! idealism.

Methodological Eurocentrism bears first an epistemological consequence as it suppresses alternative modes of knowledge - indigenous, local, or non-Western - thereby universalizing itself. On an institutionallevc1, Western academia pool resources to the West and delegitimizes non-Western knowledge as 'unscientific'. Non-Western students at home and abroad study 'foundational texts' from Plato to Max Weber without questioning their history and in turn look to their society through such ideas. Their incongruence with non-Western realities notwithstanding,

their continued perpetuation could result in certain 'self-fulfilling prophecies' wherein Western perceptions and theories are internalized by those with power to shape non-Western societies, thus reinforcing their 'universal' veneer. Whereas Western scholars before 'Orientalized' non-Western subjects, these subjects now Orientalize themselves: The (nationalistic) reaffirmation of a Chinese identity as Confucian or Indian identity as Hindu, despite their initial European construction through the texts of missionaries and ethnographers.

The universality of methodological Eurocentrism holds an implicit teleology and essentialism. Understanding concepts such as 'political modernity' inevitably invoke and engage the intellectual and theological traditions of Europe, while those beyond the West are often disregarded or treated only as secondary materials. Here, Dipesh Chakrabarty critiques the ascription of 'pre-political', 'archaic', and 'traditional' or the secularizing logic as a sign of modernity in Hobsbawm's analysis ofIndian peasant revolts. In the words of Dipesh Chakrabarty: "Historicism converted history itself into a version of [the] waiting room. We were all headed for the same destination ... but some people were to arrive earlier than others." We see instances of this in such declarations of Westem liberal democracy as ''the end of history." In the process, methodological Eurocentrism essentializes both the West and the Rest, through time and space. One end of the spectrum is the West - with identifiers of civilization, developed, democracy, rule of law - while the other end is the Rest - with perennial uncivilization, *developing,* authoritarian, and lawlessness. This bears upon our analytical prowess when such terms do not capture the subjects' diverse and changing realities, yet still used by virtue of their 'convenience' in political rhetoric and analysis.

Methodological Eurocentrism fuels a disciplinary divide as well. While much of these critiques is most felt in the humanities and international relations, their impact is less in political *science.* The crisis of confidence brought by the end of the Cold War has affected the former, though not enough to supplant the hegemonic Eurocentrism in a study of politics with 'scientific' aspirations. Demarcation exists within the humanities as well. "History belongs to the colonizers", separated

from the anthropological realm of tradition and 'other cultures' . Non-Western subjectivities are treated effectively as exhibits in museums without much bearing on the present realities. That the intimate relationship between anthropology and colonialism likely contributed to its appreciation of postrnodern and postcolonial critiques. Yet these newfound cultural sensibilities by anthropology contributed to its marginality as a 'science', critiqued by more 'scientific' endeavors for being too particularistic and unscientific.

Till1980s most of the works in Comparative Politics revolved around the political institutions of American and some European nations considered the archetypes. This . preoccupation of the comparative politics with the west that at best ignored and sometimes also derided the developing societies is known as Euro centrism. It has been the influence of Cultural Relativism, Post modernism, Multiculturism and such other critical theories that compelled the discourse to become sensitive, diverse, open and inclusive. Whatever limited works on the non western societies were available; it apparently displayed tbe bias against them. TIle institutional preoccupation was so deep that differences in cultural settings and ideological frameworks of different countries were completely ignored. Also, most of the scholars studying the field downgraded the colonised people, their society and culture in their work. They took some countries of the West as the reference point and judged the non western categories based on them. So the institutions of Britain, France and Germany served as the archetypes for the world. This bias towards the western civilization, race, culture and presumption of its superiority denotes ethnocentrism. At times, it amounted to being insensitive to the history, culture, traditions and colonial legacies of those societies. Third world creatively responded to this western hegemony with 'third world perspective' that proposed their way of looking and engaging with the world. It was felt that in order to grapple with the world; one must know the nature of distribution of power,

4.4 Beyond Eurocentrism in Comparative Politics

Postcolonial analysis or paralysis: The dangers of reductionist particularism Searing though postcolonial critiques are, they are not without own analytical

tensions. Immediately we see an issue in its definition: *What exactly is the postcolonial?* The sheer heterogeneity of the colonial experience across the Latin America, Africa, Asia, even North America, brings into question the usefulness ofthc term 'postcolonial'. This is especially striking with the relative absence of the Asian experience and critics within a scholarship seemingly dominated by South Asian, Middle Eastern, and African scholars. Even the colonial enterprises themselves operated differently from each other - at times competing - rather than being monolithic (as 'The West'). As a conceptual framework, 'postcolonial' stands to ignore certain particularities of the colonial experience and more refined tenninology (e.g., neocolonial, anti-colonial) to justify itself as a viable mode of critique.

This brings us to another paradox of postcolonialism: That it, too, essentializes, despite its anti-universal ism and anti-essentialism. For one, the insistence on the colonial encounter seems to reify its totality in restructuring the global experience and the complete lack of agency on the part of the colonized. The prevalent themes ofhyhridity andan~bivalcnce therein function almost like metanarrative of the human condition, much like the postmodem 'ironic metanarrative' that there is no metanarrative. Both postcolonial and postmodem thoughts appear to reify existing social, political, and temporal differences and forego agency (because agential capacity is conditioned by totalizing discourses). Their points of departure eventually arrive at a reductionist particularism: Everyone at every moment is fundamentally different from each other. This precludes any possibility of knowing and acting to affect the status quo, because all actions either inflict violence upon difference or arc preconditioned by existing discourses.

By reIativizing Western modernity and Eurocentrism, postcoloniatism is silent on why Eurocentrism was able to achieve its universal status. By overemphasizing culture and discourse, postcolonialism reduces Eurocentrism to merely another ethnocentrism and ironically accepts Eurocentrism and its WestlRest binary as 'given' universals, without explaining why it became so universalistic. This problematically implies a superiority of Euro-American values without specifying

the content of such values that led to their hegemony, ignoring capitalism (indeed a Marxist *metanarrative)* as constitutive element of the colonial encounter that has now globalized. These prevailing issues deprive postcolonialism of any meaningful praxis and render postcolonial authors complicit in the maintenance of global Western hegemony. Such an accusation is not unwarranted: The most prominent postcolonial authors are tenured within the most prestigious Western institutions (Columbia University, for example, houses already Spivak and Said, two out of three towering figures in the scholarship).

The challenge against methodological Eurocentrism has engaged in an active *deconstruction* of Euroccntric assumptions, without any prospects of an alternative *reconstruction.* What is needed is a re-engagement with the universal, but in a way that that does not reduce the differences of the subjects within said universal. Instead of understanding the universal as teleological with a parochial and homogenizing content, we may reconceptualize it as open and heterogenous, recognizing its inevitable historical unevenness and combination of interactive differences. In other words, an alternative to Eurocentric capitalist modernity can only be conceived in a construction of holistic social theory. Spivak herself acknowledged this necessity before with the notion of strategic essentialism: That practical political resistance inevitably requires a degree of essentialized (universalized) identity around which one can mobilize, but with an awareness ofits contextual limits and the identity as means, not goal.

Postcolonial critiques furnished our awareness of our political dispositions in knowledge- making, but that extends as well to a position of indifference. Instead, heeding Bruno Latour's argument, we should move beyond a mode of critique for the sake of critique, not to "get away from facts but closer to them, not fighting empiricism but, on the contrary, renewing empiricism." In this sense of 'renewing empiricism', there will be always be some form and degree of essentialism in our categorization, critical or analytical- the analytics of essentialism is almost synonymous with categorization, generalization, and induction, thus unavoidable in any sort of social analysis. Much as we are guarded against sweeping overgeneralization, we should similarly keep our anti-essentialism targeted.

How do we move from a methodological Eurocentrism towards a constructive and non-Eurocentric methodology? Area studies given its deliberately particular and bounded (areal) focus is the best option .. To furnish constructive arguments, I address first the critiques: Its ulterior motives during the Cold War, the artificiality of its 'areas', and a secondary position to only test Eurocentric hypotheses. On the first critique, the end of the Cold War, much like the field of international relations, has compelled areas studies to reinvent itself and appreciate the critiques launched against it. Secondly, 'areas' (East Asia, Southeast Asia, Africa, etc.) are only geographical demarcation, which in away serves a practical rather than epistemological purpose. 'Areas' are arguably less artificial than, for example, the disciplinary demarcation between political science and sociology, which often overlaps. Conversely, area studies prioritize an interdisciplinary commitment and contextual understanding of a certain area, paying attention to both particularities but not precluding generalizations, to capture more fully the dynamics of said area. Areas themselves do not erase difference, but exist alongside subunits (nations, provinces, etc.), just as both Asian studies and Japan studies are eo-constitutive. The notion of 'areas' furnish a capacity for regional analysis, which enables an account of, tor example, a budding European identity as larger than the sum of its nations. The most enduring critique thus would be the relegation of area studies to particularism and empirical testing, unable to transcend towards universal theories - a methodological Eurocentrism at core.

Yet area studies can still overcome methodological Eurocentrism. This is not a recourse to methodological nationalism, producing as many' indigenous' national schools of thoughts which are derivative of self-Orientalization in its aspirations to European capitalist modernity. Nor is this to carve out an exclusive space by-Asian-for-Asian theorizing which ultimately would produce particularistic knowledge applicable to only Asia The point, precisely, is to produce knowledge with contextually-bound observations that is generalizable and useful elsewhere. As has been made clear by postcolonialism, all knowledge is preconditioned within their production. The next step, then, is to universalizeknowledge produced within non-Eurocentric contexts. It is with a throughgoing engagement with

universalizahility that area studies can contest methodological Eurocentrism, decenter Western modes of knowledge production, not by destructive 'uprooting' Western tradition but elevating non-Western knowledge.

4.5 Non-West and Comparative Politics

There are two concrete examples for universaIizability-as-praxis. As Giovanni Sartori has pointed out, the expansion of 'politics' brings about the risk of 'conceptual stretching' that 'waters down' conceptual and analytical precision. There is thus a real need for theorization from non-Western empirical settings. One notable demonstration is the Murdoch School in Australia that theorizes from Southeast Asian state formation experience a more encompassing political economy theory that incorporates both structural and sociocultural factors. It finds that Weberian approaches, through focusing on ideal-types and bureaucratization, do not explain well the uneven and historically specific developments of Southeast Asian political economy. Historical institutional ism, on thc other hand, by overemphasizing autonomy of institutions, is unable to explain why particular institutions exist or change, particularly Southeast Asian 'institutions' that are usually deeply wedded into sociocultural contexts, not quite rationalized or autonomous. In this sense, the Murdoch School challenges methodological Eurocentrism by providing a viable, generalizable competing alternative, while still paying attention to contextual specificity. It concurs with Charles TIny that "history matters" but does not preclude the possibility of transhistorical explanations, such as Tilly's WUNC configuration.

Another example is the emerging practice of Inter-Asia referencing by Asian scholars that decenters Western frames of comparisons. Inter-Asia referencing refers to the rising academic practice of Asian scholars where they cite more than just Western scholarship and include Asian works, and critically approach Western theories. While methodological Eurocentrism, with its pooling of resources and hegemonic knowledge production, casts non-European realities as lesser versions of the West, inter-Asia referencing allows Asian scholarship to 'take itself seriously'

and paves the ways for new universals. Inter-Asia referencing is most prominent in export-oriented industrialization, urban development, and regionalization of popular culture, wherein there are 'Asian' specificitiesin economics and cultures that require a supple Asian - beyond a strictly Western - perspective. Nonetheless, the concentration of inter-Asia referencing in what appears to be products of Asian capitalism casts certain doubts into whether it can meaningfully providc alternative to capitalist modernity. An observation by ArifDirlik is relevant here: "Although the agencies that are located in EuroAmerica maybe the promoters ofEurocentrism, they are by now the not the only ones, and possibly not the most important ones." We might, instead, find viable alternatives beyond Asia, in Latin America with the indigenous experience and the outgrowing of rights- based discourse, for example. As such, area studies, with the promise of pluralized and complementary knowledge productions, is particularly promising.

The Political Culture approach appeared in 1960s, offering a larger canvass and greater inclusivity, This approach emphasised the study of set of belief, orientation and attitudes, governing the polities. Psychological and historical dimensions of the societies and citizens were highlighted. Gabriel Almond and Sydney Verba initiated the discourse on political culture and Arendt Lijphart made required modifications to it. The most recent approach that has created considerable interest in the field is the New Institutionalism that eamc in late 1970s. It symbolises the renewed interest in studying the vitality of institutions. Important work in this regard has been done by James G March and Johan P. Olsen. This approach called upon the researchers to take into account the interaction of the institutions amongst themselves and its effect on the society. It shifted the focus to study how these institutions influence citizens, organisations, associations and other variables in that society. In this way we sce that Comparative Politics is continuously evolving by inputs coming from various directions and new ways of understanding.

Dependency theory was the first non western attempt to analyse the world from the perspective of the marginaliscd nations. It was able to overcome

problems of modernisation paradigm, but only partly. Even this thesis became outdated after sometime as it was over occupied in the core-periphery analysis and failed to factor in crucial variables and determinants like the role of gender, race, culture, ethnicity ctc in its ambit. It also undermined the historical legacies, cultural constructs and specificities of particular societies. At the same time it was unjustified to put all developing countries under one umbrella. It ignored the distinct experiences of different third world countries that underwent colonial rule. For Example, the experience of French colonial regime was very different and more repressive in Algeria compared to the British colonial rule in India. Different countries had witnessed different kinds of anti-colonial struggles, based on their specific experiences of colonialism, their own histories of myth and traditions of protest, distinct political ideologies, intellectual contributions and stemming out of them, different visions for the futures. However, dependency school failed to cateh specific historical traditions and distinctiveness of third world societies. Insufficiency of these theories led to the de-legitimisation of ail the available modes of analysis, creating somewhat chaos in the field.

4.6 Conclusion

Dependency theory was the first non western attempt to analyse thewo~ld::fromthe perspective of the marginaliscd nations. It was able to overcome problems of modernisation paradigm, but only partly. Even this thesis became outdated after sometime as it was over occupied in the core-periphery analysis and failed to factor in crucial variables and detenninants like the role of gender, race, culture, ethnicity etc in its ambit. It also undermined the historical legacies, cultural constructs and spccificities of particular societies. At the same time it was unjustified to put all developing countries under onc umbrella. It ignored the distinct experiences of different third world countries that underwent colonial rule. For example, the experience of French colonial regime was very different and more repressive in Algeria compared to the British colonial rule in India. Different countries had witnessed different kinds of anti-coloniaI rule in India Different countries had witnessed different kinds of anti-colonial struggles, based

on their specific experiences of colonialism, their own histories of myth and traditions of protest, distinct political ideologies, intellectual contnbutions and stemming out of them, different visions tor the futures. However, dependency school failed to catch specific historical traditions and distinctiveness ofthird world societies. Insufficiency of these theories led to the de-legitimisation of all the available modes of analysis, creating somewhat chaos in the field.

4.7 Summing up

- One of biggest challenge to comparative politics is that how it can get rid of its apparent ethnocentric bias and at thc same time, make itself open and sensitive to peculiarities of the third world and understand reasons behind it.

- Rejection of ethnocentrism also amounts to treating all discourses emanating from such societies at par and of equal research concern to the field.

- The discipline must come out of its prejudices and seek for newer possibilities that may come from developing societies.

- Also, the attempt of comparativists should be to sensitise itself to the voices coming from marginalised section from such societies as this could lead to discovery of diverse versions of history and politics of these societies.

4.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions.

1. Discuss the effect of eurocentrism in methodology of knowledge generation:

2. Analyse the various ways in which Eurocentrism can be overcome methodologically.

Short Questions

1. Describe the ways in which comparative politics went beyond eurocentrism.

2. Explain the contribution of Third World countries in helping comparative politics to go beyond.

Objective Questions

1. Name a proponent of dependency theory

2. Identity one feature of post colonial critique of eurocentrism.

3. When did the political Culture approach emerge?

4.9 Further Reading

1. Sartori, Giovanni. "Concept misformation in comparative politics," *The American political science review* 64.4 (1970): 1033-1053.

2. Phillips, Anne. "What's wrong with essentialism?" *Distinktion: Scandinavian journal of social theory* 11.1 (2010): 47-60

3. Rattansi, Ali. "Postcolonialism and its discontents." *Economy and society 26.4* (1997): 480-500.

4. Dirlik, Arif. "Is there history after Eurocentrism": Globalism, postcolonialism, and the disavowal of history." *Cultural Critique* 42 (1999): 1-34.

5. Dirlik, Arif. "The postcolonial aura: Third World criticism in the age of global capitalism." Critical inquiry 20.2 (1994): 328-356.

Unit 5 ❑ Recent Trends in Comparative Politics

Structure:

5.1 Objectives

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to :

- Know the new methods of comparative politics

- Know new issue areas of comparative political research and study

- Know the real-world problems faced by comparative politics in 21st century.

5.2 Introduction

Described as an 'eclectic progressive' development, the discipline started with formal legal and institutional comparisons, moved to an almost exclusive focus on individuals (the 'behavioural revolution'), rediscovered the importance of institutions (the advent of the 'new institutionalism'), while continuously struggling with the question of culture. In response to patterns of globalization,

53

comparative politics has become even more explicit in its attention to international variables, while international relations has paid more attention to the role that domestic variables play in shaping international behaviour. While the substantive foci, inclusion of variables, and theoretical perspectives with which to examine them are more eclectic and open to change than ever before, the importance of systematic comparison and the need for inferential rigour, despite attempts to argue otherwise, has remained constant. In addition to the many strengths and weaknesses of the different comparative methods outlined in this book, there are several new developments in the field that will continue to improve its ability to make strong inferences about the political world. These include important issues of data collection and analysis, the transcendence of traditional boundaries in the field, and the development of new analytic software and comparative techniques. new techniques for combining quantitative and qualitative methods have been developed to offer more holistic explanations for political outcomes. Future comparative studies may want to adopt this strategy, which strikes a balance between quantitative and qualitative approaches while remaining systematic.

5.3 New Methods in Comparative Politics

The period of 'new eclecticism' recognizes and even celebrates the plurality of topics, theories, and methods in comparative politics. But this eclecticism and claim of method- ological pluralism does not mean 'anything goes'. Rather, as Part I has made clear, the method adopted and the research design that is formulated are a function of both the type of research question that is being addressed and the theoretical perspective that has been adopted. There is not a unity of method in comparative politics, but as in more general developments in the philosophy of the social sciences, there is now the practice of 'cognitive instrumentalism', which applies the necessary theoretical and methodological tools to a series of important and challenging political puzzles. But as new issues emerge and new research questions are posed, the key for comparative politics in providing sound answers to such new puzzles is systematic analysis.

The 'Perestroikan' movement primarily based in the United States, criticizes the discipline's over-emphasis on method and mathematical sophistication, leading the profession to lose sight of political puzzles and problems and/or providing answers that are largely unintelligible to policy makers and practitioners. The main charge of the movement is that the discipline has become highly 'technicist' and 'statistical', where method is given greater weight than substance. The movement argues that more weight should be given to substance over method, effectively loosening the rules of inquiry and the logic of inference, while providing 'distinctive insights into substantive political questions' (Smith 2002:10). Flyvbjerg (2001, 2006) proposes a way of recapturing the substance of politics and making political science 'matter'. Flyvbjerg challenges fundamentally the desire and attempt within the social sciences to emulate the natural sciences (i.e. its appeal to observable events and the logic of inference advocated in King et al. 1994). He draws on a short passage in Aristotle's Nichomachean Ethics on the 'chief intellectual virtues' to build a framework for conducting more holistic social scientific analysis that pays greater attention to the rich complexity of context, while offering a deeper understanding of politics that moves beyond the narrow techno-rationalism of certain dominant strands in contemporary political science. In particular, he uses Aristotle's virtues of knowledge (episteme), craft (techné), and practical wisdom (phronesis) to build what he sees is a more complete approach to studying social phenomena. Where episteme refers to abstract and universal knowledge (e.g. the rational individual) and techné to the specific 'know-how associated with practicing a craft', phronesis comes from an 'intimate familiarity with the contingencies and uncertainties of various forms of social practice embedded in complex social settings' . Of course, many have referred to this idea more colloquially as 'getting your feet wet in the mud' through knowing your cases and the political contexts in which you are working. Phronesis is thus 'situated practical reasoning' and for Flyvbjerg, it ought to be at the centre of social science research. While he does not seek to displace episteme and techné altogether, which he sees as the essential features of the naturalscience model of social inquiry, he does want to recapture phronesis and

place it on an equal footing to these other two elements. While not abandoning methodological concerns altogether, this proposition for political science and complementary arguments put forth more generally by the Perestroika movement argues that political science research 'may not be methodologically innovative, unusually precise, or indeed mathematical, but [it must] nonetheless [provide] fresh empirical evidence and well-reasoned arguments sufficient to judge some positions on important issues to be more credible than others' (Smith 2002:B10). In this sense, the movement is making a call to re-balance the discipline away from an emphasis on explanation towards a greater emphasis on understanding. This duality between explanation and understanding, much like other dualities in the social sciences (e.g. universality and particularity, qualitative analysis ongoing debate and refinement of comparative quantitative methods, such an evolution in the inferences about the relationship between development and democracy would not have been possible.

5.4 New Issues in Comparative Politics

The proliferation of new issues and the examination of old ones continue to provide an ample supply of research topics for systematic comparative analysis. The accretion of comparative methods that has developed over the years provides scholars with a rich 'toolchest' to examine and explain observed political phenomena in the world. Continued developments in information and communications technology will make the world a smaller place and ought to encourage an ethos of replication, develop a network of shared knowledge, build a stronger comparative-research community, and for certain research areas, promote links with the field of international relations. Dialogue, transparency, and intellectual honesty about the links between research questions, methods, and inferences in comparative politics will provide the basis for a thriving and fruitful discipline.

The discipline of Comparative politics has had its share of struggles and distress due to some of apparent limitations inherent in it. From its subject matter

to the methodology, there are many matters of contentions. As Lijphart states that the term "comparative politics" indicates the how but does not specify the what of the analysis. In comparative politics there is no longer any central body of literature, any grand theory, any set of concepts arrived consensually; which can function as fulcrum of analysis. This has further accentuated the ambiguity in the field. Further highlighting the problems, Klaus Von Beyme makes an interesting observation that the comparative politics has been particularly embarrassed by its failure to predict any major political events since Second World War like student rebellion of 1960s, the oil crisis, the rise of new fundamentalism, the collapse of communism in 1989 and all these events came as surprise. This unease in the field was lurking for quite some time and was also felt by the researchers. But it was not clearly outlined that what was the exact nature of the problem that was pulling the stream down. Problems were many however, the most quoted crisis of the discipline was proclaimed by Roy Macridis in 1955. It displayed the dismay of the scholars of this field. Many felt the immediate and drastic need of change in the discipline as it was boggled with primitive Institutionalism and obsolete outlook. Macridis argued that comparative politics was parochial since it focused solely on the experience of Western Europe; that it was descriptive rather than analytical; that it was formalistic and legalistic; and that it highlighted individual case studies rather than comparison of two or more societies. All the works of earlier times in the field fell in the old or classical institutional paradigm. Under institutionalism, studies basically focused only some political institutions of a particular society or at the best compared the government of few societies. Such works have never been comprehensive on any account. Most of the time, they compared legislative and executive branches of some similar courtiers of Europe. Definitely some very fine works have come from the institutional framework like that of Beard, Finer and many more, but from the modern parameters, they still were captivated in the legal-historical paradigm. Paradoxically, it has been as recent as 1950s that comparative literatures in real sense have come up. The contribution of institutional approach has been that, it offered the first generation of scholarships to the field. The challenge put by

Macridis became a watershed catalyzing newer ways and modes of explorations in the field. It depicted the redundancy of the traditional institutional framework, furthering the urgency of new interventions. Limitations of the discipline were overwhelming and comparativists have to rescue it at the earliest.

The question of utility of comparative politics is concerned with its usefulness and relevance for enhancing our understanding of political reality. It seeks to know how a comparative study helps us understand this reality better. First and foremost, we must bear in mind that political behaviour is common to all human beings and manifests itself in diverse ways and under diverse social and institutional set ups all over the world. It may be said that an understanding of these related and at the same time different political behaviours and patterns is an integral part of our understanding of politics itself. A sound and comprehensive understanding would commonly take the form of comparisons. Partial cooperation with the area of International Relations could also prove beneficial, as considerations in the areas of multi-level analysis and diffusion research have demonstrated. Moreover, many questions of International Politics are anchored within Comparative Politics. Prime examples are themes concerning the external promotion of democracy and the rule of law, as well as the realization of the Millennium Development Goals for developing countries. It is precisely this use of external means which requires sufficient knowledge about internal effect mechanisms, so as to avoid non intended consequences.. If it is therefore correct for the investigation of institutionalized forms of coordination of policy action, and their performance in policy problem solving, to form the focal point of Political Science's analysis of governance, then for Comparative Politics, a rich field of activity will unfold. In the process, multi-level coordination should claim the fullest attention. As already intimated above, the establishment of a large number of governance structures with global, regional or bilateral competence points to the development of a largely functionally conceived, new supranational steering level. With this, multilevel coordination – its success or failure – is becoming an ever present problem for Political Science, of which the handling necessitates the closest cooperation from all of its sub-disciplines. Comparative Politics can make this knowledge available.

Comparative Politics in the 21st century is a collective venture, driven not least, and not insignificantly, by communication within the scientific community.

5.5 New Areas of Study in Comparative Politics

It can thus be reckoned that in the 21st century, within the context of the structural transformation of world society (with the spread of scientific, technical civilisation and the increasing integration and interdependence between countries), as well as looming structural changes (such as climate change, the crisis of the progress paradigm and the incompatibility of traditional and post-modern lifestyles), political institutions will be put under enormous pressure to govern effectively and at the same time, to secure institutions' own interests, as well as those of established elites. These considerable changes within the subject matter of Comparative Politics signal new directions in thematic profile and research.

Direct our attention to important contexts which provide the incentive for a change in research perspective in Comparative politics. To begin with, we shall look at three not entirely new areas of analysis. Comparative social policy could look more intensively into the problem of divisions within society, a problem accentuated by globalisation, namely the forever growing disparity between that segment of society which profits from the integration of world markets and that which suffers from economic, social and political disintegration.

Comparative research into violence, armed conflict and the causes thereof still does not command the attention it deserves. Current military and other violent conflicts are frequently related to globalisation processes, which in the developing zones of world society limit many states' capacity to act. The systematic investigation of these is essential, so that we may find more effective approaches for their pacification. Much speculation is taking place concerning the logic of new wars, however well-founded, empirical studies (for example in connection with Lebanon, Pakistan, or Darfour), are in short supply. This deficit has however been recognized recently in the area of peace studies . In this context, constructivist and theoretical approaches are gaining in importance.

As far as the analysis of the consequences in terms of power and rule of 'externalised' centres of decision-making in individual policy areas is concerned, comparative policy regime research is still in its infancy. The democracy and legitimacy deficits of international and supranational levels of policy action are indeed the subject of multi-faceted debate, however for all the efforts of the currently flourishing field of Europeanisation research, we know relatively little about the consequences of outsourcing decision-making powers and structures for the organization of policy areas on the one hand and for the stability of governments and nation state-centred democracy on the other.

5.6 Conclusion

Moreover, many questions of International Politics are anchored within Comparative Politics. Prime examples are themes concerning the external promotion of democracy and the rule of law, as well as the realization of the Millennium Development Goals for developing countries. It is precisely this use of external means which requires sufficient knowledge about internal effect mechanisms, so as to avoid non intended consequences. If it is therefore correct for the investigation of institutionalized forms of coordination of policy action, and their performance in policy problem solving, to form the focal point of Political Science's analysis of governance, then for comparative Politics, a rich field of activity will unfold. In the process, multi-level coordination should claim the fullest attention. As already intimated above, the establishment of a large number of governance structures with global, regional or bilateral competence points to the development of a largely functionally conceived, new supranational steering level. With this, multilevel coordination – its success or failure is becoming an ever-present problem for Political Science, of which the handling necessitates the closest cooperation from all of its sub-disciplines. Comparative Politics can make this knowledge available. Comparative Politics in the 21st century is a collective venture, driven not least, and not insignificantly, by communication within the scientific community.

5.7 Summing up

- The last few decades have seen wide reaching changes in the context and with it the subject matter of Comparative Politics.

- This has enormous implications for comparative research itself. Comparative Politics in the 21st Century cannot be identical to that of the 20th century. Simply to continue as before would be to overlook the fundamental difficulties inherent in so doing.

- This does not mean however that Comparative Politics should be completely reinvented. Continuities will remain, and rightly so. However it does mean that given the context of significant empirical changes, research has to be rethought and deliberated upon.

5.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the effect of changes of new millennium in the study of comparative politics.

2. Analyse the various new methods of studying comparative politics.

Short Questions

1. Describe the new areas of study in comparative politics.

2. Explain the contribution of globalisation in comparative political research.

Objective Questions

1. Mention one new method in comparative polities

2. Identify one feature of perestroika movement in comparative politics.

3. What is the full form of MDG ?

5.9 Further Reading

1. Erickson, K.P. and Rustow, D.A. (1991) 'Global Research Perspectives: Paradigms, Concepts and Data in a Changing World', in D.A. Rustow and K.P. Erickson (eds) Comparative Political Dynamics: Global Research Perspectives, New York: Harper Collins, 441–459.

2. O'Neil, P. (2007) Essentials of Comparative Politics, 2nd edition, New Yorkand London: W. W. Norton.

3. Haynes, Jeffrey.(2005). Comparative Politics in a Globalizing World, London: Polity.

MODULE - 2

Unit 6 ❑ Major Approaches : Behavioural and Political Economy

Structure:

6.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

- Explain the meaning of behavioural approach
- Know the meaning of political economy
- Learn different tenets of behavioural approach
- Evaluate the behavioural approach in the light of the various criticism
- Explain how Political Economy developed into a separate field of Political Science and Economics

6.2 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 modem 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 which seeks to provide an objective, quantified approach to explaining and predicting political behaviour. Main focus of behaviouralisrn is the behaviour, actions, and acts of individuals rather than the functions of institutions such as legislatures, executives, and judiciaries. According to some scholar behavioural ism 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 emphasies that political science should be studied in manner similar to the study of natural sciences. In tins 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 govements 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.

6.3 Meaning of Behaviouralism

Behaviouralistor 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 as1908. Bentley argued that group onteraction 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 moment. He inspried political scientist 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 Dahi defines behaviouralism as a movement for bringing political studies into closer affiliation with theories, methods, findings and outlook in modem phychology, arthopology, and economics and it is an attemp 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.

6.4 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. behaviouralist uses 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**

Generatisation are valid if they are found to be so after empirical testing and verification. Explanatory statements are to be verified or fasified by confronting then with observable behaviour.

3. Techniques:

The behaviouralists 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 behaviouralists 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**

Behaviouralisms insist on separtingfacts from values. Objectivity of political analysis can be ensured only if it is value free.

● **Systematisation**

Reseach should be systematic. Theories should be build 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**

Behaviouralists belive in a pure science approach. Theoretical understanding of Political phenomena should be used for solving urgent social problem.

● **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 be more productive, should be integrated with other social sciences.

6.5 Criticism of Behaviouralism

Behaviouralist thinking was profoundly influenced by logical positivism. 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.

Science can not be evaluatively neutral and fact can not be separated from value. The factual data of Polities must be judged and appraised by moral criteria.

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

Behaviouralism has been criticized as a 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 crederitials of behavioural ism 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.

6.6 Political Economy

Over its long lifetime political economy has had many different meanings. For Adarn Smith. Political economy Was the science of managing a nation's resources so as to create wealth. For Marx, it was 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, whithin which it 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.

6.7 Evolution of Political Ec.onomy

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 to 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 an 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 breakup of feudal forms of Society and with the critique 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 as 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 or 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 on formal legal and governmental institution. The works 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 consequence of efforts by radical economists and sociologists.

6.8 Political Economy Approach

The political economy approach provides an economic interpretation of political consequences. 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 differences between liberal and Marxist political economy.

6.8.1 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

Mercantilist school of thought. Adam Smith, David Ricardo, J. H Keynes among others are often regarded as 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 and 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 should be eliminated and that government should not interfere in the economy. He argued 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 so that unless 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 static; not dynamic. It does not deal with structural crises, nor does it relate capitalism to imperialism.

These problems 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 fluctuations. According to Keynes, the market had to be improved through the political management of the state. The state should 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.

6.8.2 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 liberatize trade through open market. It seeks to maximize the role of the private sector. According to the neo-liberals, the market economy being an autonomous sphere of society, operates according to its own laws. Market delivers fairness and economic Justice. Free market is the economics system of free individual and it is necessary to create wealth.

6.8.3 Marxist Perspective

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

He developed theories on the prices 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 relation. He insisted that the production relation 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 super structure. 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 contrast, the legal and political super structure 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 Baran, 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 economy fundamentally addresses the broad historical sweep of capitalism. Paul Sweezy in The Theory of Capitalist development and Ernest Mandel in Marxist economic theory interpreted Marx's finding, 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 Amin 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 all well as to the socialist mode of production, or but not to precapitalist mode of production. All modes and formation of the contemporary world reflect accumulation on a world scale Primitive accumulation does not belong to the prehistory of capitalism but is contemporary as 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 Modem World System dated the modem world system from the 16th century but identified four periods in its evolution, (1450-1640), mercantile consolidation. (1640-1815) industrial expansion (1815-1917) and contemporary capitalist world (1917- present). He elaborated and refined Andre Gunder Frank's theory of capitalist development of under development and emphasized market relations.

All these 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.

6.9 Conclusion

The behavioural approach has made significant contribution to develop the scientific basis of political science. Empiricism and quantification have sufficiently enriched the quality of research in the discipline. However its exclusive methology and techniques has led to considerable neglect in content and substance, Strong desire for objectivity has resulted in virtual discarding of moral values.

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

6.10 Summing Up

Despite these limitations and points of criticism, it can be summed that Behaviouralism has played heuristic role in the development of the discipline. It successfully focused attention upon the limitations of the traditional approach. The behaviour a lists can legitimately claim credit for inducing, popularizing and improving the scientific method of social science research and the use of statistical and mathematical techniques in discipline. However, in the process, they became overwhelmed by concern for techniques, methodological sophistications and technical proficiency in research.

Political economy refers to a specific way of understanding social and political phenomena whereby, economics and politics are not seen as separate domains. It is premised (a) on a relationship between the two and (b) the assumption that this relationship unfolds in multifarious ways. These assumptions constitute important explanatory and analytical frameworks within which social and political phenomena

can be studied. Having said this, it is important to point out that whereas the concept of political economy points at a relationship; there is no single meaning which can be attributed to title concept. Title specific meaning the concept assumes depends on the theoretical ideological tradition. e.g., liberal or Marxist, within which it is placed, and depending on this positioning, the specific manner in which economics and politics themselves are understood :

6.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the meaning and importance of behaviouralism?

2. Evaluate political economy as an approach to the study of comparative politics.

Short Questions

1. What are the various tenets of Behaviouralism?

2. Analyse the liberal perspective of political economy?

Objective Questions

1. Who is the pioneer of the behavioural revolution in political science?

2. What was the basic assumption of Mercantilist school of thought?

3. Who wrote the book 'Modern World System'?

6.12 Further Reading

1. Angell, lames R. (1904). *Psychology: An Introductory Study of the Structure and function of Human Consciousness.* New York: Henry Holt.

2. Banks, Erik C. (2003). *Ernst Mach's World Elements: A Study in Natural Philosophy.* Dordrecht.Kluwer.

3. Boyd, Richard (1979). "Metaphor and Theory Change: What is 'Metaphor' a Metaphor For?" In *Metaplwr and Thought.* Andrew Ortony, ed. New York: Cambridge University Press, 481-532.

4. Bradie, Michael (2008). "Evolutionary Epistemology." In *the Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy.* Edward N. Zalta.

5. Campbell, Donald T. (1974). "Evolutionary Epistemology." In *The philosophy of Karl R. Popper.P.* A. Schilpp, ed. LaSalle, IL: Open Court, 412-463.

6. Chomsky, Noam (1957). *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton.

7. Boettke Pl, Leeson PT (2015) The Economic Role of the state. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham

8. Buchanan JM (1987) The Constitution of Economic Policy. Am Econ Rev 77:243-250.

9. Downs A (1957) An economic Theory of Democracy. Harperec Row, New York.

10. Eucken W (1952/2004) Grundsätze der Wirts chaftspolitik. Zth edn. Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen.

11. Fine B, Saad-Filho A (eds) (2012) The Elgar Companion to Marxist Economics Edward Elgar Cheltenham.

Unit 7 ❑ System Approach and Structural Functional Approach

Structure:

7.1 Objective

After going through this unit, learners would be able to :

- Define system and political system.
- Explain David Easton's idea about Political System.
- Explain Origin and Development of the Structural-Functional Approach.
- Explain Almond's Structural Functional Approach.

7.2 Introduction

Systems analysis is considered to be the pioneering model of Political analysis. David Easton was the first to develop a systematic framework for the analysing politics. System analysis, conceives politics in term of the political system. The origin of systems theory begin with the thining of the biologist, Von Bertalanffy, in the 1920s.

Like system approach structural-functional approach has been a very popular and useful approach to the study of Polities as Political system. It seeks to study Political system as a set of functions performed by several structures which together constitute the system of politics.

Structural-Functional approach seeks to analyse: what basis functions are performed by what political structures? Charles worth explains the crux of this approach in a very simple way.

He writes, The structural part of the approach refers to any human organisation that can do things and have an effect on human beings and pther human organisations, viz, a family a public corporation, a court, a bureau, or a legislative body.

The functional part relates to be activity of the agency and its external effects. These, according to some, are divided into "latent" and "mainfest", meaning that the letter are international and the former incidental or accidental.

7.3 Definition of System

To comprehend the concept of political system, we must first understand what a system is according to Ludwing Von. "It is a act as elements standing in interaction". According to Motion A. Kaplan, "It is a collection of interconnected variables distinct from the Emile Durkheim, Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski, Talcott paesons, R.K. Morton and Marian Levy, Jr. have significantly contributed to the growth of systems analysis in social science. David Easton, Gabrial Almond and Morton Kaplan have pioncered systems analysis in political science. While David Eastona dn Almond have applied it to national politics, Kaplan has applied it to the sutyd of International Politics. System embodies the concept of a collection of things or

pieces expressing certain features of a process. In a nutshell, a system entails the interconnectedness of its components, and when one component's boundary in a system changes, all other components and their systems as a whole are impacted. Thus, a system is a collection of individuals or objects that interact with one another and with their surroundings.

The general system theory has three fundamental pre-requisites:

(i)   descriptive concepts.

(ii) concepts highlighting the variables that control and maintain the system, and

(iii) concepts pertaining to the system's dynamics.

Descriptive ideas include those that distinguish between open and closed systems, or between organic and inorganic systems. This category also includes an understanding of the internal organisation of the system, the concept of the boundary, inputs, and outputs. These concepts aim at emphasising the factors that regulate and maintain systems and focus on the conditions that govern and sustain the systems' operation. Additionally, these involve a large number of process factors, such as feedbacks, repair, and reproduction entropy. On the other hand system dynamics notions refer to the changes that occur as a result of the find distinction between notions of disruption, desolation, and disintegration, as well as the study of concepts such as systemic crisis, stress, strains, and decay.

Numerous authors have attempted to define the concept of political system precisely. The majority of their positions share a link between political systems and the permissible use of physical force in society. According to Max Weber, a "political system" is "a human community that successfully asserts its monopoly on the lawful use of physical force within a particular territory." Additionally, Weber asserts that the legitimate force is the thread that runs through the political system's action, endowing it with its unique quality and significance, as well as its coherence as a system. Laswell and Kaplan define the political system as the process of shaping and sharing power through the threat or actual application of severe deprivation for non-compliance. According to Robert Dahl, a political system is "any enduring pattern of human relations involving power, rule, or authority."

7.4 Basic Components

Political systems exist within their contexts. In other words, political life as a behaviourial system is embedded in its environment. The political system's environment is composed of social and physical surroundings. The political system's environment can be classified into two types intrasocietal and extrasocietal Additionally, the intrasocietal environment might be classified as ecological, biological personality, or social, Additionally, the extra-societal environment is segmented. The term "intrasocietal environment" refers to the environment that exists outside the borders of a nation. It refers to the international environment. It envompasses all other countries political systems, international political institutions such as the United Nations and the International Court of Justice, as well as international economic, social, cultural, and demographic systems.

All political systems are inherently open and adaptable, Because political systems are embedded in their environments, they are susceptible to environmental impact. Political systems are inextricably linked to their intra- and extra-societal contexts. It is continually receiving information from other systems and is subjected to a stream of events and influences that shape the conditions under which its members act. These forces exert strain on the operation of political systems, creating systemic pressures. Nonetheless, political systems endure in the face of such strains Stress refers to the obstacles that obstruct the political system's normal functioning, sometimes to the point of total breakdown.

According to G.A. Almond, all political systems are made of similar components that serve similar purposes. And because these functions are critical to the system's survival. these structures are highly district. When several of these structures unite, a subsystem or a system arises. It is worth noting that political structures are inherently multi-functional.

The political system performs a variety of functions that are necessary for the system to function properly. These are the system's functional needs. According to Almond, political systems can be classed as traditional, transitional, or development based on their forms and functions. A Political system, in general, performs two

types of functions input and output. David Easton distinguishes between demands and supports in input functions. Almond discusses interest articulation and interest aggregation, but he initially included political socialisation and recruiting, as well as political communication, in his definition. On the other hand, Easton identifies policy decisions as output functions, whereas Almond identifies rule application and rule adjudication as output functions.

The political system is built of district structures: This is a necessary component of the political system. These factors or components are interdepended. This means that when one component fails to function properly, the entire system suffers. These aspects are inextricably linked, which is what makes it a system. As such, Almond asserts that a "political system" is "that structure of interaction found in all independent societies that" serves as a mechanism for integration and adoption."

A political system is an ever-evolving entity. It will continue to exist as long as it successfully regulates the stress factor. To accompligh this, it executes capability functions. It is the capacity of the political system to persevere in the face of adversity. The political system's capability functions are classified as extractive capability, regulative capability, distributive capability, symbolic capability, and responsive capability. The political system maintains itself through these capabilities, and when necessary, modifies its structure and functions. As a result, the political system is fluid in character.

7.5 Features

The political system consists of the following features:
1. It has its own perimeter.
2. It is a part of the environment.
3. The political system is a dynamic and adaptable one.
4. It is self-regulating in nature.
5. It is exhaustive in scope.
6. It is constructed of a number of distinct structures, each with a distinct function.

7. The conponents of the political system are interdependent.

8. The political system is an ongoing and dynamic entity.

7.6 Easton's Concept of Political System

According to David Easton, a political system is "an authoritative allocation of values accompanied by the threat or actual use of deprivation to make them universally binding." An analysis of Easton's definition reveals three aspects : (i) value allocation (ii) authoritative allocation and (iii) authoritative allocation is binding on society. As such, according to David Easton, a political system refers to the mechanisms of interaction that exist inside any society and are used to make binding or authoritative assignments.

According to Easton, the political system is the most encompassing system of conduct in a society for allocating values authoritatively. It operates within a defined boundary. This distinguishes the political system from other social systems. Easton identifies four criteria for distinguishing the politial system from other social systems. These are :

(i) The extent to which political roles and activities are distinct from other roles and activities, or, conversely, the extent to which they are all embedded in limited structures, such as families or kinship groups; and

(ii) The extent to which occupants of political roles form a distinct group within society and exhibit an internal sense of solidarity and cohesion.

(iii) The amount to which other hierarchies, such as wealth, status, or other non-political factors, exist; and

(iv) The extent to which recruitment methods and selection criteria differ for political and non-political roles, respectively.

7.7 David Easton's Systems Analysis

Systems Analysis's is the application of the theoretical tools of General Systems Theory (GST) to the study of political system, initiated by David Easton. The major

works of David Easton related to the exposition of 'System Analysis' include: The Political System (1953), "An Approach to the Analysis of Political System" (in World Politics, 1957), A Framework for Political Analysis (1965) and A System Analysis of Political Life (1965).

The key concepts of the Systems Analysis are:

1. **System:** It is useful to view political life as a system of behaviour Political life may be described as a set or system of interactions defined by the fact that they are more or less directly related to the authoritative allocation of values for a society.

2. **Environment:** A system is distinguishable from the environment in which it exists and open to influences from it. Those aspects of a society that fall outside the boundaries of a political system can be generalized by stating that they consist of all the other subsystems of the society. They constitute the environment of the political system. Environment embraces the social as well as the physical environment. The environment of the political system is composed of two different types of systems, intrasocietal and extrasocietal.

   i) Intrasocietal Environment: It is that part of the social and physical environment that lies outside the boundaries of a political system and yet within the same society.

   ii) Extrasocietal Environment: The systems that lie outise the society of which the political system itself is a social subsystem, yet having important consequences for the persistence or change of a political system constitute the extrasocietal environment of a political system.

3. **Boundary:** Analytically, the boundaries of all systems may be interpreted as the criteria of inclusion in or exclusion from the systems forming the focus of interest. For the political system, the test is whether the interactions (of constituting actors) are more or less directly related to the authoritative allocations of values for a society.

4. **Inputs:** Inputs are indicators that will sum up most of the important effects that cross the boundary between the political system and the other systems belonging to its environment. They indicate the way in which environmental

events and conditions modify and affect the operations of the political system. However there may be some kinds of inputs originating from the system itself, which are identified as with inputs. There are two basic kinds of inputs demands, or the raw material that the system is called upon to process, and support, or the energy to keep it going. These inputs give a political system its dynamic character.

Demands: Demands are those kinds of wants of persons or groups placed before the political system which require some special organized effort on the part of society to settle them authoritatively.

Support: Support is the energy in the form of actions or orientations promoting and resisting a political system. Actions may include voting for a political candidate or defending a decision by the highest court of the land. Whereas orientations imply deep-seated set of attitudes or predispositions such as loyalty to a political party or the ideals of democracy and patriotism. Support may be directed to three distinct objects of the political system: the authorities or the government of the day, the regime or the principles, values, legal structures and statutes that make up the constitutional framework of the system; and the political community as a whole, consisting of a group of persons that seek to settle difference or promote decisions through peaceful action in common.

5. **Conversion Process:** From among the variety of demands presented in a system, its members, particularly at-times those who have the special responsibility of leadership, must select a few as the goals and objectives of the system and commit the limited resources of the society to their realization. Through this vast conversion process the inputs of demands and support are acted upon in such a way that it is possible for the system to persist and produce outputs meeting the demands of at least some of the members, and retaining the support of most. It is a way of translating demands and support for a system into authoritative allocations. Persistence of a system, its capacity to continue the production of authoritative outputs, will depend upon keeping the conversion process operating.

6) **Outputs:** Outputs are those kinds of occurrences concerned with the authoritative allocation of values or binding decisions and the actions implementing and related to them. They are exemplified in the statutes of a legal system, administrative decisions and actions, decrees, rules and other enunciated policies on the part of the political authorities. If outputs are to have any impact on support they must be able to meet the existing or anticipated demands of the members of the system.

7) **Disturbances:** A political system is subject to influences of many kinds coming to it from the environment or from things that happen within a political system, these are designated as disturbances.

8) **Stress:** Stress is a severe type of disturbance occurring in the environment of a political system that threatens to destory it. A stress interferes in some fundamental way with the capacity of a political system to keep a conversion process working.

Demand Stress: A system may be exposed to stress from demands in two ways.

i) Output Failure: Under certain circumstances parts of the membership might seek to breakaway from the community in some kind of separatist movement. Output failure is the result of this unwillingness or inability to meet demands. This may tend in the direction of undermining support for the system leading to a condition of stress.

ii) Demand Input Overload: Stress may occur because too many demands are being made, or their variety and content may be such that they require an excessive amount of time to process. This condition of stress is identified as demand input overload.

Support Stress: Dwindling support for various aspects of a system may cause stress for a system by affecting its ability to carry out authoritative allocation of values.

i) Related to the Authorities. Support level for the government of the day may fall alamingly.

ii) Related to the Regime: Support for the whole constitutional system or regime of a system may falter alarmingly.

iii) Related to the Political Community There may be a sidespread distrust among the members of a system upon the abilities and intentions of the political community as a whole.

9) **Regulation of Demand Stress:** Demand stress must be regulated otherwise it could cause the collapse of a political system. This may be done by checking the volume of demands and augmenting the capacity of the system as well.

   a) Structuram Regulation: The structural mecanism regutate volume of demands entering the system. All political system develop gate keeping role operating rules to be followed by gate keepers. For example the interest groups, political parties, opinion leaders or the mass media in a modern system and the notables, an aristocracy or a military cadre in a traditional society.

   b) Cultural Restraints: Cultural restrains would serve to modify the number of desires that members of a society would even presume to convert to demands. To pursue this policy a system may identify certain aspects of social life such as aesthetics, religion or even some kinds of economic wants as 'not a subject for political action'.

   c) Combination of Demands: The volume and variety of demands may be reduced at a very initial stage of their articulation through comination of two or more demands into one.

   d) Increase Channels: The channels for communicating demands into outputs may be increased by implementing structural differentiation and augmenting the capacity of the system to handle a greater volume of demands. This helps a system to cope with potential stress.

10) **Regulation of Support Stress:** If support for a system threatens to fall below a minimum level then the system must either provided mechanism to revive the flagging support or its days will be numbered.

   a) Structural Regulation: The most radical strategy for regulating support stress is to transform the goals and structures of a system as a means of maintaining at least some kind of mechanism for making authoritative

allocations, such as by adopting a new constitutional order fundamentally different from the previous one.

b) **Diffuse Support:** A high level of diffuse support may be instilled in the members of a system through political socialization so as to cultivate sentiments of legitimacy, recognition of a general welfare and a sense of political community.

c) **Specific Support:** Where diffuse support may threaten to fall to a dangerously low point, efforts may be made to stimulate the input of specific support by discharging specific benefits and advantage to the members of a system in the form of outputs.

11) **Response:** Variations in the structures and processes within a system may usefully be interpreted as constructive or positive alternative efforts by members of a system to regulate or cope with stress flowing from environmental as well as internal sources.

12) **Feedback:** Feedback is essentially a process through which information about the performance of a system is communicated in such a way as to effect the subsequent behaviour of the system. It is primarily a regulative element in a political system.

7.8 Criticism

Following criticisms have been leveled at Easton's systems analysis:

1. It is very complicated theory.

2. The theory is quite abstract.

3. It seeks to follow the laws of physical sciences rather than the laws history.

4. Not original, taken from life sciences.

5. No explaination for the processes of social change given.

6. Instances of socio-economic and political crises are overlooked.

7. Its outlook is conservative and status quo seeking.

8. No recognition of the possibility of heterogeneity or diversity in political systems.

9. Concept of sub-system not mentioned.

10. Structures are not properly studied.

11. The discussion on power deliberately avoided.

7.9 Structural Functional Approach

Structural functionalism is the most ambitious attempt to apply functional approach to the study of Politics. In its contemporary systematic form this approach stems from the work of the anthropologists, Malinowski and Radc1iffe Brown in the early decades of the 20th century, Sociologists like Talcott Parson, Rk Merton and Marion Levy subsequently adopted and refined the mode of analysis. Since the 1950s a number of Political Scientists have begun to apply this approach to various problems of Political analysis. This tendency has been particularly noticeable in the field of comparative Politics. W.e. Mitchell, David Apter and Gabriel A. Almond are credited with having introduced structural functional analysis in Political Science.

7.10 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework of the structural functional approach centers around the question, what structures fulfill what basic functions and under what condition in any given system? The two basic concepts in the structural functional analysis are structure and function. While functions concern the consequences of pattern of action, structures refer to the pattern of action and resultant institutions of the systems themselves. Functions are therefore performed by various structural arrangements in any given system. It is frequently the case that a variety of specific manifest structures can perform any basic function. Moreover, there is no one-to-one correspondence between function and structures Just as a single function may be performed by a complex combination of structures, any given structural arrangement may have functional or dysfunctional consequences for a variety of functions.

7.11 Basic Assumtions of Structural Functionalism

The structural functional approach makes following assumptions; First, the whole system is the unit of analysis; second, certain functions must be performed for the survival of the whole system; Third, the structures within the system are functionally inter-dependent. Functional analysis seeks to identify the structures and processes within a system. It aims to describe how the functions are performed by the structures and processes and assess how the functions performed contribute to the overall functioning of the system. The structures and processes for performing necessary functions may not be identical across societies. It implies that societies may vary in terms of functional specialization and structural differentiation.

7.12 Almond's Structural Functionalism

Almond's basic objective is to construct a functional theory of politics. His interest centres around two interrelated fundamental issues. First, he aims to construct a theory capable of explaining the process of transition from traditional to modem political system. Second, he wants to clarify political systems as they exist in reality. He identifies three types of Political Systems: Traditional, Transitional and Modern. Modern Political system is more efficient than the traditional political system in fulfilling necessary functions and in dealing with the political problems. Transition from traditional to the modern system is basically a process of political development.

To explain comparative politics and political change Almond bagins with clear definition of politics and political system. According to him politics involves 'legitimate physical compulsion' and political system is "that system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which perform the function of integration and adaptations by means of the employment or threat of employment, of more or less. legitimate physical compulsion. The political system is the legitimate order maintaining and transformning system in the society."

Following this defintion we can identity three properties of the political system.

1) comprehensivenes, 2) interdependence and 3) existence of boundaries. It is comprehensive because it includes all inputs and all outputs affecting the use or

threat of use of physical coercion. It is interdependent because change in one subset of political interations affect other subsets. It is bounded because at some point other systems of society end and political system begins.

Almond identifies four common characteristics of political systems.

1) All political systems have political structures, and they may be compared with one another in terms of degree and form of structural specialisation.

2) The same functions are performed in all political systems, But these may be performed in different frequencies, by different structures and with different styles.

3) All political structures are multifunctional. Political systems may be compared with another on the basis of the specificity of functions performed by structures.

4) All political systems are mixed systems. There is no purely modern or purely traditional system, although the relative ratio of modernity or tradition will very from system to system.

On the basis of his experience and knowledge of the complex western system. Almond identifies four input functions and three output functions. The input function consists of 1) political Socialization and requitment, ii) Interest articulation, iii) Interest aggregation, and iv) Political communication. the output functions comprise i) rule making ii) rule application, and rule adjustment.

● **Input Functions**

Political socialization refers to the process of learning values, beliefs and attitudes towards the political system. The socialization process can be both manifest and laten. This function is performed by various socio-political organizations such as family, school, college, church, works place, trade union, political party etc. Political recruitment refers to the process of induction of individuals into different specialized roles in the political system.

Interest articulation indicates fonnulationof demands and transmission of these demands from society at large to the political system. This function is performed by interest groups.

Interest aggregation is the coalescing of myriad interests and demands articulated by individual and groups in the political system. This function is primarily performed by political parties, However, this function may also be fulfilled by other organizations such as political executives and bureaucracies.

Political communication is the means through which all the input and output functions are performed by the political system. It is the broad process covering function such as political socialization interest articulation and interest- aggregation, etc. The leaders of political parties and interest groups communicate their demands and suggestion. Ministers and bureaucrats take decision on the basis of information available to them. Mass media communicate the views, and responses of the public to the government and political patties.

● **Output Functions**

These functions are specialized and performed through different' structures. In democracies rule making is performed by legislature. Once the rules are made they are put into practice by specialized structures in the system. This function is mostly done by the bureaucracy. Civil servants with their specialized knowledge perform this function under the control of the ministers. Rule adjudication is done by courts. It is a restraint on both the rule making and rule application structure.

In this later work, Comparative Polities: A Developmental Approach, jointly written with GB Powel, Almond has effected some modification in his structural functional approach. According to him functional aspects of a political system can be viewed from three different levels. In one level he refers to the capabilities of the system which enable a system to relate itself to its environment Such capabilities are regulative, extractive, distributive and responsive. At another level, the system functions as a conversation process. It includes the functions of interest articulation and aggregation communication and the three output functions, Finally, the system has maintenance and adaptation functions which are' performed through socialization and recruitment.

● **Evaluation**

Critics argue that Almond's work was ethnocentric in its emphasis on stability in the light of Anglo- American norms and political tradition. Almond acknowledged this

difficulty in his effort to combine structural functionalism with a theory of development. Objection to this later work, however, revealed the ideological undercurrents of the structural functionalism of Almond and Powell. Their theory is implicitly designed to convert the reader to a belief in liberal democracy and liberal pluralism. It was also perceived as culture bound and formally inadequate. The pluralistic neutralism of structural functionalism makes it useless as a theory. According to Finer, "what Almond has to say.could have been said without using this systems approach and it would have been said more clearly". Moreover, there were operational difficulties, in particular, the difficulty of refining, operationalizing and testing hypothesis. It is difficult to apply on a broad basis to include both historical-and contemporary cases. The formulation tends in effect to equate the modem political system With the modern Anglo American democratic system. Critics further argue that its definitions employ too many dimensions and it neglects the problems of change and variation.

7.13 Conclusion

Easton placed himself in the mainstream of general systems theory, which he adapted to political science. He joined the interdisciplinary tradition of seeking to understand the whole system and contributed to the building of a paradigm. He highlighted the need to analyze complex interrelationships of political life. He shared the characteristics of many thinkers of the behavioural movement' including the rejection of traditional concepts like state and power, incorporation of concepts such as inputs, outputs and feedback and emphasis on theory construction.

Gabriel Almond applied a simple typology to national political system. Together with other comparative political scientists, Almond set forth new formulation, utilizing the political system as a base and turning to a set of concepts related to structure and function. Ultimately his structural functionalism exerted substantial impact upon the study of comparative politics.

7.14 Summing up

System analysis is considered to be the pioneering model of political analysis. David Easton was the first major political scientist to develop a systematic framework on the basis of the system analysis for the study of politics.

The structural functional approach was introduced to political science as part of its development via behaviouralism, We Mitchell, David Apter and GA. Almonds are credited with having introduced this approach in political science. Almond renovated concepts of comparative Politics. Function substituted for power, role for offices and structure for institution. The society is an interconnected system and function performed by its different parts contribute to the maintenance of equilibrium in it. Critics, however, perceive this approach as culture bound, establishmentarian, non-operational and formally inadequate.

7.15 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Examine Easton's System Analysis and indicate its limitations.

2. Write a critique of Almond's Structural Functional Approach to political analysis.

Short Questions

3. What according to Easton are the essential attributes of the political systems?

4. Discuss after Almond the input functions of the political system.

Objective Questions

5. Who wrote the book "Political System"?

6. What is meant by feedback?

7. What does Almond mean by structure?

7.16 Further Reading

(1) Almond, "*Political Development, Comparative Political Studies*", 1969.

(2) Almond, Gabriel A., et al. *Comparative Politics Today: A World View* (Seventh Edition), 2000.

(3) Almond and Powell, *Comparative A Developmental Approach,* (Little Brown Series), 1966.

(4) Douglas V. Verney. The Analysis of'Political System Routledge, 15th Apli2013.

(5) Easton, David, *The political system: an inquiry into the state of political science,* 1971.

(6) Ferris, Kerry, and Jill Stein. *The Real World All Introduction to Sociology.* 3rd ed. New York City: WW Norton & Co, 2012.

(7) Parsons, T., *Theories of Society foundations of modern sociological theory.* Free Press, New York, 1961.

(8) See Richard Sandbrook, *"The Crisism Political Development Theory.* Journal of Development Studies, January 1976.

(9) Stauffer, *"Great Power Constraints on Political DeveLopment"* in Studies in Comparative International Development 9 Vol. VI, 1971.

(10) Thomas Spragens, Jr *"The Dilemma of Contemporary Political Theory",* New York, 1973.

(11) William Mitchell's, *The American Policy Free Press,* New York, 1962.

Unit 8 ❑ Institutionalism

Structure:

8.1 Objective

After studying this particular unit, learners will be able to:

- Understand core elements of the institutional approach
- Explain the relevance of institutional approach in comparative study
- Understand the limitations and importance of the Institutional Approach in comparative political analysis.

8.2 Introduction

Institutional approaches are ancient and allways have been the core of traditional Political Science since the time of Plato. According to David Easton it arose out of the belief among some political scientists that 'political life can be understood and explained if we try to discern the effect of institutionalized activity on policy. Political scientists who believed that origin of politics and the influence moduling could be

located in the institutional mechanisms of the state have been generally labelled as 'traditionalists' or 'institutionalists'. According to this group of scholars, the political situatuion or the pattern of power which shapes policy is largely determined by the existence of various institutiions in society rather than by the people associated with the institutions.

With some important exceptions, early political science was often a more descriptive than analytical. 'Comparative politics,' consisted mostly of detailed configurative studies of different legal, administrative, and political structures. Institutional approach is concemed 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 theorists like Aristotle, Polybius in the ancient time to Laski and Finer in the present day have seemed 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 pattem 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.

8.3 Meaning of Institutionalism

Institutionalism means to study, observe and analyse politics from the institutional perspective. Institutional approach is closely related to traditional approaches and gives an independent identity to the study of politics in a systematic way. Previously, the study of politics was confmed to the study of state and government, thus institutional approach or institutionalism widened the horizon of study of states by focusing in the various institutions and organs of the govemment. An institution is a set of offices and agencies arranged in a hierarchy where each office or agency has functions and powers.

The major works which are seen as representing the institutional, approach in comparative politics, have concerned themselves only with governments and institutions in western countries. This approach believes in the superiority of western

liberal derriocratic institutions.According to this view western liberal democracy has a nomative and universal chapter. Thus ethrocentisirn is a typical feature of this approach.

8.4 The Institutional Approach: Historical Context

For a long time, comparative study of institutions was wiedly used in comparative political analysis. Comparative political analysis may in fact be said to have begun with a study For a long time, comparative study of institutions was widely used in comparative political analysis. Comparative political analysis may in fact be said to have begun with a study of institutions. Thus if one were to trace the evolution of comparative politics as a discipline of study, one can see the study of institutions as marking the point where the comparative method first began to be used. In this respect, It would be worthwhile to mention that after Plato, comparative study of governments was made by Aristotle who studied 158 constitutions and practices in Greek city-states. Contrasting them with politics in the so called 'barbarian' states, Aristotle introduced a typology of governments distinguishing between monarchies, aristocracy and polity and between these 'ideal' governments and their 'perverted' forms. The study of comparative politics at this stage was marked by what may be called an interrelation between facts and values. At this stage of its origins, a study of institutions did not attempt to 'analyse' the 'theory and practice' of government as emphasised by James Bryce in the late nineteenth century,. There was instead an overwhelming desire to explore 'ideal' states and forms of governments. In other words, there was more emphasis on speculations i.e, on questions about what 'ought' to be, rather than an analysis' seeking explanations of what 'is' or what actually existed. In the later period Machiavelli and Montesquieu gave the emphasis on empiricaldetails and facts about existing state of affairs as a result of which institutional, study became more reliable. Toequeville, in many ways, was the forbearer of the study of 'theory and practice' of governments, which became the essence of the institutional approach in comparative political analysis in later years. Institutional approach has been contributed to by many political scientists over a long period of time. The initial legal outlook was primarily inspired by Bentham and the English utilitarians. They had great faith in law as the regulator

of social relations. They believed that if a sound legal 'system could be created, it would automatically produce anticipated results. "Change the institutions and men will follow" was their aphorism. Similarly, American constitutionalists felt that the constitution truly determined how people acted out their political life.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century it dawned upon the students of political science that the legal provisions of the constitution did not quite describe how it actually worked. In practice, varieties of arrangements were devised around the legal provisions which had perhaps greater influence on the making and execution of policies. This view, which brought political analysis away from strictly legal description, has been called by Easton as the "phase of realism" in the study of political institutions. Bagehot (The English Constitution, 1867) made another significant contribution to the development of this element of the institutional approach in his study of the British Cabinet drawing important , points of comparison with the American Executive «» It was, however, Bryce, Lowell and Ostrogorski, who in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, made important contributions to comparative study of institutions and by implication to the development of comparative governments as a distinct branch of study.

8.5 Characteristics of Institutionalism

Any approach into a problem-solving inatter displays certain characteristics, thus institutionalism also has some characters which are related to (a) subject matter (ie., what is being studied) (brvocabulary (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 philisophical, historical or legalistic perspective.

8.6 Basic Core of Institutionalism

The study of institutions has been dominant not only in the arena of comparative politics, but in the political science 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 patties 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. However, it relies heavily on description rather than explanation. Hence it fails to qualify as a contemporary approach.

8.7 Why Institutions Matter?

Institutions are the vehicles through which the practice of politics is transmitted. Institutions matter because they shape or influence the behaviour, power and policy

preferences of political actors. The emphasis 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 operate in politics. These broader structural factors operate 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 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 Institutionalist theorizing on change have come from those scholars who specifically have tried to examine relationship between human agency and ideas. Traditionally, institutions me created by individuals seeking maximize their individualinterests. 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.

8.8 Institutional Approach: A Critical Appraisal

Criticisms of the institutional approach in comparative political' analysis emerged in the early part of the twentieth century and then again in the nineteen fifties. The main criticisms are (a) emphasis on speculation; (b) basically prescriptive and normative; (c) concerned only with irregularities and regularities without looking for relationships; (d) configurative and non-comparative focusing as it did on individual countries; (e) ethnocentric as it concentrated on western European 'democracies';

(f) descriptive as it focused on formal (constitutional and governmental) structure; (g) historical without being analytical.

Other criticisms of the institutional approach are: (a) 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) 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) its rejection of the role of informal groups and processes in shaping politics.

The approach has been criticized for the disregard of the informal aspects politics, such as, individual norms, social beliefs, cultural values, group' 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.

Since the nineteen sixties and seventies, the institutional approach resurfaced in a form which is called, the 'new institutionalism'. New institutionalism brough back the state and institutions into focus. It studied institutions in relation to macro structure, socio-culture super structure and individual political actor.

8.9 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. Institutionalists 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 of politics.

8.10 Summing Up

The institutional approach in its various forms has been an important constituent of comparative political analysis. The study of institutions of governance was at the core of political analysis be it the explorations of the ideal state of Plato's Republic or the typology of states proposed by Aristotle in his Politics. In its classical and early modern forms, the approach was more philosophical and, speculative, concerned with ideal typical states and prescribing the norms of ideal governance. With Montesquieu and his successors, the preoccupation of the approach with legal-constitutional frameworks or structures of democracies became entrenched. The belief in institutions of liberal constitutional democracies, however did not translate into a study of the manner in which the structures of governance functioned. More often than not, at least till the end of the nineteenth century, the intricacies of the legal-constitutional structures or the theoretical framework of governance, continued to seize the attention of political scientists and legal experts. So far, the approach could be said to have been characterized by a preoccupation with institutions and legal-formal institutions of government and normative values of liberal democracy. This approach was propagated also by colonial regimes to popularise European liberal values in the colonies. The works of the institutionalists were also extremely relevant to the elite's efforts in institution building in variosu countries. This is why in the newly independent countries institutionalism acquired some relevance.

8.11 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Analyse the basic elements of institutionalism?
2. Make a critical appraisal of institutionalism.

Short Questions

1. Discuss, in brief the importance of institutionalism as an approach to the study to comparative politics.
2. What are the main criticism against institutionalism?

Objective Questions

1. Who initiated comparative study of the governments?

2. Who studied 158 constitutions and parctices of Greek City states.

3. Mention the name of the Philosophers who emphasised on empirical study to make Institutional Approach more reliable?

8.12 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 Camphell, 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.

13. Mahoney, James and Thelen, Kathleen, 2009. Explaining Institutional Change.

14. Ambiguity, Agency, and Power Cambridge University Press.

15. Ostrom, Elinor (1990) Government the Commons New York: Cambridge.

16. Piersom, Paul. 2000. "Increasing Returns, Path Dependence, and the Study of Politics."

17. American Political Science Review vol. 94: 251-68.

Unit 9 ❑ New Institutionalism

Structure:

9.1 Objective

This unit attempts to deal with basic premises of Neo Institutionalism and its impact on the study of comparative politics.

After reading this unit, learners will be able to :

● Explain the meaning of Neo Institutionalism.

● Understand the basic core of Neo Institutionalism in the light of the two different school of thoughts.

● Know the limitations of the Neo Institutionalism Approach.

9.2 Introduction

By the 1970s and 1980s, scholars of comparative politics increasingly became concerned with the shortcomings of the behavioural approaches of the post World-War II era, namely the political systems and political culture approaches. This resulted in a resurgence of interest, in comparing politics of various countries through a study of their institutions. This group of scholars argued that institutions are not useless, rather they play important role in the society because institutions are not formed randomly but with the motive to serve a purpose, they are formed on the basis of idea and they try to impose their ideas on the members of the society and as a result they also decide the behaviour of the members of society. This approach is known as the Neo-Institutionalism. Neo Institutionalism gave new meaning and role to institutions in post Behavioural phase, bringing institutions into focus systhesised institutionalism to Behaviouralism and studied institutions in relation to Macro structure, Socio-cultural Superstructure and individual political actor.

Neo Institutionalism helps to understand politics by comparing Institutional eco systems and their impact on political behaviour, process and outcomes in different countries, regions and cultures. Instead of description or normative evaluation, the focus of neo institutionalism is more oriented towards explanation, analysis and explicit theory building. Within the discipline of Political Science, the neo institutional approach was brought to the focus by works of John Meyer, Brian Rown, Richard Scott, James G. March and Johan P Olsen. This institutional study, while retained som characteristics of the old Institutional approach, however, was different from it in several counts, which made it acceptable to a wider section of scholars.

9.3 Neo Institutionalism

After the World War II, a 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 rules of the book but through the direct observation of behaviour itself. Neo Institutional Approach is explicitly theoretical. Neo 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.

In political science there have been a number of reasons for the renewal of interest in institutions. 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, specially on the role of the state and involving substantial public sector reform.

Neo 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 range of arguments about how and why institutions matter. For example, scholars have argued that institutions can paly an important role in reducing transaction costs and various 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 transaction to help cope with such problems. In sociology, emphasis is put on the way in which institutional life establishes normative orientations, conventions and taken-for-granted practices that shape and influence behaviour, often in subtleways. And in political science, there has been renewed interest in how institutional arrangements shape the behaviour, power and preferences of actors in politics.

Neo institutionalism provides actors with opportunities as well as constraints. At bottom however, new institutions are important in providing actors with sets of behavioural incentives and disincentives, with sets of normative and ideational codes which shape not only behaviour but also preferences, and with resources, including power resources.

9.4 Old and Neo Institutionalism Approach : A Comparative Study

Although there are much in common between the Old and Neo Institutional Approach, yet we can broadly make the following differences between the two.

Old institutionalism is inductive in nature and thus requires a rational reasoning that includes inferences from general principles of "individual collective actions". Neo Institutionalism, whereas, aims at the "deductive reasoning" of individual & institutional behaviour based on logic, based on specific facts, to draw general onclusions.

Unlike the Old Institutional Approach, Neo 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.

Old Institutionalism is based on other human science methods such as law, history, sociology etc. for which it follows the "evolutionary approach" concerning about different types of formal institutions. By comparison, the neo institutionalism relies on neoclassical economic approach where various theories such as the theory of games and approaches to equilibrium and optimisation prevail.

The focus of Old institutional approach was on formal institutions like parliament, executive, judiciary etc. However, Neo Institutional Approach also takes into account the informal instiitutions like trade unions, pressure groups etc.

The primary focus of the old institutionalism is on the citizens' mutual actions as members of a distinct body. This ignores the individual approaches to behaviour, which originated in the middle to the 20th century in the old institutional approach, changes in individual actions are often not taken into account. Neo institutionalist approach, on the other hand, seeks to carry out specific consideration of the different

acts, choices and decisions as members of independent, democratic, economic and socio-cultural institutional mechanisms. Within the new institutionalism a person's behavioural individuality is accepted and openly debated.

The key role of institutions in old institutionalism is to mold people's interest based on socio-political and economic conditions. The neo institutionalism allows, for the rights, freedoms and conditions of members in various institutions to be broader. Conditions for discovery, knowledge and institutional boundary limitation are critical for institutional decision-makers.

We can also find old institutional approach more as static while neo institutional approach is more interested in analysing tghe dynamic process of institutional change.

Old institutional approach is considered and labeled as traditional approach to comparative study where as the neo institutional approach is much more inter-disciplinary and emphasises on economics, psychology, cultural anthropology, sociology and history.

9.5 Factors Responsible for the Emergence of the Neo Institutional Approach

Certain factors contributed to the emergence of the neo institutional approach in the later part of the twentieth century.

9.5.1 Contextual factors

With decolonization and emergence of newer states in erstwhile colonies, it appeared that the role of the state could be very crucial in shaping political behaviour in the third world, the state both in terms of the government and the coercive forces was seen as the prime locus of all kinds of development. Further, in the developed world too, the emergence of the welfare state changed the focus of academic studies. The emergence and working of centralized command economies in the communist world and some of the postcolonial countries offered a further push to take states seriously within the discipline of politics. The sweeping wave of democratization between the mid-1980s and mid-1990s also boosted the interest in institutions requirements of state and effective democracy brought in a number of new political

institutions, leading to further interest in studying them. The international politics of the time also contributed to this increasing interest in the institutions. The politics of cold war showed that states and institutions are important actors, and a study of politics cannot be complete without adequate focus on them.

9.5.2 Debates within the Discipline

Within the discipline of political science, the state has occupied an elusive space. While the study of politics began with a study of the state, a later generation of political scientists like Easton and Almond, perceived the state to be a too vague concept to be employed in attempts to understand real political operations of society. Due to this reason, they talked of replacing the concept of the state with that of the concept of political system. While the systems analysis talked of institutions as components of the political system, they focused more on the behaviour of various actors and the interaction between actors and institutions, to explain political phenomena. The historical developments however, made the political scientists rethink the place of the state and other political institutions in organizing political societies. A stand of thought that emerged in the late 1970s and 1980s talked of the state as an autonomous actor. Another strand of literature, which we can trace to writing of JP Nettl in 1968 and Abrams in 1977, and in more recent times, to that of Timothy Mitchell in the 1990s, argued that while the state may be an elusive concept that does not mean that it is any less an important concept. Instead, due to this very reason, we need to study the state very carefully, to understand how it influences and gets influenced by the various operations of society. Such a conceptual orientation towards the state has also led to increased interest in institutions as a key to understand political processes.

9.6 Neo Institutionalism and the Developing World

The neo institutionalism helps to understand and analyse the politics in the developing world. We have observed that how the international organizations 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 was 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.

Some scholars, like Sangmpan, are suspicious of the institutional analysis of politics in the developing world. He maintains that empirical evidence reveals that outcomes in developing countries consistently defy institutions as explanation and prescription Sangmpan wants to distinguish three aspects of the political system - politics, institution and the state. And he argues that in developing countries it is society rooted politics that influence and even determines the other two aspects of political system. He is of the opinion that an institutional approach marginalises such factors like competition for property, power, goods and services which actually determine the politics. However, Lisa Rakner and Vicky Randall believes that Sangmpan is deliberately ignoring one of the key features of new institutionalism, that is, it focuses on the informal institutions and its interactions with the formed institutions. In conclusion we can say that neo institutionalism offer insightful analysis of how some institutions function and guide political behaviour in the developing world while others do not. It could also help us answer questions like way and under what circumstances informal norms and practices dominate the practices of formal institutions.

Some of the ambiguities surrounding the institutionalism can be dispelled if we recognize that it does not constitute a unified body of thought. Instead, at least three different analytical approaches, have appeared over the past few years. We label these three schools of through: historical institutionalism, rational choice institutionalism, and sociological institutionalism. All of these approaches developed in reaction to the behaviourial perspectives that were influential during the 1960s and 1970s and all seek to elucidate the role that institutions play in the determination of social and political outcomes. However, they paint quite different pictures of the political world.

9.7 Three Major Models of Neo Institutionalism

9.7.1 Historical Institutionalism

Historical Institutionalism as an approach developed in response to the group theorists like pluralist on the one hand and the structural-functionalist theorist on the other. While it has borrowed not only from these two theories but also tries to go beyond them. 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. The set of institutions is capable of shaping the character and outcomes of group conflict. Analysts in this school began to explore how other social and political institutions of the sort associated with labour and capital, could structure interactions so as to generate distinctive national trajectories. Much of this work consist of cross-national comparisons of public policy, typically emphasizing the impact of national political institutions structuring relations among legislators, organize interests, the electorate and the judiciary. According to Hall and Taylor there are three distinctive characteristics of the historical institutionalism approach.

- Relatively broad conceptualization of the relation between institutions and individual.

  If institutions are so central, then in what ways do institutions affect the behaviour of the individuals? This question, according to the Hall and Taylor, is central to any institutional analysis. The Neo Institutionalists broadly provide two kinds of answers-coming from two difference approaches-the calculus approach and the cultural approach. Hall and Taylor differentiate between these two approaches-calculus and cultural, by looking at how they give slightly different answers to three kinds of questions. The first questions is about the behaviour of actors: how they behave? The second question is about institutions and their role. The third one asks the reason behind the persistence of institutions over time.

- Behaviour of Actors: how do they behave?

  According to the calculus approach, individual action are based on strategic calculations. Its assumptions are that individuals seek to maximize their

benefits by reasoning out all possible options, so select the one whice could confer maximum benefit.

However, according to the cultural approach, the behaviour of an actor is not completely strategic, but it is affected by an individual's world view. It does not deny that human behaviour is rational or goal oriented. So, according to the cultural approach Invididuals are not merely utility maximizes but also 'satisfiers'.

- Institutions and their role

  The calculus approach holds that institutions affect behaviour, through their role of providing information to actors. According to cultural approach in-stitutions provide moral or cognitive format for interpretations and actions. According to this approach, institutions affect the very identities, self images and preferred course of action for the individuals.

- Who do institutions persist over time

  According to the calculus - approach, institutions persist because people adhere to these institutions or laws, as any devidation from it will make them worse off.

However, according to the cultural approach institution persist, because people get used to institutions so much that they tend to take the institutions for granted and they do not scrutinize the institutions.

- Historical Institutionalists emphasise on the uneven distribution and operation of power, influenced by the operation and the development of institutions.

Historical Institutinalists are especially attentive to the fact that institutions, distribute power unevenly across various social groups rather than among freely contracting individuals. They argue that in the real world institutions give some groups substantially more access to the decision making process than others.

- (c) Hold a view of institutional development which is path dependent and is marked by unintended consequences.

This Historical Institutionalists reject the traditional understanding that the same cause leading to same result everywhere. Rather, they believe that effects of

specific causes would be mediated by the features of a given situatgion. Therefore, the outcome of the same course of action may very depending upon the path that was undertaken and also it may lead to many unintended consequences depending upon the socio-economic conditions of the given situation.

9.7.2 Rational Choice Institutionalism

Rational Choice Institutionalism first developed as part of the behavioural revolution in American political science of the 1950s and 1960s which sought to investigate how individuals behaved, using empirical methods. Rational choice institutionalism (RCI) emerged from the study on the congress in the United States. It sought to explain the unusual stability associated with congressional outcomes. The basic tenet of rational choice institutionalism is that institutions are arrangements of rules and incentives, and that the members of the institutions behave in response to those basic components of institutional structures. The goal of rational choice institutionalism is to uncover the laws of political behaviour and action Scholars in Rational Choice Institutionalism generally believe that once these laws are discovered. models can be constructed that will help social scientists understand and predict political behavior. Rational Choice Institutionalism drew very useful analytical tools from the 'new economics of organization' which emphasizes the primacy of property rights, rent-seeking and transaction cost to the operation and development of institutions. In recent years. Rational Choice Institutionalism have tumed their attention to a variety of other phenomena, including, cross- national coalition behavior, the development of political institutions the intensity of ethnic conflict. It relies extensively on a set of behavioral assumptions. Individuals behave in highly instrumental manner: Rational Choice Institutionalists tend to see politics as a series of collective action dilemma. It emphasizes the role of strategic interaction in the determination of political outcomes. It explains how institutions originate and persist over time. The process of institutional creation therefore revolves around voluntary agreement by relevant actors in a situation where the institution is subject to competitive selection, it survives primarily because the benefits provided to the relevant actors are far more than alternative institutional forms. Rational Choice Institutionalism contain four notable characteristics which are described below.

First, Rational-choice institutionalism employs a characteristic set of behavioural assumptions such as, that actors have a fixed set of preferences or tasks. It believes that these actors behave entirely so as to maximize the attainment of those preferences and they do so in a highly strategic manner with extensive calculations.

Second, Rational-choice institutional ism views politics as a series of collective action dilemmas; It is an instance where rational self-interested individuals, while acting to maximize their preferences, likely produce an outcome that is collectively sub-optical. Presence of such institutions can thus solve the problems.

Third, The contribution of the Rational-choice institutional ism is to show the role that strategic interaction has in determining political outcomes. The major arguments are i) an actor's behaviour is likely to be guided by strategic calculus, and ii) this calculus is deeply influenced by the actor's expectations about how others are likely to behave.

Fourth, Rational-choice institutionalists explain the origin of the institutions in a distinctive way. They explain the existence of the institution by reference to the value the functions of the institutions have, for the affected actors. They assume that actors create the institution because of the value of the functions performed by the institution. Thus, process of institutional creation is based on the voluntary agreement by relevant actors. But Rational Choice Institutionalism is suffering from some weaknesses. if uncertainty is involved, then more assumptions have to be made in addition to rational preferences. Rationality can also mean that the decision maker always chooses the most preferred op~ion, which is often not true in the real world. To simplify calculation and make prediction, some rather unrealistic assumptions are made about the world. However, Rational choice approaches combine a. "scientific" emphasis on rigorous analytical models with a strong theoretical focus on human values. It provides a unified framework of explanation across different fields of the social sciences.

9.7.3 Sociological Institutionalism

Sociological institutionalism is part of the larger group of new institutionalisms though it has grown independently of the other two models namely Historical institutionalism and rational choice institutionalisrn sociological institutionalism

developed in the field of sociology within the subfield of organization theory. Fundamental concept of sociological institutionalism is that institutions matter in social processes some sociologists began to challenge a dichotomy traditionally drawn between the two parts of the social world. First, the formal-meansend rationality of the modem forms of organisation and bureaucracy. Second, the practices associated with 'culture' which is displayed in other parts of the social world.

Traditionally, within sociology, the bureaucratic structures were seen as the most rational and efficient, and the apparent similarity in form of diverse organisations is said to be resulted by this need to be rational-efficient in functioning. The new institutionalists in sociology opposed such a view. It is argued that, many of the forms and procedures used by modern organisations cannot be explained by logics of rationality and efficiency, and that they are adopted because they are culturally specific practices. Thus, they argue that even the most formal bureaucratic practices require to be examined for a culturalexplanation. In other words sociological institutionalists emphasize how the functions and structures of organizations do not necessarily serve functional purposes, but rather ceremonies and rituals. The sociological institutionalist contradicts rationalist and instrumental perspectives on actors and agency. The latter sees actors as rational, knowledgeable and with clear purpose, whereas the former highlight how actors behavior reflects habits, superstition, and sentiments. The former sees culture as an irrational residual factor in explaining behavior, whereas the latter sees culture as essential in explaining behavior.

Sociological institutional ism contains three features in the context of the other new institutionalisms.

First, Sociological institutionalists tend to defme institutions much more broadly than political scientists do to include not just formal rules, procedures or norms but the symbol systems, cognitive scripts and moral templates that provides the frames of meaning guiding human action.

a) It defines institutions very broadly, anything that provides 'frames of meaning' guiding human action is considered as institution. It breaks down the conceptual divide between 'institutions' and 'cultures. Thus, it challenges the distinction that many political scientists draw between 'institutional explanations' based

on organisational structures and cultural explanations based on understanding of culture and shared attitudes or values.

b) Sociological institutionalists emphasize on cultural approach in respect of relations between institutions and individual actions. They argue that a "logic of appropriateness" guides the behavior of actors within an institution. It predicts that the norms and formal rules of institutions will shape the actions of those acting within them. This indicates that the behaviour of the institutional actor is influenced by shaping what one can imagine oneself doing in a given context logic of appropriateness means that actions are "matched to situations by means of rules organized into identities."Thus normative institutional ism views that much of the behavior of institutional actors is based on the recognized situation. What institutional actors will think rational or goal oriented action itself are socially and culturally constructed.

c) The sociological institutionalists argue that organisation often adopt new institutional practices, not because such practices are more efficient in terms of leading to desired ends, but because such new practice enhances the acceptance or legitimacy of the organisations or its participants in the eyes of the public. Such attempts at adopting practices that are valued in the society rather than the ones which are efficient, may in some cases, actually lead to negative effects in terms of achieving the organisation's formal goals.

9.8 Conclusion

Institutionalisrn almost became obsolete during 1950s as an approach to the study of political science specially to comparative politics due to emergence of behavioural movement. Neo Institutional ism has brougb back the inportance to institutions into focus. It has included both formal/hard and informal/soft institutions and emphasised much more focus on true comparative study. It has advocated middle range theory linking individual to structures. Its multiple strands denoted its wide range, comprehensiveness and applicability. Neo Institutionalism focuses on 'critical junctures' as moments of Institutional change. Neo Institutionalism has been considered as the most enduring approach to understand politics.

Political science to-day is confronted with not one but three 'neo institutionalism' namely Historical Institutionalism, Rational Choice Institutionalism and Sociological Institutionalism. Thus, the challenge is not to figure out which of these is most appropriate model in the studies of politics, but to find out the common ground between the two. One of the major challenges that are levelled against the new institutionalism approach to the politics is that it tends to overemphasize the role of institutions, formal or informal, and give lesser importance to the conflicts and interests that are in many ways the basis of politics in many societies. It is alleged that neo institutionalism is unable to provide universal explanatory theories. Further empirical analysis as is not easy particularly in its cultural and structural stands. However. neo institutionalism and its three models taken together can provide insights into the functioning of politics in any societies. Neo Institutionalism has added significance to human behaviour in all institutions.

9.9 Summing Up

Thus, it can be summed up that Neo institutional ism is the study of institutions (a) by combining the study of theoretical-legal-constitutional framework with facts about their functioning and, (b) giving the study a comparative flavour by including into their works the study of institutions in other countries. Thus, the approach, by the first quarter of the twentieth century, could be said to have acquired a limited comparative character and rigour by-combining in its analysis theory and practice of institutions. In the nineteen fifties, however, the approach came under attack from 'system builders' like Easton and Macridis. These theorists preferred on their own part to build 'holist' or 'global' 'models' or 'systems" which could explain the functioning of institutions in countries all over the world.

9.10 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the meaning and importance of Neo Institutionalisrn?
2. Make an evaluation of the Neo Institutional Approach?

Short Questions

1. Briefly discuss the importance of the Neo Institutional Approach.

2. Write a short note on the three models of Neo Institutional Approach.

Objective Questions

3. Mention the names of three exponents of Neo Institutional Approach.

4. What are the three models of Neo Institutionalism Approach?

5. How many characteristics contain Rational Choice Institutionalism?

9.11 Further Reading

1. Adarns, Julia. 1996. "Principals and Agents, Colonialists and Company Men: The Decay of Colonial Control in the Dutch East Indies." Americal Sociological Review 61: 12-28.

2. Alexander, Jeffrey C., Bernhard Giessen, Richard M'unch, and Neil J. Smelser, eds. 1987.

3. Micro-Macro Link. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

4. Bates, Robert H. 1989. Beyond the Miracle of the Market: The Political Economy of Agrarian Development in Rural Kenya. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

5. Becker, Gary. 1976. The Economic Approach to Human Behaviour. Chicago, Ill: University of Chicago Press.

6. Boudon, Raymond. 1987. "The Individualistic Tradition in Sociology." In The Micro- Macro Link edited by Jeffrey Alexander, Bernard Giesen, Richard M'unch, and Neil Smelser. Berkeley, Calif.

7. University of California Press.

8. Brinton, Mary. 1992. Women and the Economic Miracle: Gender and Work in Postwar Japan. Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press.

9. CampbeU, John L. and Leon N. Lindberg. 1990. "Property Rights and the Organizatiori of Economic Acti vity by the State." American Sociological Review 55: 634-47.

10. Coase, Ronald. 1937. "The Nature of the Film." Economica 4: 386-405. 1960. "The Problem of Social Cost." Journal of Law and Economics 3: 1-44.

11. 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.

12. Collins, Randall. 1980. "Weber's Last Theory of Capitalism: A Systematization." American Sociological Review 45: 925-42.

13. Cook, Karen S., Richard M. Emerson, Mary R. Gillmore, and Toshio Yamagishi. 1983.

Unit 10 ❑ Contemporary Approach: Post Modern and Feminist

Structure:

10.1   Objective

10.2   Introduction

10.3   Definition of Post Modernism

10.4   Post Modern Political Theory: Basic Features

10.5   Criticism

10.6   Definition of Feminism

     5.6.1   History of Feminist Movement

10.7   Basic Features of Feminist Approach

10.8   Basic Concepts of Feminism

     10.8.1   Sustainability

     10.8.2   Cultural Competence

     10.8.3   Balance and Reciprocity

10.9   Types of Feminist Approach

     10.9.1   Socialist Feminism

     10.9.2   Liberal Feminism

     10.9.3   Radical Feminism

     10.9.4   Black Feminism

10.10 Conclusion

10.11 Summing up

10.12 Probable Questions

10.13 Further Reading

10.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

● Explain the meaning 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.

10.2 Introduction

Post modernium is a philosophical movement evoled in reaction to modernism, the tendency in contemprorary culcure to accept only objective truth, It emphasizes the role of language, power relations, and mativations in the formation of ideas and beliefs. It claims that there *is* no absolute truth and that the way people percieve the word is subjective. For the post modernist, reality is what is constructed. There are only interpretations, no sameness, but all differences.

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

The pioneers of Postmodernism is the French intellectual Jean-Franois Lyotard (1924-1998). Jacques Derrida also is one of the most important philosopher of Postrnodernism Michel Foucault put emphasis 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.

10.3 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 in sofar 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 postmodemist considers metanarratives to be the product of totalitarian intentions and dismiss them as involving the fallacy of essentialism. As opposed to the grand narratives, Postmoder 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; •i•ek. The Reality of the Virtual). Further Postmcidemism 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 iniertextuality 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 ret1ected in how postrnodernism, 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)

10.4 Post Modern Political Theory: Basic Features

The basic features of postrnodernism as an approach to the study of Politics are:

1. There always exists in the political world something 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. Thin reminds us of the capacity for resistance, ever a moment of indepence 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 modem 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 metaphysic, Plato's division between the true world of the forms and the deceptive world of sensuous apperance. Augustine's city of God and city of Man, Kant's noumenal and phenomenal realms and Hegel's implicit idea as it unfolds in history etc. are examples of metanarratives in political theory.

3. Postmodem 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 politics.

4. Postmodem 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 master agent behind it Humanity has good, though inadequate resources for intervening in life and inflecting the direction of becoming. Becoming can be facilitated, shifted or resisted, but not commanded or ordered completely. Postmodem political theory tends to conceive the relationship between 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 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. One of the negative effects of social rationalization and scientific categorization is the marginalization and denigration 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 of presidents and Parliaments and they are often not aimed directly at elections or legislative agendas. Rather the key agencies of micro politics are television shows, films, military training professional meeting, clubs, neighborhood gangs and internet 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, intensify or discipline the emotions, aesthetic impulses, moral urges and different moods that enter into political programmes 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 operates, 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 light onto body. Foucault in his 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 Postmodem theorists the metanarrative of a lost golden age of social coherence and unquestioned morality is inappropriate even as a regulative ideal. In the contemporary world multicultural societies are the norms, where technological developments increase the speed with which social transformation occurs. People with diverse culture coexist 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.

10.5 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 said 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 modem 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 postmodcrnism is an innovative body of theoretical work that came of age in the last several decades.

10.6 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 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 onhehalf of women's rights and interests. The Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary defines feminism as "a belief that women should be allowed the samerights, 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, inopposition to patriarchy and sexism. In brief, it can be said that frminism is a belief in the equality of sexes.

10.6.1 History of Feminist Movement

While it is very difficult to find out the precise meaning of the word one cannot helpbut agree with Rebecca West, the famous writer whom wrote in 1913, "I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiage 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 tradeunionists 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 inunense 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.

10.7 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:

- Concern with power relations, whether these are gendered, physical, racial, class-based, or cultural. etc.

- Openness to question seemingly natural objects, such as the self, the family, the existing modes of political discussion and debate. Feminist political theorist illuminate and question the power relations embedded in these seemingly natural institutions.

- Critique of the history of political philosophy and its norms and theories.

- Critique of the history of feminist political theory and its norms and theories. Critique of 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.

● 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.

● 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.

● 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.

10.8 Basic Concepts 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. Ferminism 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 associated with feminist approach are Sustainability, Cultural Competence, Balance and Reciprocity.

5.8.1 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.

5.8.2 Cultural Competence

Ferminism 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.

5.8.3 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.

10.9 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 approaches are :

5.9.1 Socialist Feminism

Socialist feminists begin with a class analysis and argue that the fundamental force of musculine domination is economic. There areas 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.

10.9.2 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. Lberal feminists use figures and concepts from the liberal tradition to develop feminist institutions and 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.

10.9.3 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 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.

10.9.4 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 need 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, Andre 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, philosophy, based in African American women's experience, womanist theory tells a different history of women's struggles for emancipation.

10.10 Conclusion

Like all approaches to political theory postmodernism has developed a distinctive vocabulary. It has refused to translate its insight directly into an idiom copatible with the traditional cognative machinery of political thought. If there is a vision of politics common to postmodern theories it is of a political realm that renegotiates 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 feminst perspectives, its emphasis on historicized and conceptualized analysis, its focus on real world inequalities, it's dialogue with black and post colonial critiques, its moral critique of universalistic models of democratic representation, justice and redistribution, feminst political theory has much to offer to political theory as a whole.

10.11 Summing Up

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

The feminst approach is reflective of larger transformations in the perceptions and constructions of social reality. The feminist approach has contributed to the in clusion of new thernes and concepts. It is inclusive in the sense of focusing on more diverse experiences and perspectives of women of different races, ages, colours, cultures and histories. This trend has meant useful analysis of gender relations.

10.12 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the basic features of the post modern approach?

2. Examine the importance of feminism as an approach to the study of comparative politics.

Short Questions

1. Briefly discuss the effect of post modernism?

2. What is meant by metanarrative?

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. Mention the names of different feminist approaches.

10.13 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. Ramazano∂u. 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.ctin.

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 - 3

Unit 11 ❑ Historical Context of Emergence of Party System

Structure:

11.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

- Discuss the Origin and development of the party 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.

141

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 establishments 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 in to 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 relationship, 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, 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 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 unite 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 organise 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 or 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 indispensible. 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 to 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, they 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 agree." 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, 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 Party

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

- 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.

- Every political party has a specific program. The parties operate in a systematic and constitutional manner to make this program a reality.

- 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.

- 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.

- Political parties compete against each other for the same thing, and that is gaining the power.

- 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 reasons, 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 imaging 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

- The term party has since come to be applied to all organized groups seeking political power, whether by democratic elections or by revolution.

- However, political parties in the modern sense were formed in England in the seventeenth century.

- The role of political parties is essential to conduct modern political activities and the originality and significance of this role is universally acknowledged.

- The broad basis of a political party is personal or group interests, usually group interests.

- 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.

- 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

1. Discuss the major functions of the Political Parties.
2. Define Political Party and indicate its basic characteristics.

Short Questions

1. In what way Political Parties promote democracy?
2. Account for the decline of Political Parties in the west.

Objective Questions

1. What is the defining characteristics of the Political Party?
2. What is the reason for the feeling of powerlessness on the part of the party members?
3. Who wrote the book 'Political Parties, the Organization and Activity in the Modern State'?

11.10 Further Reading

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 and UK

Structure:

12.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the 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 performs but also because the complex interrelationships between and among parties are crucial in structuring the way. Political system work in practice. The network

150

of relationships is called party system. It is said that in an age of volatile voting pattern party systems are lossing their systematic character. As a result it becomes difficult to distinguish one system from another.

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 loosing their systemic character. As a result it becomes difficult to distinguish one system form another.

Giovanni Sartiori'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 competion and particularly when it alters the direction of the competion." 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 party system is by reference to number of parties competing for power. Using this criteria Maurica Duveger 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) evern multiparty systems. This approach "assumes that the behavior of a lparty 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 high lighting 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 deal with question related to the appropriate definition of party and party systems, factors determining a parties' inclusion in the count, criteria for a parties' relevance or credibility, and the roles of behavior, competition and party unity. These issues often lead to very distinct typologies of party system.

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, 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, have 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 By-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, in America, 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 bi-party system.

- **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 the 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.

- **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."

- **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."

- **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."

- **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.

- 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.

- **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'.

- **Vested interests:** Vested interests are created in a two-party system. The ruling party protects 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.

- **Party intolerance arises:** In a bi-party system of governance, the ruling party, supported by the majority, considers all its decisions as infalliable 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 and UK

A comparison may be made between the two-party system as it is found in the United States and 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's 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, not 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 which 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" 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 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 that 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 seg-

ment 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 or by the concentration of power in the hands of the party's elected and publicly accountable members oligarchic tendencies may be an inevitable consequence 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 effectively 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

1. Discuss the nature of bi-party system in UK.
2. Make a comparative study of the party system in UK and USA.

Short Questions

1. How would you classify party system.
2. What are the major arguments against bi-party system?

Objective Questions

1. What is meant by bipartisanship?
2. Why is U.S. two party system called pseudo two party system?
3. Which countries have 'multi-party' system?

12.13 Further Reading

1. Armingeon, K., Wenger, V., Wiedemeier, F., Isler, C., Knöpfel, L., Weisstanner, D. and 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.CrossRefGoogle Scholar

3. Baumgartner, F. R. & Jones, B. D. (1993). Agendas and instability in American politics. Chicogo: 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

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

- Explain the Uni-party system in China

- Discuss the organizational structure of Communist party in China

- Explain the role of Communist party in China

13.2 Introduction

In a one party system a single party enjoys a monopoly of power through the exclusion of all other parties. Monopolistic parties effectively function as permanent government with no mechanism 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 fused 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 conform. What the

164

party speaks is truth and everything else is faisehood. Such a situation spells a grave danger for 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 different 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 anticolonial nationalism and state consolidation in the developing world. In Ghana, Tanzania and Zimbawe, for example the ruling party proclaimed the overriding need for nation-building and economic development; one party system in these countries have useually built 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 leader-ship 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 country level are elected by voters. These country 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 municipali-ties) 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) contin-ues 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 gov-erning 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 Chongquing, 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 bur some-times 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 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 re-habilitated 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. Af-ter 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 secretaryy (the post of chairman was abolished in 1982) by another Deng protégé, Zhao Zi-yang, 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 po-litical 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.

● **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 member-ship 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 pro-bation 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 member-ship 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 faith-fulness 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.

● **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 Organ-isations 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.

● **Party Congress at the Country Level**

All the PPOs of a country, or autonomous country 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 country.

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.

● **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 the 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.

● **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.

● **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.

● **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.

● **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**

■ 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 wholehearted 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 Dictotorship 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.

■ 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.

● **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

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

In 1953, a committee headed by Mao Tse-Tune 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 Community Party.

- **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.

- **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.

- **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 arid 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-Leninsm and Mao Tse-Tungs thought, also talked of 'upholding truth, correcting error and overcoming numerous difficulties and hardship'.

The Constitution secured a separation between the Communist Party and the government and did not make any mention of or gave any constitutional recognition tot he 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 decision. 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 the 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 diametri cally 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 the choice it gives to the electrorate. By eliminating all other competitors, a one party system deprives the electrorate of their right to free choice and in the process lead to the negation of freedom and democracy.

13.7 Summing up

- In a one-party system, patronage is shown towards a specific goal, ideology and doctrine.

- The politics of the People's Republic of China take place in a framework of a single-party socialist republic.

- In all governmental institutions in the PRC, the party committees at all levels maintain an important role.

13.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. Discuss the role of the community party of China.

2. Examine the organisational structure of the communist partys of China.

Short Questions

1. Do you think that single party system is antithetical to democracy?

2. Discuss in brief the role of the Communist Party in the Post-Mao era.

Objective Questions

1. What is Politburo?

2. What is meant by democratic centralism?

3. What is the full form of C.P.C ?

13.9 Further Reading

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 June 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 No, 2014.

Unit 14 ❑ Multi-party System: France

Structure:

14.1 Objective

After studying this unit, the learners will be able to:

- Understand the multi-party system
- Discuss the reasons for the emergence 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. If 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 Reasons 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 nature 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 République 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. This situation was clearer on the left: since the Tours split in 1920, there had existed two well-organised rival parties, the Section Française de I'Internationale Ouvriçre (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 severn 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 Emanuel Macron was liberal in La Republique 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.

14.5 Nature and Characteristics of Frenchh 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 stand 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-

(i) 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 white it is a battle for the French."

(ii) **Constitutional Recognition of the Role of the Parties:**

Unlike the American Constitution which is totally silent abut 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.'

(iii) **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.

(iv) **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.

(v) **Political Defections and Frequent Changes:**

In another way, the French Party-System is like the Indian party system. In France 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."

(vi) **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.

(vii) **Organisational Diversity:**

The organisation and policies of different political parties exhibit great diversities. The parties cover a very large range extending from commission 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. They formulate 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.

(viii) 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 Part 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:

● **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 demo-

cratic 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 favours 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 Arrondisements.

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.

● **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.

● **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.

● **The Conservatives (The RGR):**

This party consists of a number of political groups. At the time of 1946 elections, the Independents, the Peasant, 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.

● **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.

- **The Union of New Republic (The U.N.R.) and the Rally for the Re-public 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 Gauilism 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 conservativism. 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 continu-ous and rapid flux, involving alignments, realignments and counter alignments. They 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.

14.6 Conclusion

The positive aspect of multi party systems is that they create internal checks and balance within government and exhibit a bias in favour of debate, conciliation and

compromise. It ensures broad responsiveness taking into account 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 fractured and unstable, paying, greater attention to squabbles among coalition pertners than to the task of governance. Another problem is that coalition politics is characterised by a search for common ground rather than by the politics of principle. The parties are encouraged to abandon principles in their quest for power.

14.7 Summing up

- If there are more than two organized parties in the political field of the country, it is called multi-party system.

- One of the most important of these is the recognition of the existence of multiple political parties in a liberal democracy.

- The influential French political parties are also characterized by a remarkable degree of inter-party factions, each of which effectively forms alliances within itself.

- French Party-System is similar to the Indian party system.

14.8 Probable Questions

Essay Type Questions

1. What are the reason for the emergence of multi-party system in liberal democratic system?

2. Write an essay on the merits and demerits of multi-party system.

Short Questions

1. Discuss in brief, the ideology and programme of the French Socialist party.

2. What are the basic characteristics of the French party system?

Objective Questions

1. What is meant by multi-party system?

2. What is the primary defect of the multi party system?

3. Mention the name of at least three political parties of Finance.

14.10 Further Reading

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. CrossRefGoogle Scholar

Unit 15 ❑ Party System in Post-Communist Society

Structure:

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 growth of stable party system.
- Nature of the party system in the post-communist sociaties.

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 are reasons 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 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 articulating 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 problems. The transition from central planning to laissez-faire capitalism unleashed deep insecurity because of the growth of unemployment and inflation and it significantly increased social inequality. 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 Europes

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 mass 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, Bulgarian Socialist Party, Polish Peasant-Party, Albanian Socialist party, Czech Communist Part.

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,a nd 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 reelected 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 over all picture is one of institutional stability. Poland, however made substantial changes in the distribution of power from the 1992 constitutions to the final 1997 constitution. In contrast several Balkan countries changed formal distribution 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 system. 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.

15.5 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. On the contrary, federalization probably helped to institutionalize national conflicts. Ethnic, religion and regional cleavages survived the communist regimes, and socioeconomic conflicts between the gainer and losers of the economic transition surfaced. Second, in every country, some parties and movements had a head start. Former regime parties profited from experienced elites, large memberships, newspaper, 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 pension 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 and 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 every win representation is the Slovak Communist Party, a party formed by former hardliners in 1991.

In so for as former regime parties reformed and adopted a social democratic platforms, they won easy victory over historical social democratic parties. 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 of European socilists or the Socialist International and can be regarded as Social Democratic parties. Less successful were the excommunists 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 liberalism or conservatism. 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 50 percent in the 2007 election.

The strongest liberal party is the Balkans is the Bulgarian National Movement for Stability and Progress. Other fairly successful Parties are the Party Alliance and 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's fronts disintegrated into various ideological factions. Of the central European countries only Hungary has national conservative parties.

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 the national minorities. Agrarian parties depend on sizable peasant population. Most of these parties originated 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 semitic, anti Roman and anti minority. Ethnic minority parties have the most stable electoral base in countries with sizeable 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 develop-ment. 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 marked by a plurality of com-peting 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 base to the new political parties was per-haps the single most important factor inhibiting the development of party politics. New parties in Russia suffered two-fold estrangement: from the social and politi-cal 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 unstable democratic politics. The weakness of the state did not necessarily mean the strength of society but indicated a general crisis of political institutions and civil associations in post-Communist Russia.

The increasingly regional character of Russian politics Suggested that conditions were lacking for the development of a mass 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 to encompass the national, regional, ethnic, class, group, elite and other in society. The sheer size 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 context where traditional social institutions and groups try to preserve

their position while challenged by new social actors. A vicious circle emerge in which parties developed but were weak because of the post totalitarian condition of Russia, while society could not be democratically integrated into the state without powerful parties.

The party political system remains the weakest link in the new state. There are no more than a handful of serious parties apart front the 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 its essential characteristic.

The travails of Party development in Russia are part of the apparent general crisis of parties in Europeans 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 an artificial environment sustaining continuities 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 as 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 a functioning 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 thus 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 turn out, 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 conhesion, 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

1. Examine the process of development of the party system in central and East European States.
2. Analyse the factors inhibiting the growth of stable party system in Russia.

Short Questions

1. Indicate the salient features of the party system in central and East European states.
2. Discuss, in brief, the nature of party system in Russia.

Objective Questions

1. Which factor obstructed the development of civic culture in the post-communist societies?
2. What is the reason for the fragmented party system in some of the countries of central and Eastern Europe.
3. Mention the name of at least one party of Balkan States?

15.10 Further Reading

1. Axtmann, Roland (ed); Balancing Democracy Continuum, London, 2001

2. Heywood, Andrew, Politics, Palgrave, 2003

3. Webb, Paul and White Stephen (ed.); party Polities in New Democracies, Oxford University Press New York, 2007

4. Meleshevich, A. Andrey, Party System in Post-Soviet Countries, New York, Palgrave Macmillan, 2007

5. March, Luke, The Communist Party in Post-Soviet Russia, Manchester University Press, New York, 2002