STUDY MATERIAL

COMPARATIVE POLITICAL SYSTEMS

For

MA POLITICAL SCIENCE

PAPER - V

II YEAR

(2013 ADMISSION ONWARDS)

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

Calicut University, P.O. Malappuram, Kerala, India-673 635

495 A

UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT

SCHOOL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION

STUDY MATERIAL

M.A.POLITICAL SCIENCE

PAPER – V

Comparative Political Systems

II YEAR

Prepared by:

1. Dr. G. Sadanandan
    Associate Professor and Head
    P.G Department of Political science
    Sree Kerala Varma College, Thrissur.

2. Vinukumar N.V

3. Salin C Simon
    P.G Department of Political science
    Sree Kerala Varma College, Thrissur.

scrutinized by:

   Dr.G.Sadanandan
   Associate Professor and Head
   P.G Department of Political science
   Sree Kerala Varma college, Thrissur.

Paper V: Comparative Political Systems

(The course will he discussed with reference to U.K., U.S.A., France, Russia, China and India)

Layout & Settings: Computer Section, SDE

CONTENTS

CONTENTS	PAGES
MODULE - I	05-20
MODUL - II	21-35
MODULE - III	36-52
MODULE - IV	53-66
MODULE - V	67-81
MODULE - VI	82-98
MODULE - VII	99-114

Module-I

Nature, Evolution and Scope of Comparative Politics.
Political System - Meaning and Nature, Political Modernization, Political Change.

Module- II.

Theories of Comparative Politics:
System Theories, Cultural Theories, Class Theories, Development Theories

Module- III.

Federalism and Constitutionalism.

Module-IV

A Survey on Rule Making, Rule Application and Rule Adjudication Functions.

Module-V

Interest Aggregation and Party Systems - Comparative Analysis.

Module –VI

Interest Articulation and Interest Groups: A Comparative Analysis of Pressure groups.

Module – VII

Bureaucracy (INDIA, USA, UK, CHINA AND FRANCE) - A Comparative Analysis

Module-I

Meaning, Nature and Scope of Comparative politics

'Comparison' is man's instinctive tendency which impels him to appraise his own conduct *vis-a-vis* those of others. He is ever keen to know how people around him live, behave and act. The study of Comparative Politics is at the heart of contemporary Political Science. Comparative Politics has, therefore become a field of growing importance in all the countries. More recently, modern Social Science has increased our power to observe and compare systematically empirical world of facts around us and to subject many of these facts and processes to qualitive measurement and logical and mathematical analysis. At the same time, the behavioural Sciences have given us a good deal of new and partly verified information as to how people think, feel, perceive and act individually and in a group. Before we attempt to define 'Comparative' Politics we should first define the term 'Comparative and then Politics.'

By Comparison, one can see patterns of activity, taken by different regimes, analyse differing ideologies and processes and decision – making and examine propositions about both importance of certain characteristics under study and the relationship between classes of data. Comparison allows systematic empirical testing of generalization used to order diverse data. By comparison one may observe patterns, similarities and differences.

The story of the world 'Politics' began the 'Polis' the City – state community of ancient Greece. Plato, Aristotle and many of their contemporaries regarded Politics as the affairs of the Polis. Politics is, therefore, only one of the several social activities of man. The essence of it said to lie in fundamental freedom of man in society to master his own fate by political means. Politics is, thus, "the process through which man orders the society in which he lives according to his political ideas about the ends of man."

The study of politics is concerned with the description and analysis of the manner in which power is obtained, exercised and controlled, the purpose of which it is used, the manner in which decision are made and the context in which those decisions take place. Politics also means striving to share power or striving to influence the distribution of power, either among states or among groups within a state. We may conclude by saying that politics deals with power, rule or authority.

Meaning of Comparative Politics

Comparative Politics is concerned with behaviour, institutions, processes, ideas and values present in more than one country. It searches for those regularities and patterns, those similarities and differences between more than one nation state that help clarify the basic nature, working and belief of regimes. Comparative Politics studies a broader range of Political activity, including governments and their institution as well as other forms of organization not directly related to national government; for example ,tribes, communities, associations, Unions etc. Comparative Politics, like Political

science, relates both to Theory and Methods. "Theory refers to sets of systematically related generalizations and Method is a procedure or process that involves the techniques and tools utilized in inquiring and for examining, teaching, testing and evaluating theory". Comparative Politics is also concerned with the norms, basic beliefs and values underlying political activity. The field of Comparative Politics involves the systematic and comparative study of nations and their political systems.

In practice the comparative politics do the first, to compare means that similarities and differences are described. Comparative politics describes the real world and, building on these descriptions, establishes classifications and typologies. For example, we classify different types of electoral systems. Similarities and differences are explained. Why did social revolutions take place in France and Russia but not in Germany and Japan? Why is there no socialist party in the US whereas they exist in all other Western democracies? Why is electoral turnout in the US and Switzerland so much lower than in any other democracy? As in all scientific disciplines, we formulate hypotheses trying to explain these differences (to control variation) and use empirical data to test them to check whether or not hypothesis hold true in reality. It is through this method that causality can be inferred, generalizations produced, and theories developed and improved. For example, is it empirically true that proportional representation (PR) tend to produce more fragmented party systems.

Growth of Comparative Politics

The study of comparative politics became highly significant in the 1950s when a good number of leading American political scientists sought to 'transform the field of politics' by taking the study of this subject from foreign to comparative political phenomenon and 'from the study of the governments to the study of the political systems'. However, the historical development of this subject may be roughly put into three phases unsophisticated, sophisticated, and increasingly sophisticated.

The contributions made to the study of politics by great figures like Aristotle, Machiavelli, de Tocqueville, Bryce, Ostrogorski and Weber belong to the first phase who simply utilized the comparative method for the primary purpose of better understanding the working of the political organizations. These writers employed, what was called, the comparative method that "aimed through the study of existing politics or those which had existed in the past to assemble a definite body of material from which the investigator by selection, comparison, and elimination may discover the ideal types and progressive forces of political history".

The contributions of some important recent writers like Samuel H.Beer, M. Hass, Bernard Ulam and Roy C. Macridis may be included in the second phase who made use of the comparative method with a good amount of self consciousness and also with a deliberate mood to present a more useful study of different political institutions. They are concerned with the various strategies of comparison area studies, conngurative approach, institutional and functional comparisons, a problem-based orientation

and with various methodological problems conceptualization, the establishment of agreed categories for comparison, validity as a problem, cross-cultural difficulties and the availability of data.

The contributions of David Easton, Gabriel A. Almond, James C. Coleman, Karl Deutsch, G.B. Powell, Harold Lasswell, Robert A. Dahl, Edward Shils, Harry Eckstein, David Apter, Lucian W. Pye, Sidney, Verba Myron Weiner and a host of others may be included in the final phase. The writers belonging to this phase have made use of inter-related set of concepts for the sake of presenting their contribution on the basis of comparative analysis, though they have provided a specialized vocabulary in the their own says. As Roberts says: "If Easton talks of inputs, outputs, demands, gatekeepers, supports and stresses, environment, feedback, values, critical ranges and political authorities; Almond offers a set of input and output functions; Deutsch borrows a cybernetic language which applies to political systems the concept of feedback of various types- autonomy, memory, load, lag, lead and gain, receptors, communication, selective screening of information and so on. Almond's aim of 'universality' sums up the purpose for the choice of such languages – they are sufficiently general to be applicable to any political unit, regardless of size, period, degree of development or other factors".

NATURE AND SCOPE OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

In the field of comparative politics, the term 'politics' the term has three connotations – political activity, political process and political power political activity consists of the efforts by which conditions of conflicts are created and resolved in a way pertaining to the interests of the people as far as possible, who play their part in the 'struggle for power'. The reduction of tensions or the resolution of conflicts naturally takes place through the operation of permanent mechanisms of tension reduction as well as, from time to time, by the introduction of further 'reserve' mechanisms designed to reduce the amount of tensions and conflicts in emergencies. If politics means the authoritative allocation of 'values', some measure of conflict is bound to arise between 'values' as desired by the people and 'values' as held by the men in power. Thus arise conflicts that demand their solution and what leads to efforts in this regard constitutes political activity. It is the government that has to solve these conflicts by whatever means are at its disposal, the only limitation being that in so doing it must prevent the break-up of the polity.

Politics not only connotes 'political activity'. It also implies a train activity, i.e, efforts directed towards creating the conditions of tension and having their resolution until the point of 'spontaneous' unanimity is achieved. Political activity emanates from a situation of 'predicament'- a form of human behavior in which the interest of persons, more than one, clash or interact for the purpose of having an allocation of binding values in their respective favours.

Political process is an extension of the sense of political activity. Here the case of all those agencies figures in that have their role in the decision – making process. The study of politics is thus broadened so as to include even 'non-state' agencies. A study of the way of groups and associations

operate shows that they are not free from the trends of struggle for power; they have their 'internal governments' to deal with their internal conflicts and tensions. What is particularly important for our purpose is that these 'non-state' associations influence the government of the country for the sake of protecting and promoting their specific interests. Thus, there occurs a very sharp process of interaction between the groups inter se and between the groups and the government of the country. Participate in policy formation by the government or become the government, is the political process.

Since comparative politics includes all that comes within the scope of political activity and political process, it is said to 'drown' the national governments "among the whole universe of partial governments which exist in any community".

Finally, the scope of comparative politics includes the subject of political power. The term 'power' has been defined by different writers in different ways. For instance, while Carl J Friedrich describes it as 'a certain kind of human relationship'. Tawney regards it as the capacity of an individual, or a group of individuals to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups in the manner which he desires. Referring to the role of power in the matter of decision-making, Lasswell says: "The making of decision is an inter personal process: the policies which other persons are to pursue are what is decided upon. Power as participation in the making of decisions is an interpersonal relation. Politics thus connotes a special case in the exercise of power an exercise of power – an exercise in the attempt to change the conduct of others in one's own direction".

It is the study of the subject of politics from the stand point of power that has widened the scope of comparative politics so as to include a study of the infra-structure of the political systems. It is on account of this that politics "cannot be studied properly without identifying the ruling class, or the governing and non-governing elites, and measuring their respective roles. Politics also functions, by and large, within groups, though as we have seen earlier, however important in themselves the group may be, neither the individual nor the society can be left out". The subject of 'authority' becomes the hand maid of power. The rulers in a democratic system try to justify their authority by means of having the title of 'consensus' those of a totalitarian system resort to the marked use of power for achieving the superficial title of legitimacy. Thus, it becomes a celebrated principle of comparative politics: " Where consensus is weak, coercion tends, to be strong, and vice versa".It is on account of these important connotations that the term politics has come to have its peculiar definition in the realm of comparative politics. The result is that it is not merely a study of the state and government; it is a study of the exercise of power.

The discipline of comparative politics includes three different traditions. The first tradition is oriented towards the study of single countries. This reflects the understanding of comparative politics in its formative years in the US, where it mainly meant the study of political systems outside the US, often in isolation from one another and involving little, if any, comparision. For long comparative politics – especially in the Anglo –Saxon world – has meant the study of foreign countries. The second tradition is methodological and is principally concerned with establishing rules and standards

of comparative analysis. This tradition addresses the question of how comparative analysis should be carried out in order to enhance their potential for the descriptive accumulation of comparative information, explanation (to provide causal explanations and associations between key variables), and prediction. This strand is concerned with rigorous conceptual, logical, and statistical techniques of analysis, involving also issues of measurement and case selection. The third tradition of comparative politics is analytical, in that it combines empirical substance and method. The body of literature in this tradition is primarily concerned with the identification and explanation of differences and similarities between countries and their institutions, actors, and processes through systematic comparison using cases of a common phenomenon. Its principal goal is to be explanatory. It aims to go beyond merely ideographic descriptions and ultimately aspires to arrive at the identification of law like explanations. Though comparison researchers control, test, verify, and falsify whether associations and causal relationships between variables hold true empirically across a number of cases. The comparative character of cases is derived from the identification of shared properties among the cases. Whether based on large 'N' or 'small N' research designs with mostly similar or different cases (with N indicating the number of cases considered), and using either qualitative or quantitative data or logical or statistical techniques for testing the empirical validity of hypotheses, this tradition ultimately aims at causal explanation.

Characteristics of comparative politics

The subject of comparative politics as developed, in the latest phase, has following characteristics. They are as follows:

1. **Analytical and Empirical Investigation:** The analytical – cum – empirical method adopted by the writers belonging to the latest phase 'has definitely enlarged the field of our enquiry. Eckstein has referred to the late decades of the nineteenth century as a period in which political Science, influenced by a 'primitive positivism affected a divorce between its normative and its descriptive concerns. He further says that in the realm of comparative government, more and more writers turned from a concern for the evaluation of governmental forms to a pure description. Thus, for example, a pure ideal type democracy, while it continued to be a tool employed in normative political theory, no longer had utility for specialists in comparative government, and the definition of democracy was loosened to permit inclusion of a congeries of actual governmental forms and socio – political conditions.

2. **Study of Infrastructure:** The study of comparative politics is not confined to the formal structures of government as was the trend with the traditional political scientists, If instead of 'government' the term 'political system' is used, naturally it becomes a part of the entire social system and the 'input-output process' includes all those forces of the environment that have their effect on the decision – making process. Thus, the role of political parties and pressure groups, for example, becomes as significant as the role of legislatures and executives in the study of modern political system.

3.Emphasis on the Study of Developing Societies: What has added more to the significance of the study of comparative politics is the emphasis of more writers on the 'politics of the developing areas'. The study of comparative government is no longer a study of the selected European or American governments; it is as much a study of developed western governments as those of the developing political systems of the poor and backward countries of the Afro-Asian and Latin American world.

4. Focus on Inter – Disciplinary Approach: What has really enriched the field of comparative politics and, at the same time made it a complex subject is the focus on inter disciplinary study. Writers have made more and more use of tools that they have borrowed from the disciplines of sociology, psychology, economics, anthropology and even from natural sciences like biology. A study of new topics like political development, political modernization, political socialization, political acculturation, political change, political leadership and the like shows that now political science has become the application of sociological and psychological analysis to the study of the behavior of government and other political structures.

5. Value – Free Political Theory: Finally, the subject of political science has lost its normative aspect and assumed empirical dimensions in the sphere of comparative politics. The result is that value free political theory has replaced value laden political theory.

COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT AND COMPARATIVE POLITICS

The study of Comparative Government and Comparative Politics are closely linked with each other. Finer, however, points out four meanings of the term government – it denotes activity or process of governing and the extent to which it exercises control over others; indicates the state of affairs in which that activity or process is to found; tells about the people who are charged with the study of governing and denotes the manners, method or system by which a particular society is governed. Government is, thus, a standardized arrangement for taking decisions which affect the whole group. And the need of government arises as it is essential for territorial associations to adopt a common policy and as in many cases rival bodies of members advocate mutually exclusive policies.

Alan Ball has tried to establish a link between the Government and the Politics. There is now a great stress in both on informal political process than political institutions of the state. That is why Freeman points out that Comparative Politics is nothing else but comparative analysis of various forms of government and diverse political institutions. Jean Blondel also agrees with the view and says the "Comparative Government can be defined as the study of patterns of national governments in the contemporary world".

Although the two terms 'comparative politics' and 'comparative government are used loosely and interchangeably, there is a point of distinction between the two. While the latter covers a comparative study of different political systems with special emphasis on their institutions and functions, the former has a broader scope so as to cover all that comes within the purview of the former and, in

addition to that, all else that may be designated as the study of 'nonstate' politics. In other words, the scope of comparative politics is wider than that of comparative government despite the fact that the search for making comparisons is central to the study of both. The concern of a student of comparative politics does not end with the study of rule-making, rule-implementing and rule-adjudicating departments of the political systems or even with the study of some extra constitutional agencies (like political parties and pressure groups) having their immediate connection, visible or invisible, with the principal departments of state activity.

From the above, it infers that the term 'comparative politics' should be preferred to the term 'comparative government' as the scope of the former is wider and more comprehensive to include all the essential characteristics that we have discussed under the preceding section. Blondel, that the term comparative government has two aspects horizontal and vertical. Vertical comparison is a comparative study of the state vis-à-vis other associations and groups that have their political characters and cast their impact upon the functioning of a political system. If horizontal comparison is a comparative study of the state vis-à-vis other national governments. Comparative government can thus be defined in a preliminary fashion as the study of patterns of national governments in the contemporary world.

The study of Comparative Government is much limited than that of Comparative Politics. Comparative Government comprises the study of states, their institutions and functions. It does not take into account of the non-governmental institutions and is also not concerned with their functions. But Comparative Politics is concerned with politics *i.e.* Power relationship – where ever they occur. Hence its jurisdiction is not limited to the state only. Comparative Politics is, therefore, not concerned only with the comparative study of the state and its institutions and processes but it also deals with non-state political context such as leadership, political socialisation, resolution of political conflict, bargaining, communication, decision-making etc.

While making a distinction between the two Michael Curtis points out that , "Comparative Politics is concerned with behavior, institutions, processes, ideas, and values present in more than one country. It searches for those regularities and patterns, those similarities and differences between more than one nation-state that help clarify the basic nature, working and beliefs of regimes. The study of Comparative Politics, thus, involves "comparison of both entire nation- state or political systems and partial systems or particular processes or institutional activity".

By drawing distinction between Comparative Government and Comparative Politics, Ronald Chilcote writes, "Comparative Government usually refers to the study of countries or nation-state in Europe and the focus of the study is on the institutions and function of those countries, with attention to their executive, legislatures, and judiciaries as well as supplementary organisations as political parties and pressure groups. Comparative Politics, in contrast, studies a broader range of political activity, including governments and their institutions as well as other forms of organisations not directly related to national governments; for example, tribes communities, associations, unions".

COMPARATIVE POLITICS IN POST-WORLD WAR SECOND ERA

Moreover, till the middle of the 20th century the area of Comparative Politics was limited largely to those countries in Europe and English speaking world which were either highly developed or had long lived political institutions. But after that efforts have been made to include the new nation states *i.e.* developing and under-developed nations.

The traditional approach to the study of Western Political systems, being focused on the formal constitutional aspects such as chief executive, Parliaments, Civil Services and electoral systems, was mainly a matter of abstract and formal speculation upon the broads conceivable questions with little regards for the empirical content of speculation. But in their attempt to embrace a larger geographical area and a wider spectrum of human experience and to be more truly comparative and realistic, the theorists have borrowed concepts from other disciplines such as from Law, Philosophy, Political Sociology, Economics, Psychology, Anthropology, Biology, Science of Cybernetics, mathematics etc. They also used varieties of techniques and approaches. Departing from the legal frame work and method, scholars began to probe into non-legal levels and processes of politics. They, therefore, turned away from purely formal and constitutional approach to a consideration of political dynamics and the processes of decision-making.

Data for comparative inquiry has now been collected from a wide variety of sources *i.e. from the study of elites, mass opinion polls, voting statistics, aggregate data such as Economics, demographic, or census material, history and other Social Science yielding information about political behavior.*

World War second has another effect on the field of Comparative Politics. It has been greatly affected by the extension of inquiry into Asia, Africa, South-East Asia, Latin America and Middle East. By providing fresh and exciting new laboratories for the analysis of political development, these countries significantly expanded the universe of Comparative Politics. Moreover, inquiry into the changing politics of this Non-Western World has pointed out the inadequacy of traditional approaches which did not take into account critically important social and cultural factors. Thus, in studying Non-Western Political systems, the scholars began to deal not only with strange societies but also with ideas and values often incomparable with those of the west. In their quest to find out categories and concepts appropriate for the comparison of political systems differing radically in culture and structures the scholars of Comparative Politics listed some of the new concepts such as Role Structure, Political Culture, political system, Consensus, Actors, Socialization, Rationality, Structural-Functional Analysis etc. All these provided the scholars of Comparative Politics convenient sets of tools for analysis.

Many approaches are, therefore, being used by the political Scientists such as System Approach, Structural. Functional Approach, Communication Approach, David Apter's Structural and Behavioural Approach, Inter-discplinary Approach, Developmental Approach, Cultural Approach, etc.These new approaches have provided diversity to the field of Comparative Politics.

In the late fifties and early sixties David Easton had begun to publish his general work on the political system which has given further impetus to the study of flow, process, informal actors and input-output analysis that was also incorporated into Comparative Politics. A parallel work on development and nation building was being done by Karl Deutsch during the same period. Lipest published his *political man* (1959) showing the inter-relations between social modernisation and political democracy.

A variety of more alternative approaches also began to emerge in the field of Comparative Politics in late 1960s and early 1970s. the two of them – Corporatist Approach and Marxist Approach – have given new life to the failure of the Liberal-developmentalist Approach. There also emerged a renewed interest in the Phenomenon of state-society relations and mathematical modeling.

Political scientist, afterwards rediscovered the state as a major variable, as a distinct from the 'Black Box' on neutral reference of system theory. There also emerged a renewed interest in the phenomenon of state-society relations, Mathematical modeling of Comparative Politics and in Political Economy. Public Policy analysis – a new field in the discipline of Comparative Politics has also emerged.

Criticisms

The study of comparative politics is beset with a number of problems that defy the requirements of a scientific analysis. They are as follows:

1. There is the problem, of a standard and precise definition of various important concepts and terms. Leading writers on this subject make use of different concepts according to their specialized knowledge, what Sartori calls conceptual stretching.
2. Many political terms used in the field of comparative politics not only suffered from ambiguity, they are also used as political rhetoric that create the fear of neologism.
3. Serious difficulties are encountered in collecting information and data about the political system and other non-state institutions having their definite connection, whether visible or invisible, with the departments of a political organization.
4. Political behaviour is not necessarily conducted on a rational basis or on scientific principles thereby rendering a scientific study more difficult.
5. A value-free political science becomes a source of problem for one who has a normative approach.
6. There is the factor of the complexity of political systems and political behavior.
7. The roles that the individuals play in the politics of their country cannot be subjected to uniform rules as evolved by a student of comparative politics.
8. Comparative politics is not experimental. We cannot go to a laboratory and artificially change an electoral law in order to see if the number of parties shrinks or increases. Researchers cannot raise levels of literacy to see if political violence decreases, like physics increases heat

to see if water boils faster. John Stuart Mill, MaxWeber, and others all stressed long ago the impossibility of carrying out experiments in the social sciences.

However, a correct evaluation should be made from a different stand point. Such a list of problems that beset the study of comparative politics does not tend to suggest that the study of this subject is impossible, but it explains why the development of a general theory has proved an arduous task. Undaunted by such problems, even though formidable, recent political scientists have invented certain theories with which political systems may be compared not only on the basis of their structures but also on the lines of their infra-structures in way as much precise as possible Blondel makes a very fine observation when he counsels: "Rather than try to define with great precision the 'things' which belong to government and those which do not, it seems much more fruitful to think in terms of liens, or of channels by which the governmental machine is activated and comes to respond. Although we may not always be certain in advance which 'things' will, indeed, constitute these lines, we have a technique, or a frame of reference by which we shall be able to decide concretely in individual instances, whether or not a thing or a problem belongs to the study of government. Irrefutable is the statement of Curtis on this subject that the study of comparative politics is at the heart of contemporary political science".

POLITICAL SYSTEM

The social system consists of many sub systems. Each sub system has certain specified functions to perform. The political system is interwoven with other subsystems in society. There is close relationship between social and political systems. A study of the modern man is incomplete which does not include question like how does he earn his livelihood, how does he spent his moment of leisure relaxation, what kind of problems worry him the most, how and where does he come into conflict with his fellow-beings, to mention a few. Although for a political analyst all the above mentioned factors are important, his basic concern would always remain with regularization and institutionalization of power, making of authoritative decisions, conflict resolution to name a few aspects of human behavior with a clear political bias. The agency which has been entrusted with these functions is the state and its organ actively undertakes these jobs are known as government. But it is realized that the term 'state' and 'government' have restricted legal meanings. The concept of 'Political System', write Almond and powell, " has acquired wide currency because it directs attention to entire scope of political activities within a society, regardless of where in the society such activities may be located".

1. **David M. Wood**. " Political system thus becomes a set of interrelated variables conceived to be politically relevant and treated as if they could be separated from other variables conceived to be politically relevant not immediately relevant to politics."

2.   **S.H. Beer and A.B. Ulam**. " Political system has emerged as a part of the broad way of looking at all social behaviour. From that perspective, the political system is a structure that performs a certain function for a society. In the fewest possible words, that function is to make legitimate policy decisions."

3.   **Almond and Powell**. "It directs attention to the entire scope of political activities within a society, regardless of where in the society such activities may be located." Further explaining the concept of political system Almond and Powell say, "When we speak of the political system we include all the interactions which affect the use or threat of use of legitimate physical coercion. The political system includes not only governmental institutions such as legislatures, courts and administrative agencies, but all structures in their political aspects. Among these are traditional structures such as kinship ties and caste groupings; and anomie phenomena such as assassinations, riots and demonstrations; as well as formal organisations like parties, interest groups and media of communications."

Comparative Politics makes a deep and systematic study of different political system. Political system determines political power, political culture, and nature of the state, political mobility and so on. Its chief characteristic is political allocation which has been defined by Marion Levy, "As the distribution of power over and responsibility for the action of the various members of the concrete structure concerned, involving on the one hand coercive sanctions, of which force is the extreme from in one direction, and on the other, accountability to the members and in terms of the structure concerned, or to the members of other concrete structures." The political system is sanctioned by the state and the political power.

Explaining the influence of political system Almond and Powell point out, "In the end it may be remembered that the political system produces a certain output for the society: legitimate policy decisions. The goals at which these decision aim may be precise and programmatic, or only vague and general. They may be accepted readily or reluctantly, by many or by few. But to call them policy decisions is to stress that they do have consequences for the society, and to note their legitimacy is to draw attention to the main characteristics that make them political. Through the political system goals for the society are defined and carried out by legitimate policy decisions."

PROPERTIES OF POLITICAL SYSTEM

According to Almond and Powell the political system is known by the following properties:

1. **Comprehensiveness**. A political system is comprehensive. It includes input as well as outputs. It includes all the interactions which affect the use of physical coercion. It is more concerned with the political aspect of kinship and lineage, status and caste groups, religious and cultural bodies as well as anemic phenomena such as violent riots and street demonstration.

2. **Interdependence**. A significant property of political system is the interdependence of its various parts. A subset of interactions produces changes in all other subsets. It is so because the

functioning of the subsets is inter-dependent. For example, changes in the technology of communication transform the electoral process, the political parties, the legislature and the executive.

3. **Boundaries**. Every political system draws boundaries between society and polity. According to Almond, "When we talk about good and bad boundary maintenance, we must use criteria appropriate to the system. In one case diffuseness and intermittence may be appropriate boundary maintenance; in another specialised secular structure are appropriate,"

Political change

Political change is one aspect of social change. The word 'change' means a shift in position. A specific change may be good or bad. But, 'change' as such is value neutral. This is the difference between 'political change' and 'political development'. Unlike change, development connotes forward movement and progression. Power being the essence of politics, political change manifests itself in power realignment in society. In fact, change in the political sphere is often the consequence of changes in societal power positions. Concretely Changes can take place at the national level also there can be changes at the level of a single constituency or grassroots institutions.

Political regime change can be traced to changes in social power disposition. Historically, there have been periods of secular changes when the basic political framework itself has undergone a radical transformation. Such radical political changes occasioning almost a total ox,erhaul of the character of rule are known as 'revolutions.' Revolutions are therefore framework-rupturing and framework-innovating episodes in history.

Ideas about political change are as old as man's earliest political thinking. The Greeks, for instance, used to think that political changes were due to unbalanced governments--regimes that had been insensitive to popular needs. In Plato's writings (Eighth Book of Republic), political change has been described in terms of succession of regimes. Internal dissensions and divisions could lead to military despotism. Tyranny, the worst form of government might emerge when people would be incited by demagogues. Hence, the Greeks equated good government with balance and lack of excesses. Aristotle had similarly talked about governmental changes affecting the end or purposes of rule. This is identified by Aristotle-Monarchy, aristocrats; tyranny and democracy--were concrete manifestations of political changes.

During the Middle Ages, basically a theological view sought domination over the narrow political view. Change was, therefore, thought in terms of subjugating state power to higher theological goals. The idea of radical political change through revolutionary, means is of fairly recent origin. In this context, the two revolutions--the French (1789) and the Soviet (1917) are of great historical significance. These opened up possibilities of massive changes in the socio-political fabric. Theories of political change thus reflect the evolutionary, changes in political thinking about state-society relationship.

The Third World Context

With the emergence of the "new states" after the Second World War, political science had to reckon with the new phenomenon of "the past- colonial state." These States bore the impact of imperial institutions. The institutional hang-over was symbolic of continuity of governing systems. This situation has been described "political scientists as the "old society-new state" syndrome. The concept of 'third World' or "developing" was coined to denote the phenomenon of the new regime. In all these new states, there was a universal quest for rapid socio-economic development. The objectives have been to remove poverty and destitution and bring about all-round development.' There was anxiety, under these circumstances, for matching political changes so that the desired societal conditions could be attained by a new system of rule. Thus, political change attracted as much practical attention as academic attention. A group of political scientists has been exclusively engaged in the study of political change in the developing societies. The scholars, mostly American, have undertaken vigorous field studies and tried to formulate medium and broad gauge theories of political change. The outcome was the birth of the "political development" school in political science.

Theories of Political Change

Theories of political change fall broadly into two classes: the structural-functionalist and Marxist. Following Gabriel Almond who is widely known for his Parsonian functionalist approach to politics, the theory of political change can be looked at as those broad gauge ideas that deal with the transactions between the political system and its environment with decisive effect on general system performance. Almond draws attention to the system's capabilities in terms Of its ability to cope with inputs successfully. Capability analysis is the method by which the political system can be empirically examined. The concept of political change is thus considered in terms of challenges to the political system coming from different sources which the system has to cope with for survival. Three important sources identified by Almond are : (a) elites within the political system itself, (b) social groups in the domestic environment, a The centrality of politics in the fast moving social scenario of the third world countries has been Huntington's main thesis. Edward Shillls holds a similar view when he refers to the absence of a single civil society in the third world countries. In his view, "they (third world societies) lack the affirmative attitude toward rules, persons, and actions that is necessary and (c) other political systems in the international environment. Kothari argues, "Political change comes to occupy the centre of attention". Almost in a spirit of endorsement of Huntington's advocacy of institutionalization.

Apter's Model of Change

A very sophisticated model of political change has been suggested by David Apter. Following the systems framework, Apter looks at government as the recipient of inputs from tile elites and the society. These inputs a: then converted into outputs which are decisions of various kinds. In political systems, the governmental concern is to ensure the effectiveness, of authoritative decision-making.

Apter Uses the concept of "'political ceiling" to explain the limit up which a political system can withstand pressures for change. The implication is that there is a threshold point of governmental persistence, and beyond this point political change overtakes the governmental system.

In Apter's view, no government can function without "'information and "coercion'. The contents of governmental action or the agenda of rule are determined by the "information" obtained from elites. Out of the proposed actions, what could be actually implemented would depend large on the coercive opportunities available to the government. Two structural requisites identified by Apter are (a) authoritative decision-making accountability and consent Government can be looked at as boil 'dependent" variable and 'independent" variable. The former can be found in a situation when government is bounded by elites and societal variables, and has to respond to inputs generated outside of its immediate boundaries.

The latter is evident in a situation where government takes the lead in bringing about industrialization, modernization and societal change. Systemic change in government, according to Apter, is related to 'political ceiling' or the point beyond which a government cannot take effective action. The "'political ceiling" is reached "when functional and dialectical changes in society are so excessive flxat either the structure of accountability and consent or the structure of authoritative decision-making fails- "Apter postulates a condition of "equity-order balance" for a functioning political system. As he observes: "If a political system is to work, equity must be structurally integrated with order. When a political ceiling is reached and the system breaks down, then order is not integrated with equity.'"

Increasing modernization brings in its trail complexity and uncertainty in the sense of systemic "capacity to predict a reasoned sequence of events.' Simultaneously, the need for information and coercion also increases. An increase in coercion changes the governments with are dependent varibles into independent ones while attempts to increase information transform them into dependent ones. "The response to uncertainty" Apter concludes, "whether in terms of coercion or information, is thus the key to political system change.

This is a very synoptic view of an extremely thought-provoking formulation by Apter. Political change has been viewed by him in the context of political balance and the causes that tend to upset this balance.

Huntington and the Concept of Political Decay

Samuel Huntington has offered another interesting explanation of 'political decay' in terms of a decline in political order and undermining of the authority, effectiveness, and legitimacy of government. Throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, the problem, in his view, is not political development but political decay. This he attributes to rapid social change and the rapid mobilization of new groups into politics coupled with the slow development of political institutions. As Huntington observes, "The rates of social mobilization and the expansion of political participation are

high; the rates of political organization and institutionalization are low. The result is political instability and disorder." There is, as it were, a 'political gap' in the developing countries--a shortage of political community in terms of effective, authoritative and legitimate government.

In Huntington's view, political systems can be distinguished by their levels of political institutionalization and their levels of political participation. In terms of institutionalization, there can be political systems that have achieved a high degree of political institutionalization and those that have achieved only a low degree. In terms of participation, three levels can be identified. At the lowest level, participation is confined to a small traditional aristocratic or bureaucratic elite; at the medium level, the middle classes would be entering into politics ; and in a highly participative polity, the elite, the middle class and the general public would all be sharing in political activity. According to Huntington, the stability of a political system depends on the relationship between the level of political participation and the level of political institutionalization. Increasing political participation must be matched by the increased complexity, autonomy, adaptability and coherence of the society's political institutions. Only thus can stability be ensured.

On the basis of relationship between participation and institutionalization, Huntington makes a two-fold classification of polities: praetorian, pol Praetorian polities are characterised by low levels of institutionalization and high levels of participation. In these polities social forces, using their arm methods, act directly in tile political sphere. By contrast, civic polities are those characterised by" a high ratio of institutionalization to participation. It is thus argued that modernization and social mobilization tend to produce political decay unless countervailing steps are taken to moderate or to restrict its impact on political consciousness and political involvement. During the most intense phase of modernization therefore, most societies suffer a loss of political community and decay of political institutions.

Critique of Developmentalism

Despite subtle variations in approaches and presentations, Ahnond, Shils, Apter and Huntington (in fact, all developmentalists)share in common a concern for the capacity of the third world political systems to cope with 'modernization" and rapid social change. The 'modernization" theory is based on the perception of the U.S social scientists about the processes of socio political changes taking place in the so called 'developing' countries. Modernization has been conceived in terms of the processes of transformation of these societies into advanced, capitalist, and hence pluralist and democratic (on the model of Western capitalist democracies) forms. Toward the end of the 1960s the 'dependency' or "underdevelopment" theorists successfully launched a polemical attack on the ideologists of modernization and developmentalism. The devastating criticism by the dependentistas led by Andre Gunder Frank, Susan Bodenleimer and others proved to be paradigm-shaking.

Huntington calls for the careful formulation of a theory of political decay that would be useful in analysing the political processes of the developing countries. As he comments : "This decay in

political institutions has been neglected or overlooked in much of the literature on modernization. The theories of political change, as formulated mostly by the U.S. social scientists, are basically ideological in character; despite their apparently scientific presentations. These are influenced by their Preference for their kind of political system. In these formulations, one discovers an advocacy-of a particular type of political process and order., and an anxiety to save the Third World from the "pernicious" influences of revolutionary movements.

The theories of political change, as formulated mostly by the U.S. social scientists, are basically ideological in character; despite their apparently scientific presentations. These are influenced by their Preference for their kind of political system. In these formulations, one discovers an advocacy-of a particular type of political process and order., and an anxiety to save the Third World from the "pernicious" influences of revolutionary movements.

The 'theorists' of political change are thus polarised into two contending groups, the evolutionist-reformist and the radical Marxist. Most U.S. social scientists dealing with modernization and political development fall in the first category. For an alternative formulation, one has to look to Marxist theory of social change which subsumes a notion of political change.

Module II

Theories of Comparative Politics

System Theories

The modern approaches to the study of comparative governments and politics are numerous. One such approach is the systems approach, also called the systems theory or the systems analysis. This approach is, and in fact, has been the most popular way of looking at any political activity. According to Prof. Kaplan it is the study of a set of inter-related variables, as distinguished from the environment of the set and of the ways in which this set is maintained under the impact of environment disturbances. It focuses on sets of patterned relations involving frequent inter-actions and a substantial degree of interdependence among the members of a system as well as established procedure for the protection and maintenance of the system.

The System approach is the study of inter-related variables forming one system, a unit, a whole which is composed of many facts, a set of elements standing in interaction. This approach assumes that the system consists of discernible, regular and internally consistent patterns, each interacting with another, and giving, on the whole, the picture of a self-regulating order. It is, thus, the study of a set of interactions occurring within and yet analytically distinct from, the larger system.

Systems Approach

The systems approach has its origins traced to natural resources, though numerous involvements aimed at the unification of science and scientific analysis may be said to have worked for this approach. The original idea of systems analysis came from biology and then adopted by the social scientists. The German biologist Ludwig Van Bertalanfly was the first to state the formulations of the general systems theory way back in 1930s, and it was from the general systems theory that the social scientists evolved and formulated the concept of the systems theory. Bertalanfly defined system in a set of 'elements studying in interaction'.

David Easton (*A system Analysis of Political Life,* 1965), Gabriel Almond (*Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*, 1978), David Apter (Introduction *to Political Analysis*, 1978), Karl Deutsch (*Nation and World: Contemporary Political Science,* 1967), Morton Kaplan (*System and Process in International Politics,* 1957 or with' Harold Lasswell, *Power and Society*, 1950) and other leading American social scientists pioneered the systems analysis in Political Science. More specifically, Easton was one of the few Political Scientists to suggest the utility and importance of the systems anlysis for politics while defining a political system as that "behaviour or set of interaction through which authoritative allocations are made and implemented for society".

Another trend, known as structural-functionalism, tries to be holistic but towards a no historical and middle - range analysis. It has grown from two academic traditions. In the first tradition, we can place the works of Malinowski, Radcliffe -Brown, and Talcott Parsons. In the second traditions, we can

refer to the works of Arthur and David Truman. Both these traditions have converged in the contributions of Gabriel Almond, whose structural - functional approach made great impact on comparative politics.

Systems approach is one of the modern approaches which have been introduced in Political Science, especially in Comparative Government and Politics by scholars like Kaplan, Easton, Almond, Apter, and Deutsch. Accordingly, they have seen system as a set of interactions, interrelations, patterned behaviour among the individuals and institutions, a set of structures performing their respective functions and one that seeks to achieve certain goal and attempts to maintain it amidst attitudes.

Systems Analysis: Characteristic Features

Systems analysis implies system as a set of interactions. It is, as O.R. Young says, "a set of objects, together with relationships between the objects and between their attributes." To say that a system exists is to say that it exits through its elements, say objects; and its elements (objects) are interacted and they interact within a patterned frame. Systems analyst perceives inter-related and a web-like objects and looks for ever-existing relationships among them. He is an advocate of the interactive relationship, among the objectives his major concerns are

   i)   to emphasise the patterned behaviour among the objects of the system,
   ii) to explain the interactive beliaviour among them,
   iii) to make a search for factors that help maintain the system.

 Systems analysis elaborates, for understanding the system itself, a set of concepts. These include system, sub-system, environment, input, output, conversion process feedback, etc., System implies persisting relationships, demonstrating behavioural patterns, among its numerous parts, say objects or entities. A system that constitutes an element of a larger system is called a sub-system. The setting within which a system occurs or works is called environment. The line that separates the system from its environment is known as boundary. The system obtains inputs from the environment in the form of demands upon the system and supports for its functioning. As the system operates, inputs are subjected to approach what may be called conversion process and it leads to system outputs embodying rules to be forced or policies to be implemented. When system outputs affect the environment so to change or modify inputs, feedback occurs.

Systems approach has, therefore, characteristic features of its own. These features may be summed up briefly as under:

   1)   A social phenomenon is not what exists in isolation; it is not just numerous parts joinedtogether to make a whole. It is a unit, a living unit with an existence and goal of its own.

   2)   Its parts may not be and in fact, are not organically related together, but they do make a whole   in the sense that they interact and are inter-related. Specific behavioural relationships pattern them into a living system.

3) It operates through a mechanism of inputs and outputs and under within an environment which influences it and which, in turn, provides feedback to the environment.
4) Its main concern is as to how best it can maintain itself and face the challenges of decay and decline.
5) It implies patterned relationships among its numerous parts, explaining their relative behaviour and role they are expected to perform.

Systems Approaches: Concerns and Objectives

The system analysis is concerned with certain objectives. It addresses itself to the nations order, change and goal realisation as Welsh points out. The first concern of the systems approach, **Welsh** says, is 'maintenance of the system's integrity' which, he asserts, depends on system's ability to maintain order. Obviously, the system would evolve 'regularised procedures,' 'by which society's scarce resources' would be so distributed that its members are sufficiently satisfied and would, in no case, permit a situation of chaos and collapse.

The second concern of the systems approach, as indicated by Welsh, is how the system meets the challenge of change in its environment. Changes in the environment are natural, so are natural environment's effects on the system. It is the system that has to adapt itself realities the environmental changes especially to the technological and changes. The systems approach identifies the conflict between of responding to the changes and the already engineered the environment, and also the capacities to remove the conflict.

The third objective of the systems approach is the importance it gives to the goal realisation as the central aspect of the system. Why do people organise themselves? Why do people indulge in persistent patterns of interaction and interdependence? Why do people accept particular modes of attitude so as to demonstrate specific behaviour? Obviously, they do so because they want to pursue certain goals that they feel are important. No system call exists over a substantial period of time without articulating, determining and pursuing some specific identifiable goals. Welsh concludes, "The process by which these goals come to be defined for the system as a whole, and by which members of system pursue these goals, are important foci in the systems approach."

Derivatives of the systems analysis

Political system or the input-output approach is one derivative of the systems analysis. David Easton has been one of the early political scientists to have introduced the systems approach to politics. He has been able to provide "an original set of concepts for arranging at the level of theory and interpreting political phenomena in a new and helpful way" (Davies and Lewis : Models of Political Systems). He selects the political system as the basic unit of analysis and concentrates on the intra-system behaviour of various systems. He defines political system as "those interactions through which values are authoritatively allocated and implemented for a society". It would be useful to

highlight some of the characteristic features of Easton's concept of political system and these, briefly, are:

a) Political system implies a set of interaction through which values are authoritatively allocated. This means the decisions of those, who are in power, are binding.

b) Political system is a system of regularised persistent patterns of ' relationships among the people and institutions within it.

c) Political system, like any natural system, has in it a self-regulating system by which it is able to change, correct and adjust its processes and structures.

d) Political system is dynamic in the sense that it can maintain itself through the feedback mechanism. The feedback mechanism helps the system to persist though everything else associated it may change, even radically.

e) Political system is different from other systems or environments physical, biological, social, economic, ecological, but in coverable to their influence. Boundary lines separate them.

f) Inputs through demands and supports put the political system at work while outputs through policies and decisions throw back what is not accepted as feed- back.

O.R. Young sums up the essentials of Easton's political system, saying: "Above all, the political system is seen as a conversion process performing work, producing output and altering its environment, with a continuous exchange between a political system and its environment based on the steady operation of the dynamic processes. At the same time, this approach provides numerous concepts for dealing both with political dynamics in the form of systematic adaptation processes and even with purposive redirection in the form of goal changing feedback."

The merits of the input-output or political system approach cannot be ignored. The approach has provided an excellent technique for comparative analysis. It has also provided a set of concepts and categories which have made comparative analysis ignore interesting and instructive. Young has admitted that Easton's analysis is "undoubtedly the most inclusive systematic approach so far constructed specifically for political analysis by a political scientist." According to Eugene Meehan, "Easton has produced one of the few comprehensive attempts to lay the foundation for systems analysis in political science and to provide a general functional theory of politics."

Structural - Functional Derivative

The structural functional analysis is another derivative of the systems approach. Coming in through sociology and originating mainly in the writings of anthropologists like Malinowski and Radeliffe-Brown, and adopted in political science, especially in comparative politics by Gabriel Almond, structural functional analysis is basically concerned with the phenomenon of system maintenance and

regulation. The basic theoretical proposition o f this approach is that all systems exist to perform functions through their structures. The central question of this approach, as Young says, is: *'What structures fulfill what basic functions and under what conditions in any given society"?*

The basic assumptions of the structural-functional derivative of the systems approach are:

1) Society is a single inter-connected system in which each of its elements performs a specific function and whose basic goal is the maintenance of the equilibrium;
2) Society, being a system as a whole, consists of its numerous parts which are inter-related;
3) The dominant tendency of the social system is towards sensibility which is maintained by its own in-built mechanism;
4) System's ability to resolve internal conflicts is usually an admitted fact;
5) Changes in the system are natural, but they are neither sudden nor revolutionary, but are always gradual and adaptive as well as adjustive;
6) System has its own structure, with its own aims, principles and functions.

The structural-functional derivative speaks of the political system as composed of several structures as patterns of action and resultant institutions with their assigned functions. A function, in this context, means, as Plato *(Dictionary of Political Analysis)* says, 'some purpose served with respect to the maintenance or perpetuation of the system', and a structure could be related to "any set of related roles, including such concrete organisational structures as political parties and legislatures."

Gabriel Almond's classic statement of structural-functional analysis is found in the introduction to *The Politics of the Developing Area, 1960.* Briefly summed up: All political systems have a structure, i.e. legitimate patterns of human interactions by which order is maintained; all political structures perform their respective functions, with different degrees in different political systems;

Input functions include

a) political socialisation and Recruitment;

b) interest articulation;

c) interest aggregation;

d) political communication;

Output functions include

i) rule-making,

ii) rule-application,

iii) rule-adjudication.

Almond, while considering politics as the integrative and adaptive functions of a society based on more or less legitimate physical coercion, regards political system as *"the system of interactions to be*

found in all independent societies which *perform the functions* of integration and adaptation by means of the employment or threat of employment of more or less legitimate order-maintaining or *transforming system in the society."* He is of the opinion that there is interdependence between political and other societal systems; that political structures perform the same functions in all systems; that all political structures are multi-functional; and that all systems adapt to their environment when political structures do have behave dysfunctionally.

There is a basic difference between Easton's input-output model and Almond's structural-functional approach. While Easton lays emphasis on interaction and interrelationship aspects of the parts of the political system, Almond is more concerned with the political structures and the functions performed by them. And this is perhaps the first weakness of the structural-functional analysis which talks about the functions of the structures and ignores the interactions which are characteristics of the numerous structures as parts of the political system. Almond's model suffers from being an analysis at the micro-level, for it explains the western political system, or to be more specific, the American political system. There is undue importance on the input aspect, and much less on the output aspect in his explanation of the political system, giving, in the process, the feedback mechanism only a passing reference. Like Easton, almond too has emerged as status-quoist, for he too emphasized on the maintenance of the system.

The model has successfully introduced new conceptual tools in political science, especially in comparative politics. So considered, the structural-functional analysis has really enriched our discipline. It has also offered new insights into political realities. And that is one reason that this model has been widely adopted, and is being used as a descriptive and ordering framework.

Cybernetics Derivative

Cybernetics or communication approach is another derivative of the system analysis. Karl Deutsch (*The Nerves of Government*, 1966) may rightly be called the chief exponent of the Cybernetics model. Cybernetics is defined as the science of communication and control'. Its focus is "the systematic study of communication and control in organisations of all kinds. The viewpoint of Cybernetics suggests that all organisations are alike in certain fundamental characteristics and that every organisation is held together by communication." Because 'governments' are organisations, it is they where information-processes are mainly represented. So are developed Deutsch's concepts in his Cybernetics approach, especially information, communication and channels. Information is a patterned relationship, between events, Communication is the transfer of such patterned relations; and channels are the paths or associative trails through which information is transferred. Deutsch rightly says that his book, the Nerves of Government, deals less with the bones or tussles of the body politic and more with its nerves..... its channels of communication. For him, the 'core-area of politics is the area of enforceable decisions, and the ensure of politics' is the 'dependable coordination of human efforts for the attainment of the goals of society'. Hence, he looks at the political system, which

according to him is nothing but a system of decision-making and enforcement, as a network of communication channels.

Drawing largely from the science of neuro-physiology, psychology and electrical engineering, Deutsch is able to perceive similarities in processes and functional requirements, between living things, electronic machines and social organisations.

The characteristic features of the cybernetics model of the systems analysis can be, briefly, stated as under: (1) Feedback constitutes a key concept in the cybernetics model. It is also called a servo-mechanism. By feedback, Deutsch means a communications network that produces action in response to an input information. (2) All organisations, including a political system, are characterised by feedback mechanisms. It is feedback that introduces dynamism into what may be otherwise a static analysis.(3) Cybernetics introduces certain sub-concepts of the feedback concept and there are negative feedback, load, lag, gain and lead.

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

Deutsch's cybernetics model deals with communication, control and channels against Easton's input-output model of interactions and interrelationships and Almond's structural-functional analysis of stating structures and their functions, All these seek to explain the functioning of the system - its ability to adapt itself amidst changes and its capacity to maintain itself over time. Deutsch's model has numerous drawbacks : it is essentially an engineering approach which explains the performance of human beings and living institutions as if they are machines, the cybernetics are concerned more with what decisions are then how and why they are concluded and towards which ends; the approach is quantity-oriented, and hence is not quality-oriented; it seeks to store information an overlooks its significance; the approach is sophisticated in so far as it is complex, it is complex in so far as it does not help understand the phenomenon.

As a derivative of the systems approach, cybernetics analysis has helped in the search of analogies which has, in turn, contributed to development of hypotheses concerning human behaviour. To that extent, the approach has added to our understanding of the system scientifically. Furthermore, the cybernetic devices, such as computing and data processing, proved to be extremely useful to political scientists in their research efforts.

Cultural Theories

The cultural thrust in comparative politics, conspicuously prominent during the 1960s, emanated from traditional work on culture in anthropology, socialization and small group studies in sociology, and personality studies in psychology. The concept of political culture was related "to nations or national cultures. In this sense political culture represented a sort of recasting of the older notions of national character. Political culture related to systems as well. Political culture consisted of beliefs, symbols, and values that define situations in "which political action occurs. Types of political culture characterized systems; for example, parochial, subject, and participant political cultures. These types of political cultures reflected the psychological and subjective orientations of people toward their national system. The pioneer comparative effort to construct a theory of political culture was Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba's Civic Culture, which was based on a survey of the attitude of citizens toward their nation in the United States, Great Britain, Germany, France, Italy, and Mexico. Inherent in this study was the proposition, set forth earlier in the work of Almond that the ideal political or civic culture could be found in an Anglo-American model of politics. Lucian Pye and Sidney Verba elaborated on the theory and brought together essays by prominent specialists in the field in Political Culture and Political Development. Although there have been efforts to relate political culture to the politics of specific nations—such as Pye's Politics, Personality, and Nation Building: Burma's Search for Identity—generally the literature has been divided into two subareas: political socialization and communications. Edited volumes by James S.Coleman, Education and Political Development, and by Pye, Communications and Political Development, reflect the work in these areas. '

During the 1970s political scientists moved from general studies of political culture to more specific inquiry on political socialization and the shaping of political attitudes through such agencies as family, school, and work place. They also emphasized the study of public opinion, the role of mass media, an communications in general as reflections of the general political culture. During the 1980s the emphasis shifted to studies of individual choice, with attention to political parties, public opinion, and electoral politics. Attention to rational and individual choice permeated the non-marxist efforts of Ronald Inglehart in analysis of the survey data of the Eurobarometer collection on Western Europe, while a Marxist perspective was associated with the empirical and quantitative efforts of Adam Przeworski.

Although the concept political culture was often criticized for abstract idealizations it was not only recycled in later literature but also became part of the discourse of intellectuals everywhere. Michael Thompson, Richard Ellis," and Aaron Wildavsky in Cultural Theory (1990) did very well in recounting the contributions of major thinkers from Montesquieu and Comte to Durkheim, Marx, and Weber in arguing that cultures are plural, not singular, and presenting a multivaried conception of political culture and its implications.

Because cultural characteristics tend to reflect the conservation of values, attitudes and norms, political cultural studies inevitably emphasized stability and patterns of continuity in political like.

Research questioning this approach and concerned more with the prospects for societal change, however, could utilize the approach to study how power holders maintain control or how indigenous peoples oppose outside penetration-for example, the cultural resistance of Africans in Mozambique or Angola to the commercialization and colonization schemes of the Portuguese during the colonial period. The notion of culture also was incorporated into the idea of the new man or person, the selfless and sacrificing individual who was willing to work for the betterment of socialist society. Cultural influences were of importance in the role of family and capitalism; an example was, the analysis by Eli Zaretsky in Capitalism, Family, and Social Life (1986). Gabriel Almond first introduced the concept of political culture in 1956 in his early attempt to offer a classification for comparing political systems. "Every political system is embedded in a particular pattern of orientations to political action. In The Civic Culture (1963), Almond and Verba refined this conception of political culture and used it in an empirical study and survey of attitudes in five nations. They defined political culture in terms of political orientations and attitudes held by individuals in relation to their political system. People are induced into it just as they are socialized into nonpolitical roles and social systems. Cognitive orientations include knowledge and beliefs about the political system, its leaders, and operation. Affective orientations involve feeling s about the system such as attachment or alienation. Evaluative orientations comprise judgments and opinions about the system and might, for example, include the application of values such as democratic norms. These orientations become the basis for types of political culture. Three types are postulated: parochial, implying that individuals have low expectations and awareness of government and generally are not involved; subject, in which individuals are aware of the outcomes of government but do not participate in the processes that result in policy, decisions; and participant, in which individual; are active and involved in the system as a whole, that is, in both the input and output processes.

In a collaborative effort with G. Bingham Powell, Jr., Almond elaborated further his conception of political culture, tying it both to the political system and to political development. "Political culture is the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations toward politics among the members of a political system. It is the subjective realm which underlies and gives meaning to political actions. Political culture is explained in terms of its relationship to the capabilities of the political system. Development is a reflection of the degree of secularization of the political culture. Cultural secularization implies bargaining and give-and-take interactions, a kind of "marketplace attitude which permeates the conduct of politics. Additionally, cultural secularization is seen in the movement from diffuseness to a specificity of orientations and a differentiation of roles in the polity; diffuseness characterizes parochial cultures in which there is little or no awareness of the political system as a separate entity, whereas specificity and differentiation characterize subject and participant political cultures. In newer nations a "cultural dualism" is evident, in which a small elite is modernized or "socialized in the specific, universalistic, and pragmatic orientations which typify 'modern' culture—while the vast majority remains tied to the rigid, diffuse, and ascriptive patterns of tradition".

Developmental Theories

The concern with development was prompted by the emergence of many new states in the Third World. Almond and others in politics of the Developing Area directed attention to backward areas that promised to develop, and he found in necessary to tie has ideas about the natures of the political system and about political cultures to development. The result was a journal articles in World Politics it 1965 and a book with G. Bingham Powell, Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach. In that work Almond more consciously began to work out a model of concepts and stages that would characterize development. The volume commissioned by the Social Science Research Council's (SSRC's) Committee on Comparative Politics (1963 to present) also place an emphasis upon comparative developmental theory.

The mainstream literature on development actually falls into at least five categories. The first, represented by Almond and others, others, attempt to utilize traditional notions of democracy and political development and to recast then into more sophisticated, sometimes abstract, terminology. A stage theory of Political Development is depicted in A.F.K. Organski's The Stages of Political Development, a work modeled after that of the economist Walt Rostow. These conceptions of political development, however, rest heavily upon the Anglo-American experiences in politics. Studies in the second category focus on conceptions of nation building. These studies attempt to combine old notions' of nationalism, those" or" Hans Kohn for example, with new interpretations of development. Karl Deutsch's Nationalism and Social Communication is an excellent example of this combination, and Rupert Emerson's From Empire to Nation and Kalman Silvert's Expectant Peoples: Nationalism and Development are examples of works that apply to nationalism and development, respectively, to the areas of Africa and Latin America.

Modernization is the focus of a third category of studies-on development. Examples of this type of literature include Marion J. Levy's Modernization and the Structure of Societies, an ambitious effort to apply structural-functionalism to a theory of modernization, and David Apter's The Politics of Modernization, a provocative attempt at model building. A fourth category comprises studies of change a prominent example being Samuel P. Huntington's Political Order in Changing Societies. The fifth category includes works critical of ethnocentric the-Dories of development, such as those mentioned above.

Criticism of these approaches emphasized their ethnocentrism and failure to address the lack of development in backward nations; instead the theories concentrated on solutions through the diffusion of capitalism and technology from the advanced to the less developed nations. Theorists focused on the Third World in order to work out a theory of underdevelopment The idea that the diffusion of capitalism promotes underdevelopment and not development in many parts of the world was embodied in Andre Gunder Frank's Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America (1967), Walter Rodney's How Europe Underdeveloped Africa (1972), and Malcolm Caldwell's The Wealth of Some Nations (1979). Theotonio dos Santos worked out the idea of the "new dependency" to explain

the traditional relationship of nations in these areas to the advanced capitalist countries, especially the United States; this form of dependency was especially characteristic of the multinational firms in the period after the Second World War. A variation of this theme appeared in Ruy Mauro Marini's notion of "subimperialism," a situation in which some Third World countries could serve as intermediaries for imperialist nations in the exploitation of other countries. Finally, Fernando Henrique Cardoso advocated the idea of associated dependent development, whereby some capitalist growth was possible in dependent countries. These ideas appeared as radical alternatives to the North American literature on development, but they eventually became absorbed into the mainstream of political science, despite the objections of Almond, Huntington, and some other comparatives who responded to criticism that had largely discredited their earlier theories.

Theories of development generally relate to the experience of the advanced nations. Thus traditional perspectives of development in the less developed nations usually assume the possibility of development everywhere; capital and technology might filter down from the advanced to the less developed nations. Diffusion of capitalism, it is believed, will resolve the problems of poverty, hunger, health and the like. After the Second World War however, it was clear that this approach was not resolving the problems of the less developed nations. The intellectual reaction that followed (principally from the less developed nations) included differing perspectives, both non-Marxist and Marxist.

The non-Marxist reaction sprang from the economists associated with the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA), under the aegis of Raul Prebisch of Argentina. Essentially ECLA accepted the proposition-that a new bourgeoisie, commercial and industrial in character, would emerge as a supporter of national interests in the face of foreign penetration into the domestic economies of the less developed nations. ECLA thus assumed a nationalist yet an anti-imperialist stance. ECLA, figuratively speaking, divided the world into an industrial center and a periphery producing raw materials and assumed that both could benefit from the maximizing of production, income, and consumption This bifurcation of the world kindled an interest in underdevelopment as well a in development. The writing of Celso Furtado, a Brazilian economist once active in ECLA, is representative of this approach.

Furtado criticized bourgeois neoclassical as well as Marxist theories in his Development and Underdevelopment . Furtado examined various trends in the development of the European industrial economy and noted that expansionism led to dualism—some structures characterize the capitalist system and others perpetuate the features of the previous precapitalist system. European industrial development manifested itself in various stages so that underdevelopment was not necessarily a stage in the formation of the modern capitalist economies Furtado then went on to analyze the structural causes of the external disequilibrium in the underdeveloped economies. Elaborating a contrasting perspective to traditional bourgeois theory, Furtado essentially favored autonomy as a solution to

national development. He opposed imperialism and foreign penetration into the domestic economy, but his approach did not embrace a Marxist framework.

Samir Amin, TheEgyptian scholar, who reminded us to look for understanding of development outside Eurocentric thinking, stressed Marx's "brilliant insight" about non-European societies, given the dearth of knowledge at the time Marx wrote. Amin argued that Marx foresaw that no colonial power would be able to preclude for long the local development of capitalism. With the rise of monopolies, however, the "development of capitalism in the periphery was to remain extraverted, based on the external market, and could therefore not lead to a full flowering of the capitalist mode of production in the periphery" .

Class Theories

Sometime during the mid-1960s, the SSRC's Committee on Comparative Politics decided to direct attention to studies of elites. During the 1950s Floyd Hunter and C. Wright Mills had concerned themselves with questions of power and who rules, but their work was attacked by Robert A. Dahl and others who relied on a pluralistic conception of politics. Weaknesses m a generation of community studies by political sociologists were exposed, and U.S. political scientists turned to the new field of urban politics. Comparative political scientists, however, tended not to be distracted altogether by the pluralist-elitist debates of the early 1960s. The rise of charismatic figures such as Fidel Castro and Kwame Nkrumah dramatized the need to study political leaders of the Third World. Then too, the failure of the parliamentary institutions to provide stability in the nations Of Asia, Africa, and Latin America prompted the study of elites. Elite theory, however, moved in several directions, somewhat influenced by the earlier work of Marx, Mosca, and Pareto. In the tradition of C. Wright Mills and G. William Domhoff, some theorists focused on power structure alone ignoring mass behavior. Other theorists pursued study along the lines of stratification analysis, outlined by sociologists, and Marxists turned to questions of class struggle .and an analysis of a ruling bourgeois class and a proletariat.

Comparativists moved in at least two directions. One tendency looked at masses in many nations, examples being Alex Inkeles and David Smith in Becoming Modern (1974) and Sidney Verba, Norman Nie, and Jae-on Kim in Participation and Political Equality (1978). Both endeavors emphasized the role of the individual rather than the elite, the former study being especially interested in how the relationship of the individual to the means of production determines his or her consciousness and the latter study delving into the extent to which a participant population is representative of a whole population. Another tendency turned to questions of class struggle and an analysis of particular social classes in an effort to formulate theory.

Theories of class stemmed from a number of traditions, including the attention to circulation of elites, evident in Vilfredo Pareto's Sociological Writings (1966); the idea 6f a governing class in Gaetano Mosca's The Ruling Class (1939); and the concern with ruling class in various works of Marx.

Among significant efforts to build on a Marxist approach were studies by Nicos Poulantzas in Political Power and Social Classes (1973), who emphasized the expanding role of the "new petty bourgeoisie" or service sector, and Erik Olin Wright in Class, Crisis and the State (1980) and Classes (1985), who called this group the "new middle class." Among the criticisms of this literature were the attention on power structure behavior; emphasis on stratification studies without examination of the economic, especially capitalist, basis of class; and undue stress en working class as agency changing conditions of capitalism and socialism when in fact other popular forces (ecological, feminist, pacifist, and so on) had emerged to push for reforms and changes.

A central premise of the class theory is that in every society a minority makes the major decisions. The origins of this theory are in Plato, but its elaboration is in the thought of two Italian political sociologists, Vilfredo Pareto and Gaetano Mosca.

Pareto (1966) emphasized distinctions between elites and non elites and downgraded Marx's emphasis on economic forces as well as Mosca's concern with organizational ability. Pareto referred to the idea of a circulation of elites, which seems to have two basic meanings. On the one hand, one elite may be replaced by another elite, as, for example, when aristocracies decay or regenerate. On the other, individuals circulate between two levels—a high stratum of elite and a low stratum of non elite. Pareto divided the high stratum into a governing class or elite (those who directly or indirectly govern) and a no governing elite (the rest of the elite who are not in government). Pareto clearly did not imply that the governing class or elite is a particular socioeconomic class, as in a Marxist context. At one point in his writings he argued that in the mass democratic state the governing class consists of a tacit alliance of entrepreneurs and their workers against fixed-income groups; the objective of the governing class or elite is to satisfy all clienteles.

Pareto did not relate his elite to social and economic classes. Apparently this reflects his concern with the ideas of Marx, which he "denatured" rather than contradicted; in his retort to Marx he transcended Marxist categories so that elite rule takes the place of class rule, and so on. Second, Pareto's concept of the governing class or elite is all-inclusive and is used to reveal a typology of regimes that are scarcely described. Nor are any criteria offered to explain the differences between the regimes. Pareto provided historical examples of the rise and decline of elites drawn exclusively from the Italian experience, when instead he might have synthesized a large number of cases in order to demonstrate regularity in the elite circulation of individuals and groups. Propositions are asserted, not supported, and generalizations appear to be readily invalidated by historical example.

Mosca differed slightly in his conceptions. The term elite is not emphasized in his writings. Instead he preferred such terms as political class, ruling class, and governing class. His conception of rule was similar to that of Pareto, however: "In all societies—from societies that are very meagerly developed and have barely attained the dawnings of civilization, down to the most advanced and powerful societies—two classes of people appear—a class that rules and a class that is ruled".

Mosca offered a number of propositions that relate to that conception of rule. First, the ruling class is less numerous, monopolizes power, and benefits materially. From its position, whereas the class that is ruled is more numerous and dominated. Second, if and when the masses are discontented, they can influence the policies of the ruling class. Third, the person at the head of the state cannot govern without the support of the masses, which are capable of deposing a ruling class. In the event that a ruling class is deposed, another organized minority within the masses has to assume the functions of the ruling class.

Mosca essentially recognized a circulation of classes or elites. An old class may be replaced by a new one. New groups may gain access to the ruling class whose ranks are open. Position in the ruling class is not necessarily determined by individual intellectual or moral qualities, as stressed by Pareto. More important is the rise of new interests and groups—for instance, in the development of a new source of wealth in a society, which may cause dislocations in the ruling class itself. Bottomore noted that this interpretation approximates Marxist thinking but that Mosca attempted to distinguish his theory from that of Marx by limiting an economic interpretation of history; in this regard Mosca was close to Weber's position. Although Mosca opposed Marxism and socialism, he also opposed democratic theory, which promised rule by the masses. He agreed with Montesquieu's revision of Aristotle's classification of government (monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies were replaced by absolute monarchies, limited monarchies, and republics), He argued that Aristotle's democracy was in fact an aristocracy with a broad base of members. Mosca's principal concern was that although a minority class rules in every society, upward mobility through various social strata leaves open the ranks of the ruling class. Thus circulation occurs through assimilation, cooptation, and other moderate changes; if these are denied, and then circulation may occur through rebellion, revolution, and other forms of violence.

Gramsci's notes on the state provide one basis for structuralist thought and have influenced Althusser and Poulantzas. Gramsci directed us toward a Marxist theory of politics. His emphasis on hegemony or dominance of some social group or class in power has prompted some critics to suggest he was advocating reformist interpretations or undialectically separating politics from economics. Gramsci tended to utilize categories of analysis, for example, in distinguishing between state and civil society, as did Hegel and Marx, in his early work Gramsci's conception of state is varied, however. Crises occur in the hegemony of the ruling class because it fails in some political undertaking and the masses become discontented and actively resistant. Such a crisis of hegemony is a crisis of authority or crisis of the state. Under such conditions a ruling class may seize control and retain power by crushing its adversaries. Gramsci examined this activity in terms of the experiences of Italy and other nations in Europe.

In his essay on ideology and the state, Althusser sketched Marx's representation of the structure of every society in terms of levels: infrastructure or economic base composed of productive forces and relations of production, on the one hand, and superstructure composed of politico-legal and

ideological aspects, on the other hand. Althusser referred to this representation as a spatial metaphor, that is, it remains descriptive, and he set forth a different formulation. Following Marx he conceived of the state as a repressive apparatus that permits the ruling classes to dominate over and exploit the working class. This apparatus includes the bureaucracy, police, courts, prisons, and the army, which intervenes in times of crisis. The state then is a force of repression and intervention that shields the bourgeoisie and its allies in the class struggle against the proletariat. Indeed the whole of the political class struggle revolves around the state. The objective of the class struggle concerns state power, for the proletariat must seize state power, destroy the bourgeois state apparatus, replace it with a proletarian state apparatus, and then in the end destroy the state itself.

Althusser thus distinguished between state power and repressive state apparatus, and he identified the structural elements of this state apparatus. In conjunction with the repressive state apparatus he alluded to a plurality of ideological state apparatuses, which appear to the observer in the form of distinct and specialized institutions, including the religious system of churches, schools, family, political parties, trade unions, communications, and cultural enterprises, These ' ideological state apparatuses operate generally in the private domain in contrast to the repressive state apparatuses, which are public. The former function pre-dominantly by ideology; the latter, by violence. Such diversity should not disguise the real unity of the ruling class, which holds state power and may utilize both the repressive and ideological state apparatuses. These conditions ensure the reproduction of relations of production through historical periods.

Module III

Federalism and Constitutionalism

Federalism

Federalism is quite common in modern world because many small nations very rightly feel that unless these combine together it shall not be possible for them to either defend themselves from outside aggression or economic development. But federations come into being under different situations and conditions and relations of central government in a federation, with its federating units vary from federation. Federation is a system in which powers are distributed between federating units of government on the one hand the central government on the other. In case there is no division of subjects and powers, the system can be called unitary.

Gradually and slowly, small states are realizing the necessity of coming together for collectively solving their common problems. These states are interested in surrendering only some powers without losing their identity altogether. Thus these authorize the central body to which they have agreed to join to confine themselves to certain limits and not to go beyond these. Both the central government as well as federating units in a federation act within their respective jurisdictions without outside interference. In some cases it is so arranged that the subjects are divided between central list and state list and some of the subjects are kept in the concurrent list. On these subjects both the centre as well as federating units can legislate but when a law passed by the central government conflicts with a law on a subject passed any federating the state on a subject mentioned in the concurrent list, it is former which prevails. In some cases more subjects are in the central list and vice versa hold well in some other cases. Usually residuary subjects i.e , subjects not mentioned in all three above mentioned lists are allocated to the centre. In some federations, however, these are retained by the states or federating units.

As against the common system of federalism in which federating units come together, these is also Indian type federal system. Usually in a federation, small independent and sovereign states decide to come together. These surrender some of their powers and a new central government comes into existence. But in India there was already a strong central authority and it was felt that the country being vast, it was not possible to rule effectively and purposefully from one Centre. It was, therefore, decided that the country should be divided into certain provinces. Whereas most of the powers were retained by central government, some of these were transferred to the newly created provinces or states, as these are now called.

In an ideal federation all powers flow from the constitution itself. Provisions of the constitution are blinding both on the Centre as well as the States. None is subordinate to the other, but both are cooperative and complementary. While defining federation Dicey has said, "A federal State is a political contrivance intended to reconcile national unity and power with the maintenance of State rights."

Federations can be weak as well as strong. A weak federation is one in which centre has for less powers as compared with the units. But when the Centre is stronger than the federation unit such a federal system is called quasi-federal system. For that matter India is called a quasi-federation. So was true of about erstwhile USSR federal system. Elements of centralization to a varying degrees are, however, present in every federation.

In a federal system there is no complete merging of federating units in the centre. As soon as federating units of a federation completely lose their identity then that does not remain a federation, but becomes unitary. In a federation there is always double set of governments. On the one hand is one set which runs and deals with the subjects mentioned in the central list whereas the other is responsible for dealing with subjects outlined in the state list. In decision making as well as policy formulation and implementation both the central government as well as governments of federating units are made participants. This system is opposed to Unitarianism:

In a federation central government as well as governments of federating units is neither dependent nor independent of each other.

Whole system works on cooperative and flexible basis. It is a system in between unitary system and loose association of sovereign states. It is a system in which there are several overlapping sub systems. Political decisions are taken and issues decided on the basis of bargaining power of the centre and the states. In modern federations the units are trying to dominate each other to the extent to which possibly they can. Each unit tries to dominate the Centre as well, if that can be done with some inconvenience even. There is increasing demand in some federations by the federating units that the federal government should not indirectly interfere in their affairs but more powers should be transferred from the centre to them.

Features of characteristics of federation

Federal system has its own features or characteristics. In this neither the central government nor the state governments derive their powers from each others. On the other hand both derive their powers from the constitution. In this way in every federation there is supremacy of constitution. Both look to the constitution for every matter. Since final source of authority is constitution itself, therefore, it cannot be based on conventions. It ought to be written. It is in the form of a treaty, provision of which can be referred at any time by any court of law.

Next important feature of a federal system is that it must be bicameral. It implies that the legislature should have two Houses. Whereas lower House is constituted on the basis of direct elections, the upper House consists of indirectly elected representatives of the people. It is in this House that proper representation is given to the states or federating units. Usually in federations Upper Houses enjoy very many powers, but in some cases these are not as powerful as the Lower Houses, as is the case in India.

Division of Powers is another feature of a federal system. All subjects are divided into three

categories namely the 'Central list', 'State list' and Concurrent list. It depends on the circumstances in which federation is to be created, whether Central list or State list should be heavily loaded. Again, it depends on the federation whether residuary powers should be vested with the central government or enjoyed by the federating units. Matters of national importance are, however, dealt by the centre and remaining by the states.

CONDITIONS ESSENTIAL FOR FEDERATION FORMATION

In our own times many federations have come into existence. This indicates that small states have thought it proper to come together rather than to remain in isolation. But there are certain factors which are conducive for the formation of federation. In case these factors exist, it can be presumed that chances for the creation of federation are bright.

One such factor is that units which wish to come together should be in a geographically contiguous area. In addition, units which intend to join a federation, should be very close to each other. It will be difficult for a federation to come into existence and work successfully if federating units are far away from each other. If federations in India, and the USA have succeeded so far it is primarily because the units are geographically closer to each other. Then another factor is that federating units should have common interests. This does not mean that there should not be any diversity. What is needed is that in that diversity there should be desire for unity. Thus in India is and erstwhile Soviet Union there was lingual, social and cultural unity and the outcome is successful working of federations.

Similarity of political and social ideas goes a long way in the formation of federation. In case federating units have dramatically opposite political and social ideas, there will always be conflicts and quarrels, thus creating i hindrance on the path smooth working of all institutions. It is very essential that both in the federating units and at the Centre there should have same torn of government

It is always good for a federation that in the units there should be t wide geographical inequality. Of course, it is difficult to have units which are exactly of equal size or density of population. But what is needed is that as far as possible these should be equal. In case there is inequality when the federation comes into existence then no distinction should be maintained and all should be treated equal in all matters, as is the case with the USA where all states irrespective of any other consideration are given equal representation in the Senate. Any distinction is likely to create dissatisfaction in the units whisk cannot be in the interest of federation.

A federation will work successfully only if the units which join it are economically at the same level. In case some are very rich and the other very poor, in the long run these may not smoothly pull on with each other. The system may collapse after some time. But if after joining the federal central authority takes deliberate steps for removing the imbalances by rapid development of the weak areas and succeeds in that then the federation may be saved from break up. It is always in the interest of the federation that all imbalances should be removed, if it is desired that federal arrangement should be lasting.

Economic resources to play their part in successful working and in fact in the formation of a federation. In a federation double sets of governments are to be maintained. In addition, economic development of vast area is to be ensured. All this can be possible only if the federation has good economic resources. If needed resources are not available, then there may not be desired development and the federation may break in disgust.

Political awakening also contributes in successful working federalism. If the people are sufficiently politically awakened, it is only then that they can make the working of federation a success. They will then come to know how far they are responsible to the centre, what can be there the contribution to the federation and so on.

Federation can be a success on the availability of political leadership it will become strong and stable if leaders have national image. They are known for their love for the nation and their views have national acceptability. On the other hand, if the leadership is regional and has left an impression for as partiality then that federation is not likely to flourish and prosper Spirit of patriotism, love for nationalism and national integration are other positive factors which contribute towards federalism. In case after the federation the people still continue to love their region and do not develop feelings of national integration, then that federal system may not for a long time. It also depends on leadership i.e., how far by its behaviour and action, it is in a position to wipe out the feelings of regionalism and inculcate those of nationalism and national integration.

Success of federalism also depends on the attitude which it develops towards federalism. In a federation where there are feelings of competition, coercion, rigidity and negation between the centre and units, that federation is bound to face many difficulties. On the other hand, if federal system from the very beginning is developed in a manner that there is cooperation, persuasiveness, flexibility and positive approach to each problem, then that up is bound to last long and that is surely for the good of both the centre and states.

Of course, these days there is trend towards centralisation and centralism. Central government in one way or the other always tries to grab more powers. It is because both national and international problems are so increasing day-by-day that powers are invariably needed to deal with these. If a federation is to work successfully for that it is essential that both centre and the states should appreciate the position. Whereas the federating should not resist any encroachment on their rights when avoidable, the central government should not unnecessarily try to grab more powers than are absolutely unavoidable.

Mill has laid sufficient stress on the amount of Sympathy for the success of federation. In his own words, "The sympathies available for the purpose are those of race, language, religion and above all, of political institutions, as conducive most to a feeling of identity of political interests."

Centralism in federal systems

Federations are created under some arrangement by which federating surrender some of their powers

to the Centre. These give up minimum right whereas retain the maximum. Accordingly central governments in the rations should ordinarily be weak. But experience has shown that there is trend towards centralism in all federations. There is a continuing and ongoing tendency towards centralism. Some of the important causes which have led towards centralism include outbreak of wars, increasing national and international tensions, economic depression, concept of welfare state, tendency towards nationalisation of industries and failure of the federating to solve their economic and social problems, etc. These are such 'problems which, by and large, do not concern one federating unit but all the units and need both coordinated and planned efforts for finding out so only at national level.

Founding fathers of U.S. Constitution did not wish that the centre should be as strong as now it has become, but in that both the courts of law subsequent constitutional amendments have made the centre very powerful. Central government has started participating in regional affairs, is exercising financial control and is engaged in national enforcement of policy of equality. By XVI Constitution Amendment central government in that country powers to levy and collect taxes direct from the federating states without appointment to any state. The central government did not enjoy this before the passing of this Constitutional Amendment Act. This has made it strong in financial matters. In fact, the Supreme Court in that country almost always interpreted the Constitution in such a way that centre could more powers, than what the constitution fathers intended to give it.

In the USA central government has been exercising more and control in financial matters. In 1937 in that country it got the power to protect the rights of the workers when Supreme Court upheld National Labour Relations Act in that year. Securities Act of 1938 gave central government powers to have control over financial affairs and subsequently several Acts were passed by it which upheld its control over financial matters. Today central government in that country controls housing and education, which constitution fathers never thought of leaving to its care. By upholding promoting policy of equality between the White and the Negroes the central government got powers to intervene even in many affairs, which were hitherto not within its purview.

This tendency of centralism is found in Switzerland too. Now new area are coming under the jurisdiction of central government. In fact since 1874 there is a visible tendency towards centralism in that country. In 1947, centre in that country got wide economic powers to deal with economic affairs.

Not only in Switzerland but this tendency is also found in Australia Like the USA in that country to the Supreme Court has helped centralisation process. The centre has powers to control inter-state commerce and foreign affairs. It has also got powers to control monopolies and trade by sea, land and air and to protect the interests of workers. There is a mark decline in the powers of the states in that country.

In Canada, too also one finds tendency of centralism. The country there has shown a trend towards centralisation from the very beginning. In federation residuary powers are already vested in the centre. The British North American Act empowered the dominion Parliament to make laws for peace

and good Government of the country. But Privy Council in that country has held that by this clause the government should not try to encroach upon the jurisdictions of the provinces. In that country Privy Council up to 1931 usually tried to restrict rather than increase the powers of the central government. It was after that year that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council tried to enlarge the scope of activities of the central government. In 1940, the powers of the Dominion Parliament in economic matters were considerably increased.

Tendency of centralism in almost every federation increases during difficult times like war, floods, devastations, national calamities and so on. During these difficult times federating units willingly and happily surrender their many rights, because every unit feels its security in danger and looks towards the centre for its very existence. In those days unified direction, planned action and command is needed which can be provided only by one central authority.

Federal systems: A Comparative analysis

There is no doubt that usually there is a trend towards centralisation in federalism. It will, however, be interesting to compare federal systems in at least three countries, namely, in USA where there is capitalist system of economy, erstwhile Soviet system in which there was socialist system and Switzerland which believes in neutrality. In all the three countries federal system in varying degree was/is in practice. Swiss federation is, however, commonly known as confederation. In the USA it is provided that the States after joining the federation shall not enter into any treaty or alliance with any foreign power. Similarly it will not be legal for any State to keep troops or to sign any military agreement or to get engaged in any war, unless invaded suddenly by any foreign power. In that country and for that matter in every federation conduct of defense and foreign affairs is considered the responsibility of the central government.

In Switzerland Cantons cannot declare war or conclude peace or sign any other military pact with any foreign power. This prerogative has been given only to the central government.

In erstwhile USSR the position was, however, different. In that country Union Republics, which were units of federation of that country, had been authorised by the constitution to exchange diplomats and conduct their own foreign policy. The Republics too had their own military formations. It was under these provisions of the Constitution that Ukraine and ByloRussia became members of the UNO. But everyone knew that in that country that it was all in theory. In actual practice every Republic followed policies in the central government both in national and international affairs.

Next then comes the question of secession. Federating units of a federation join a federal system on their own. Before their becoming a partner in federal system these units enjoy an independent and almost sovereign status. But in the constitution of federations it is always provided that federation is eternal. In the USA it has been settled once for all after civil war that no State of the US federation will have any right to break away from the federation. The Supreme Court of the USA several times has confirmed that federation is not destructible.

The Constitution of Switzerland also does not provide for secession of any Canton from the federation.

USSR Constitution had, however, provided that Union Republics could secede from the federation if these so desired. But this right was only in theory and not in practice. Before disintegration of mighty USSR no Republic ever attempted or thought of breaking away from the federation. Not only this, but there were no chances of their breaking away as well. It was due to several reasons, e.g :

(a) Communist party network both at the Centre as well as in the State was very strong.

(b) No unit in the federation could adopt any other system except socialist system of government.

(c) Central government in the Soviet Union was very strong and powerful.

(d) The workers spread all over the country were not prepared to tolerate any idea about breaking away from the Centre.

(e) It was believed that any movement which weakened central government was capitalist inspired and must be crushed.

One common characteristic or feature of all the three federations (i.e. including erstwhile USSR) is that in each there is bicameral system of legislature. Not only this, but in the legislative states, which constitute the federation, have been given equal representation in the Upper-House. Thus in U.S. Senate each state is authorised to send only two representatives irrespective of the size of the State. Similarly in Switzerland in the Council of States each full Canton can send two and half Canton only one representative. In the soviet Union in the erstwhile Soviet of Nationalities which was Upper House of that country's Supreme Soviet each Union Republic was represented by 32 Deputies, whereas Autonomous Republic was represented by eleven and Autonomous Region by five and autonomous area by one representative only. In this way uniformity in representation had been maintained in that country as well.

In a federation it is desired and in fact it is one of important features of the federation that there should be separate and independent judiciary. It is supposed to be above the influence of the executive and the legislature. It is given the power of judicial review, under which it can declare any law passed by the legislature as ultra wires of the constitution. It is supposed to be a balancing wheel between the centre and the federating units. In the USA Supreme Court has been given power of judicial review. It is the highest court in the country and can listen appeals from the lower courts.

In Switzerland, Federal Tribunal is the highest court of appeal. It can listen to appeal in all matters both federal and cantonal.

In the erstwhile Soviet Union there were two sets of courts, one of federal and other of the States. But in that country there was practically single set of court and the Supreme Court and Prosecutor General combined all judicial powers and influenced judiciary and judicial process in a very powerful

and effective manner. In the country, however, the Supreme Court had no right to interpret any provision of the constitution. This power was vested in the Supreme Soviet.

In so far as Switzerland is concerned, that is land of direct democracy. In that country whenever any problem about interpretation of any provision of the constitution arisen, either the people take the initiative or the government arranges referendum. In this way this power virtually vests in the people and not in the courts.

Federations come into being after reaching an agreement as to what is to be surrendered to the centre and what is to be retained by the units. There is thus very clear division of powers between the centre and states. Subjects on which each can legislate are listed as 'Centre list', 'State list', and 'Concurrent list'. It is on the subject mentioned in the last mentioned list that both centre and states can enact, but when there is a clash between the two laws on a subject mentioned in the concurrent list, it is Central law that prevails. Residuary powers in some cases are left with the centre, while in others with the units. In the USA and Switzerland residuary powers are with the states and same was the case with erstwhile USSR. But in spite of this, due to various reasons and under different arrangements, central governments in each federation are getting more powers than the governments of the units

EFFECTIVENESS OF FEDERALISM

Whether federation is strong or weak, a question which needs attention and consideration is whether it is effective or not. For measuring its effectiveness some yardsticks have been laid by D. Duchaek in his treatise, 'The Comparative Federalism', According to him what is to be seen in this regard is to which extent federation is in a position, to successfully maintain its relations at diplomatic level with other states. Then it is to be seen, whether it has or has not effective and full control over national defense and to which extent it is forced to depend on the federating units in this regard.

Then it is to be seen whether both in letter and spirit the federation is indestructible or not. If any attempts are made by the units to secede from the federation and if so what support these get from the people and organisations.

Do the people accept authority of the central government willingly or happily without outside interference and if not to which extent support of individuals, groups and organisations is needed for getting that accepted. If such assistance is needed to which extent again these individuals and groups are within the influence of central government.

Federations come into being as a result of some arrangement, which is reflected in the constitution. Continuance of federation very much depends on respect and stability of this document. To which extent and in which manner constitution can be amended and whether the unit or the centre has supreme authority for its amendment, on that also depends effectiveness of the federation.

Then another yardstick can be whether the units have collective sharing system in executive and judiciary and if so in what way and in what manner It is also to be seen whether the units are being

given equal representation in one of the two Houses of the legislature at the centre or not.

Duchaek is of the view that for measuring federation's effectiveness it is to be seen whether there is a single set of courts or a double one. It is also to be seen as to what are the powers of the courts. Has it been so arranged that these inspire confidence of the units about protection of their rights. It is also to be seen as to what is the balancing role of the Supreme Court in Centre- State affairs.

Another important point to be examined is whether the Supreme Court or Federal Court has the power of judicial review and can declare, on the representation of federating units, as a law passed by the central government as ultra wires of the constitution, if it so feels. It is also to be seen how far the courts are above the influence of central authorities and also both the executive and the legislature.

Still another factor is whether the central government has exercised only those powers which constitution gave to it or has tried to snatch powers which were legitimately with the federating units. In case there is tendency towards centralism, then to which extent federating units have resisted this temptation or willingly agreed to such a tendency.

Last yardstick which he has provided is whether the federating units have clear and demarcated boundaries and if so, to which extent the central government has power and authority to change those boundaries and make territorial adjustments. In case central government has such powers and can boundaries of a state or unit then nature of federation is different when it has no such powers.

Types of federation

Federations can broadly be placed under two categories namely Unitarian and cooperative. A Unitarian federation is one in which there is too much of tendency for centralisation of authority in centre, irrespective of the fact whether the units which have joined the federation like that or not Such a tendency becomes quite visible in judicial pronouncements and legislative measures of the Parliament. In some cases federating units reconcile themselves to this tendency, while in others do not. When there is too much of suspicion and misunderstanding on the part of federating units then at times very existence of the federation is jeopardised and its disintegration become imminent. It then becomes very difficult to save the situation. If the of disintegration are strong and there is any attempt to resist their demand of secession, recourse to violence and other pressure exerting measures is taken. In this way either the demands of disintegrating forces are accepted or the federation gets disintegrated and there is break down.

As against this there is cooperative federalism. In this federal system too there are all the characteristics or features of a federation. But both the t as well as the units has keen desire to cooperate with each other. At every level of administration, there perfect understands. No unit keeps itself completely away from other units. There is no diversity of regulation dances of disintegration are reduced to the minimum. In order to have cooperation inter-governmental cooperative agencies are set up. In Australia there are inter-Provincial Conferences and also State Primaries and Prime Minister frequently meets with each. In these financial and constitutional matters are discussed and

problems, if any, are settled. In the in this regard Governor's Conferences hold an important position. In constitution has mentioned that India is a Union of States and there perfect understands. Meetings between the President and State Governors, Chief Ministers with the Prime Minister, central and slate ministers are periodically held. Meetings are held by the Planning Commission in which centre and state governments, actively participate. In India inter-state zonal councils and several high level commissions have been set up to assess the needs of state governments in different walks of life.

Federal centrism and federal system

There is an increasing tendency towards federalism in almost every federation. This tendency increases when there is war or the nation is faced a situation of economic depression. It is felt that only a strong and powerful central government can solve these problems. Moreover, in most of the state because of policy of nationalism and in the name of welfare activities central government tries to encroach more and more powers. When there is poverty and unemployment or sudden outbreak of diseases, then also government is given more power to solve these national problems.

Moreover experience has shown that usually state government has not been in a position to cope efficiently with the subjects which have been allotted to them. It is because these have not very efficient and adequate. Available staff is not provided adequate training for handling the job allotted to it. Thus in the face of public criticism when centre tries to intervene justify its actions, the units' just keep quiet and find themselves in a position helplessness.

Then another cause of centralism in federations all along has beer role of technocrats. They are appointed and paid by the central government. They formulate policies and programmes under its directions and finalised these are required to be implemented by the federating units. They so formulate policies that central interests are protected more than those of the federating units.

Powers of federating units are considerably curtailed on account control of the purse by the central government, which decides to give grand in-aid to the federating units. Since these units are always short of finance, therefore, they are to depend on the centre. Perforce these enact rules formulate policies in a way that these are approved by the centre so that finances become available.

In increasing the importance of the centre and for federal centralise party politics too has played a great role. A national party which controls governments both at the centre as well as in the states can result in more centrism than when party control is weak. It is party which decides the candidates for the elections. Again it decides what policies and programms should be followed both by the central government and the governments of the federating units. This control by the political parties is strong and effective weapons in the hands of central government in reducing the powers of this state government. This is quite clear in India and was so in erstwhile Soviet Union.

Now a question which is quite often posed is whether this tender towards centralism is dangerous for federation and will federal system come to an end after some time if the tendency continues ? It is argued that since federation functions on the basic principle that in it units want to come together for

unity and do not wish to end their autonomy and if the tendency continues then the whole federal structure will end up in a unitary system. & federations in those case governments are reduced to the status. Administrative units of the central government or what is sometimes called glorified municipalities. Carl. J. Friedrich has said about American federal system that the procedures and exigencies of a compact and highly industrialised national economy one day might force the people of that country to abandon federal pattern. Salt as well as W.F. Willoughby are of the view that if this tendency towards federalism continues, then one day the whole system will fade away. They therefore, feel that the future of federalism is in the dark.

But on the other hand, Wheare does not agree to this viewpoint. Some time back he said that in spite of the fact that tendency towards federalism has been continuing for a very long time, yet so far no federation has disintegrated. But he is not true today because erstwhile USSR has now disintegrated. He then very strongly defended existing system of federations. According to him federalism will come to an end only when there is not a single function which falls exclusively either under the control of the central or the regional government and that situation is not likely to arise in any federation. He was fully well aware of the problems of federalism and accepted that there was increasing tendency towards federalism, but at the same time he argued that federalism should be seen both in theory and also in practice and that both should not be confused with each other. In his own words, "It is not enough that the federal principle should be embodied predominantly in the written Constitution of the country. That is something, but it is no guarantee necessarily that a system of federal government will operate. What determines the issue is the working of the system."He also does not agree with the critics that war, economic crisis and financial difficulties are responsible for ending federal system. According to him these can make the mischief provided such calamities as wars and diseases or devastations and floods frequently occur. Since these do not and once after long intervals, therefore, these cannot be a threat of federalism.

Again he does not believe that taking over welfare services can be a potential threat to federalism, because if such services are left at the disposal of the regional government for administration, there will be much less attention to these, then what is received by these when under the charge of federal government.

As regard financial difficulties of the regional governments, which have been highlighted by the critics, he is of the view that these can be solved by re-allocating financial resources and thus this too does not pose a threat to federalism.

Wheare is of the view that if there is continuing political and economic unrest, then alone it can be said that federal system and structure is in danger and not otherwise. States in every federation, according to him, are maintaining their rights and strongly defending these. These are conscious of their existence and so long the consciousness exists there cannot be end of federalism. When the central government in any federation has tried to unnecessarily encroach upon the powers of federating units, as happened in Australia, when there was demand by Western and Southern States

for secession, that type of demand everywhere is bound to arise. Similarly a Canadian federation similar demand was made by Prairie and Manure provinces.

Then what is the future of federalism? Many feel that it is dark tendencies of centralism are bound to change present federalism into unitary states. On the other hand, many others feel that there is no danger c federalism. Federating units very much realise that it is not within their competence to deal with even increasing and ever growing complex national and international problems. Of course, this debate in the academic circles will continue but future of federalism very much depends on the willingness of tin people to remain in the federation or to leave that. Federations come into existence as an agreement of the federating units. There is no compulsion for any unit for joining a federation. As long as the people feel that they are happy with the arrangement, they will continue in that. No sooner do they feel that arrangement is not acceptable to them, they will leave and federal structure will collapse. In this way most important factor which is likely to endanger federations and federalism is not centralism but non-desire of the people to continue with federal arrangement.

Constitutionalism

Concept of constitutionalism is something new, or that it is the outcome of the thinking of our modern political thinkers - scientists, but that is not so. Idea of constitutionalism in one form or the other can be traced back to the good old Greek days. In those days there was system of city state with the institutions of direct democracy operating in most r e states. It was in those days that both Plato and Aristotle gave the idea of an ideal state and discussed the functions of each organ of the government. There the state was made the most powerful, but at the same time; philosopher tag was required to work within certain restraints.

After Greek came the Romans, under whom city states had no place. They believed in the concept of empire building. Under them constitutions, which consisted of mass of precedents, were simply enacted and reduced in writing. Monarchy was common form of government at that time. It was in about 500 B.C. that in place of monarchy the system of republics with elected consuls was introduced. An attempt was also made to codify laws and some institutions of representative government were set up. Certain procedures were laid down which decided the relationship of the rulers with the ruled.

Next stage came with the fall of the Roman Empire, which resulted in feudalism. In that small and big feudal lords came to power and tried to establish their supremacy. The authority of the king considerably weakened and there was a struggle between the church and the king. Whereas the king claimed that he was both religious and temporal head of the state, religious leaders and church fathers believed that he had nothing to do with religion. Not only this, but being temporal head he was bound to work under direction, supervision and control of religious leaders. But common practice in those days was that the king was to take an oath in the presence of religious leaders and his own subjects, in which he accepted that he drew his authority from them and as such he was not to cross limits put on

his authority.

But even then the monarchs acted in the way they liked. Some believe in the theory of Divine Rights of Kings. For them it was just not rational to think of any limitations on their power and authority. They believed that there was nothing like constitution and constitutionalism. They considered themselves as the deputies of God on earth. This came to an end only when national movements started in some of European countries and the people began to feel that the king was much below the state. They got awakened and began to demand that the monarch should work within certain limits and under several limitations. In other words it was the end of medieval age and beginning of the modern.

With Renaissance and Reformation movements new awakening can among the people. Evils which had come to stay in religion and church were focused before the public and efforts were made to end these. Pubic conscience was touched and in this way supremacy of the papacy was brought to an end, but that of sovereign still continued. Machiavelli very loud claimed that there should not be any restrictions on absolute authority of the king. According to him the king knew no constitution and as such there was nothing like constitutionalism.

Concept of constitutionalism

Constitutionalism as a concept is drawing more and more attention peoples of the world. They everywhere believe that the subjects should have certain rights and that the state should not be allowed to exceed or cross its allotted limits. But concept of constitutionalism is not uniform for the peoples and nations all over the world. It varies from Western to Communist world and is something different for developing nations, as compared with the developed nations.

In the western world constitutionalism to a degree is related to a form of government *i.e.,* democracy which is to be seen both in parliamentary or presidential systems. According to them constitution is both a means as well end for giving liberty to the people. The provisions of the constitution discuss functions of several organs of the government on the one hand and government as a whole on the other. These also provide guidelines for achieving the objectives as well. A constitution can be both in the form of a document as is the case with India as well as assemblage of customs and old institutions as found in England. The rules can both be written as well as unwritten. They view constitutionalism from one angle namely the observance of the laws. They wish to ensure that constitution so operates that areas of civilised government are well preserved and not unnecessarily transgressed. For them it is the duty of the government to realise that the ideals as embodied in the constitution are achieved and also that each organ of government functions within prescribed frame work and follows certain well defined procedures. From constitutionalism it is also understood that change in a political system is brought by peaceful means and methods and that freedom of press is guaranteed and rule of law is always upheld. The system thus holds constitution in high esteem.

In erstwhile Soviet Union constitutional system had different approach altogether different concept of

constitutionalism. In that country constitution was supposed to promote a particular political ideology. It was an instrument for adopting certain ideological ends. The constitution then did not at limiting the powers of the state or any of its organs though in theory functions of each organ had been clearly specified. It aimed at ensuring that enemies of socialism were destroyed. Their concept of constitutionalism closely linked with their political ideology. It was based on the principle of class struggle, dialectical materialism and so on. In this concept policy of party and not the constitution which was supreme. Soviet Union constitution then clearly stated that Communist party of the country is vanguard of the nation's freedom struggle. In China constitution has been called as party manifesto. Thus Chinese go to the other extreme in constitutionalism. Even now Communist World does not believe that it is with the help of parliamentary democracy that constitutionalism can be preserved, according to them in fact this form of government is a big sham. It is a system of government in which interest of exploiters but not those of the exploited are protected. They applaud their system as the one in which masses are actually associated with every organ of government.

Next then come the developing countries, which are yet to establish their uniform and universal concept of constitutionalism. They have failed do so because their problems are several and they are not finding it easy to solve these. Some of the problems faced by them are:

1. These countries are yet traditional and as such these are establish a healthy combination between modernism traditionalism, which these have not been in a position to do as it seems difficult whether in the near future they will be capable giving up their traditionalism.

2. Under their peculiar circumstances it has not been possible them to establish as to which extent it is possible for them to give to their people safety on the one hand and to make state supreme on the other. They are thus struggling about the sphere of state activity and problems of rights and duties of citizens.

3. Developed countries in many cases have not achieved political stability. In many countries frequent changes have come in form of government. These have also witnessed military *coups*. Thus constitutionalism too has been tossing from time to time these countries.

4. The peoples of these states due to ignorance and illiteracy have not enjoyed the fruit of liberty given to them in the constitution. In way constitutionalism has no effective meaning for them.

5. In many countries political leadership has not clearly worded ideology in the letters of the constitution. They have remained undecided about the form of government.

Except few countries like India, which have clearly defined liberty and equality as objectives of the state and have also provided constitutional and legal provisions for their attainment, on the whole constitutionalism as concept is yet to develop in third world countries.

Strength of constitutionalism

Concept of constitutionalism, as already said, varies from society to society. Whereas Western societies have different concept from the Eastern, the developing societies are yet to develop that. Strength of constitutionalism by and large can, however, be measured with the help of four factors: namely, *(a)* Basic Rights and Liberties; *(b)* Constitutional jurisdiction (c) Independence of judiciary and *(d)* Decentralisation of Power.

Basic Rights and Liberties: In western world constitutionalism is measured in terms of liberties which a state gives to its people and the way in which these are defended in actual practice. Though for the first time these were embodied in a written constitution in the American Bill of Rights, today these are incorporated almost in every constitution. It is the desire of the people that the state should not touch these. These have had been incorporated in the constitutions of even Communist states like China and erstwhile USSR. In developing Afro-Asian countries there is an increasing demand that political and economic liberties must be guaranteed and that both should go hand in hand. Though the people for some time did not properly appreciate the value and importance of these rights, but with the experience of working of dictatorship and totalitarianism in practice, in some parts of world where political, economic and every other freedom is all along denied; value and worth of these rights and liberties is being increasingly appreciated and felt.

Some of the rights and liberties which are quite often given to citizens are freedom of speech and expression, freedom from arrest, security of life, liberty and property, etc. But now emphasis is gradually shifting towards such rights which help in personal expression and cultural development. But in every developing society these days the people demand right of participation in political processes, freedom of press, freedom to form association and arbitrary arrest, on the one hand and that of having right to hold assembly and so on, on the other.

Constitutional Jurisdiction : *From constitutional jurisdictions* mean a system under which 'the courts of law have the power of judicial review to ensure that other organs of government remain within their constitutional jurisdictions. In other words in this system the courts are competent to ensure the observance of provisions of the constitution. This jurisdiction is particularly important in a federal system where it is absolutely necessary to delimit the jurisdiction of both the centre as well as of the federating states. Constitutional jurisdictions can be studied with some interest in the light of experiences gained in West Germany, Switzerland and the USA. In these countries the courts can uphold both individual and group rights depending on the situation, which have been guaranteed by the constitution. These decide a conflict between ordinary law and the constitutional law and the extent to which both contradict each other. These also help in deciding relationship between different organs of the government on the one hand and minorities and majorities on the other.

As against democratic states, there are totalitarian states which do not believe in limiting state power or authority. These do not believe in the system of judicial review, as according to them it means

undermining sovereignty of legislature, which represents the will of the people. In these states it becomes difficult to have any constitutional jurisdictions because ruling party wants to have concentration rather than decentralisation of power

In France, by and large, it is believed that sovereignty vests in the Assembly which expresses the will of the people and that sovereignty is inalienable. In England there are several institutional traditions rather than any written law which divides functions of three organs of government. In that country to the courts have no right to protect the rights of the people.

Independence of Judiciary: Another feature or related factor of constitutionalism is 'independence of judiciary'. Under this system courts are not treated as organs of government for the implementation of state laws and policies. These are empowered to frame their own rules and regulations for their working. In this system by giving guarantee of tenure, high salaries and by similar other protections it is so arranged that the judges can function independently. It is believed that for limiting the functions of the executive and the legislature it is the minimum guarantee that the judiciary should be independent. In a welfare state, activities of the government are so wide spread that the citizens find themselves helpless from high handedness of both the executive and the legislature in case there is no independence of judiciary.

Though democratic states by and large believe in the independence of judiciary, yet these too are faced with their own problems. First major problem is that after all in the judiciary those who are to protect the people from high handedness are human beings. They too have their preconceived notions and prejudices. It is really very difficult to do away with these, because human weakness is universal.

Then another difficulty is that in the legislature there are group and class interests and every law is enacted to serve these interests. Usually every law protects, social, economic and political interests of some group or party, though that is enacted in the name of the state as a whole.

Still another difficulty is that usually judges also come from elite group. They enjoy the support of either some social or economic group or even of the both. They have been educated and developed in particular environments and view the problems from a particular angle which may not be suited to the poor or weaker sections of society, which they claim to protect.

Then another problem with independence of judiciary is that the courts try to become third chambers of legislature. Judges are supposed to be impartial while deciding issues. But issue that comes before them is either political or economic or social in nature. By interpreting these in a way in which government does not wish these to be interpreted, judges try to change economic and political policies of the government and that way they play the role of third chamber, which is disliked by many in the state.

Problem of independence of judiciary in a democratic state becomes serious when the courts are called upon with the help of writs, *etc.,* to either review basic policy issues or constitutional

provisions *e.g.,* Fundamental Rights and Privileges of Members of Parliament. When such a situation arises in which interests of few elite groups are effected, pressure groups exert themselves, with the result that they try to influence decisions of the judiciary. If the judges are thus influenced that is not good for the health of the society.

Decentralisation of Powers: In constitutionalism lastly then comes decentralisation of power. In every form of government to some extent there is some sort of division of powers. This used to be the system to some extent even in the past because central government did not find itself abides to cope with heavy work load. Today, more particularly in federations, there is clear division of powers between the centre and the federating units resulting in decentralisation of power Even unitary governments try to mostly concentrate on national issues and local affairs are left to the care of local bodies. These days' local bodies are trying to become more independent and autonomous. Now it is believed that division of subjects is very essential because local self government units are needed for training future legislators. In addition, the people sitting in the central legislature do not properly| understand local problems, which can be better understood and solved by the people on the spot. These are counter balance against over centralisation am tyranny of the centralised authority.

Local self government institutions in England, the USA, and Franc function on somewhat different lines. In England and the USA local se government officials work independent of the central government. Even they are supposed not to indulge and infuse politics in these institutions. On the other hand in France, Perfect who enjoys maximum autonomy within his own area, is political agent of central administration.

But local self institutions are faced with a serious problems in working; namely, too much interference of politics. Elections of local bodies are contested not on the basis of local but national issues. Each election is considered as trial of strength by political parties and thus every major and minor political party gets completely involved in that. After the elections over, political bosses try to control local self institutions from above, making decentralisation virtually meaningless.

Decentralisation of authority and power has also been threatened increasing urbanisation and industrialisation. This trend has resulted in migration of population from rural to urban areas and in the formation of big metropolitan areas, growth of shanties, resulting in health hazards and creating law and order problem. This has considerably reduced the importance of local self institutions.

Module IV

A survey on Rule making, Rule application and rule adjudication functions

Effective and efficient governance is the exception of every civilized society. This role is performed by the government which is one of four essential elements of the state. No state is possible without a government which not only provides security to the people, but also looks after their basic needs and ensures their socio-economic development. A government is a set of institutions that exercises control through legal devices and impose penalties on those who break the law. Social acceptance of the power of the government to control people must be accepted by the people voluntarily recognised by them. A government normally functions by dividing its functions between its organs, with each organ performing some specific functions. It primarily performs three main functions i.e. law making, enforcing the laws and adjudicating disputes.

There are three organs of a government- the legislature which make laws, the executive which implements them, and the judiciary which interprets laws and decides disputes. The organs of the government are so structured that they can adequately perform the functions required of them. This system of dividing powers among the three organs of a government is called "separation of powers". This political tradition most of prevalent in the U.S, there, the Congress makes the laws, the president administers them and the supreme court along with other federal courts, interprets them and imparts justice. The three branches of a government are independent of one another. The legislature should comprise the people's representatives, since they perform the most important duty of making the laws by which the people are to be governed. Thus efforts are made to secure a fair and wide representation of people in the legislature. The executive implements the laws made by the legislature. It is therefore, necessary that the executive should comprise competent and efficient people. The third organ of the government, judiciary, interprets the laws and decides cases in accordance with the laws and the constitution.

Rule making

Legislature in the field of comparative politics is technically Known as the rule making department. Legislature most commonly known by the name of parliament forms the first important organ of a political organisation. The word parliament, which originally meant 'a talk' is derived from the 'parles' and the Latin word 'Parliamenuni' framing laws is the most important function of the present day legislatures and they are often known by the quality of their legislation. However, today, the normative interpretations describing legislatures as a 'mirror of a nation' embodiment of the general will of the community.

Representation of people

In modern states, direct democracy, as it functioned in Greek city states, is impossible. Therefore, people in a democracy elect their own representativeness to perform the tasks of the government.

Representation, is actually, "the process through which the attitudes, preferences, view points and desires of the entire citizenry or a part of them are, with their expressed approval, shaped into government action on their behalf by a smaller number among them, with binding effect upon those represented". The legislature are supposed to reflect public opinion. Elections are held periodically in order to register changes. Devices like reservation of seats or functional representation are also adopted for certain section of the population who do not get fair representation. For example in India, seats are reserved for scheduled castes/Tribes in the legislatures as well as in the bureaucracy.

In a parliamentary democracy, the executive is elected by the people and it is the legislature which claims to represent the sovereign will of the people. Even in non-democratic states, the executive seeks to real on a body of people who it thinks, can express popular wishes.

Organisation of legislature-Unicameral and Bicameral

Legislatures are either unicameral or bicameral. The issue of bicameralism has however, gained more importance. A unicameral legislature has only one chamber based upon popular representation and is responsible for the entire function of law making. Unicameral legislatures exist in some countries such as New zealand, Denmark, Filand and china. It also existing in some of the Indian states like Punjab, Haryana, Orissa and Kerala.

A bicameral legislatures consists of two chambers (A) The upper and (B) The lower chamber. The lower chamber is generally more popular in character and has a greater say law making. The lower houses are directly elected as in India , UK, France, Germany, etc. Upper houses are also directly elected in some countries such as senate in the United States. In Britain, members of the upper house, the House of Lords, are nominated. In India, the upper chamber, the Raja Sabha, is indirectly elected. In a bicameral legislature, there is a lot of party politics and the process of law making is much more complex, since both the house has to give their assent to the bills. The federating units have their representatives in the upper chambers, which enables them their view point's also to be represented in the parliament, and which also enables them to safeguard their rights. A bicameral legislature easily manages to maintain balance between the centre and the federating units, which is very essential for the successful functioning of the federal system.

In some upper chambers (as in India), there is also provision for giving representation to learned and well - known individuals, to represent literature, on the whole , can benefit from their experience and wisdom. The upper chambers, in fact, can act as a check upon the popularly elected lower chambers. However, in actual practice, it is very difficult to say if the upper chambers are really more sober, less partisan or better guardian of states.

Functions of legislature

The places and significance of the rule making bodies, from a functional point of view varies from the 'sovereign' English parliament to the non-sovereign supreme soviet of the erstwhile USSR or from the powerful American Congress to the 'powerless' Courte of Spain- a body 'supinely

acquiescing in the will of ruler' while taking a synthesized view of the functions of legislative bodies. The main functions of legislature are:

(1) Legislature chooses the head of the state: they may also remove him by the process of impeachment or they can change the law of his succession or election. For instance, the British Parliament can change the law of primogeniture or the method of abdication. The parliaments of India and Israel elect the president of the Republic, the house of representative of the United states has the right to elect a president in case no candidates gets absolute majority in the presidential poll.

The legislatures of the US and India can also remove their presidents by the process of impeachment. The Parliaments of Canada, New Zealand and Australia recommend three names to the English sovereign and one of them nominated by him/her to act as the Governor-General of the country.

(2) The legislature also approves the choice of the prime minister and his ministers in some countries. All ministerial nominations by the president in the U.S have to be ratified by the Senate. The federal assembly of Switzerland elects its seven presidents of the federal council. The prime minister nominated by the president in France has to seek a vote of confidence in the Parliament. In countries having a cabinet form of government like Britain and India, the ministers can remain in office only as long as they enjoy the confidence of the legislatures.

(3) Legislatures may also influence or control government behaviour or seek to make the executive accountable to them, vote of no-confidence, censure motions, interpretation of procedures. Debates on budget and major policies of the government, process of impeachment, etc., are the various devices in the hands of the legislators to exercise their control over the government. Thus, the legislatures also perform certain judicial functions; in India they have the power to power to impeach the president as well as the chief justice of the Supreme Court and so on.

(4) Legislators choose their office-bearers and they can also remove them. They can also disqualify their members on the charge of proved 'misbehavior' or committing an act of corruption or treason or breach of privileges. Speakers and deputy speakers are elected by the rule –making bodies and they may remove them by a vote of confidence.

(5) The most important function of the legislatures is to make rules, because they are the rule – making departments of the government. The bills are moved, debated and then passed with or without amendments. In most of the countries having a 'democratic' from of legislative behaviour, the bills are given three readings. Often the bills are referred to the committees of the parliament for more detailed scrutiny. Also, the ordinance issued by the head of the state when the parliament is not in session has to be ratified by the legislature within a period of six weeks from the date of commencement of the session.

(6) A legislature often holds the purse strings. It approval is necessary for the annual budget or for the imposition of taxes. Through committees, they also scrutinize the expenditure of the government. In India, this is done by public accounts committee.

The legislatures also reduce 'tensions' provide reassurance and generally enhance satisfaction with the policies and government. They also provide scope for the articulation of interests.

Decline of legislature

A very critical examination of the functions and powers of the legislatures, confirms that the old distrust of the executives has been replaced by a new confidence in their leadership. The strong position of the cabinet working under the leadership of the prime minister in a parliamentary form of government. The cabinet has emerged as the main forum where the policies are discussed and finalized. While the parliament merely discusses more or less as formality, and is in no position to alter them if the cabinet enjoys absolute majority in the parliment.It is the cabinet that has the final say in parliamentary form of government . This is applicable to all the legislatures based on English model. The American congress has lost much of its legislative autonomy because of the presidential check on one hand the power of judicial review on the other.

 The charge of decline of decline of legislature draws support from following points:

(1) The area of authority which originally belonged to the legislatures has been usurped by the executives. It is the cabinet that decides about many things like summoning and proroguing the session of the parliament, writing the text of the inaugural address to be delivered by the head of state, preparing a daily timetable of the session of the house and doing a host of other things that constitute the stock of parliamentary business.

(2) The power of the courts to look into the constitutional validity of a legislative measures has a affected the authority of the legislatures.

(3) Today party politics diluted the legislative powers, the top leaders of the party keep the members under their strict control with the result that the latter have no alternative but to toe the official line.

Though the power and prestige of legislatures is declining, they are working with varying degrees of authority. The legislature is still treasured as a formal centre and focus in every political system. Britain is generally referred to as the mother of Parliamentary democracy. England considers a prototype of a country for parliamentary democracies. Britain lacks a written constitution that systematically outlines government procedures and institutions. Although they followed parliamentary democracy, Britain has preserved historical unity and change. The most significant example of this is the co-existence of monarch and democracy thereby giving the country a distinction of constitutional monarchy. Unlike other legislatures, the constitution establishes the supremacy of the Parliament, Britain Parliament is the supreme organ of authority. Parliament, specifically, the House of Commons, can pass any law it likes. It can override or set aside any authority. It can repeal or amend any of any former Parliaments.

The British Parliament technically consists of the crown (Monarchy) the house of Lords and House of Commons, together they Exercise sovereign legislative power. In practice, the monarch's role is

symbolic. The House of Lords powers also have been reduced since the beginning of the nineteenth century. In terms of real political power, Parliament is now the House of Commons.

The Parliament of Britain consists of two houses, The House of Lords and House of Commons. The House of Common consists of the representatives of people, but the house of Lords is essentially hereditary. The house of Lords is the upper house of the British parliament. It has more than 1000 members, the number varying through deaths and the creation of new peers. It consists of seven categories of members (1) The princes of the royal blood (2) Hereditary peers (3) Scottish peers (4) Lords Spiritual (5) Law Lords (6) Life peers. The Lord Chancellor is the presiding officer of the House of Lords. The House of Lords have limited power. It is therefore considered to be weaker second chamber in the world. They have limited executive, financial power, they passes some judicial powers.

The house of commons is the lower house; the house of commons consists of elected members. There are 635 members in the House of Commons, 516 for England, 36 for Wales, 71 for Scotland and 12 for Northern Ireland. Every British citizen who has attained the age of 18 enjoys the right to vote. There is no distinction between men and women in the respect.

The house of commons is elected for a period of five years. However, it may be dissolved earlier by the sovereign on the advice of the prime minister. The house of commons is presided over by the speaker. He is elected by the members immediately after a new parliament is formed.

The functions of the house of commons are numerous,. Its most important function is law making 'Parliament Sovereign law making body', with no legal restrictions on its powers. House of Commons is supreme in financial matters, all money bill originate in the commons. The house of commons controls the executive. The ministry emerges from the House of Commons. The King/queen calls leader of the majority party in the house to form the ministry. Cabinet hold their office only so long as they enjoy the confidence of the House of Commons.

Legislature of USA is known as Congress. The constitution assigns to the Congress all legislative powers of the federation. The American political system works in a principle of separation of powers. Constitution framers of USA were to give the congress some role in the executive and judicial spheres as well as some other powers. The Congress exercises a lot of powers which are both legislative and non-legislative. Congress has bicameral character. It has two houses, known as the senate and House of Representatives. Unlike the British House of Lords, the American Upper House is elected. Britain has a parliamentary form of government whereas USA has a presidential form of government.

House of Representatives has come to be known as the first house, and the senate as the second house. The Senate is the upper House of the American Congress. The American constitution is federal. So it needs a powerful upper House to represent the states. In accordance with federal principle, all states are equally represented in the senate. Each state selects two senators, as there are

100 members in the senate. Senate members are directly elected by the people on the basis of universal adult franchise. Each member has a six-year term. One third of the members of the senate retrieve two years, so the House enjoys a permanent tenure.

The vice president presides over the meeting of the Senate. In the field of legislation, the senate possesses equal powers with the House of Representatives any bill may be introduced in the senate except money bills. The senate has executive power also. The American president makes a number of appointments to federal offices. These appointments are to be confirmed by the senate. Without the consent of the senate no one can be appointed by the president as ambassadors and other diplomatic offices to represent the USA in foreign countries. He can also make treatise with foreign countries. But the appointments and the treatise made by the president are to be approved by the Senate. The Senate possesses some judicial power also. The senate conducts the trial of impeachment of the President and judges of the Supreme Court. Apart from these, the Senate enjoys equal powers with the House of Representatives in amending the constitution. It is a compact house with 100 members. The Lower House is comparatively bigger in size. Moreover, its term of office is only two years. Thus the politician of USA considers the office of senator as prestigious; due to this Senate is the most powerful second chamber in the world.

The House of Representatives is the lower house of the American Congress. There are more than 435 members in this House. Each member represents about 30,000 people. The members are directly elected by the people on the basis of universal adult franchise. Term of offices of the house is two years. The House elects a speaker to preside over its meetings. The house of representatives in the lower House of the Congress and it enjoys powers in legislative, financial, constitutional, electoral and judicial spheres. However, despite being a lower and popular House, it enjoys fewer powers than the upper House, the senate. Any bill can be introduced in this House; the money bill can be introduced only in this House. But the American Lower house cannot override the upper House like the British lower house. In Britain the House of Lords is only a delaying chamber. But the American Senate has equal powers in matters of legislation. No bill can become low without its consent. It can amend even the money bills. So the House of representatives is not as powerful as the British House of Commons. The executive powers of the House of Commons are also comparatively limited. The senate has to approve the appointments and treatise made by the president. But the lower house no such power. The president has to get consent of the lower house before he declares war. However, the Lower House has some judicial powers. It can intimate impeachment against the president, vice president and other High officers.

The National people's Congress is the highest organ of state authority and it is the sole legislative authority in the country. Its functions are varied, constituents, legislative, executive, electoral and judicial too, and all told they will establish its supremacy. The National People's Congress amends the constitution, supervise the enforcement of the constitution, enacts laws, elects and removes the

different officers of the state, decides questions of war and peace, examines and approves the budget, ratifies the status and boundaries of provinces and other local areas.

The National People's Congress is unicameral legislatures. It is composed of deputies elected by provinces, autonomous regions, municipalities under the direct central authority, the armed forces, and the Chinese residents abroad. Deputies to the National People's Congress are divided into groups based on the units which elect them. Citizens who have reaches the age of 18 have the right to vote and stand for election. The number of deputies, including those representing national minorities, and the manner of their election are prescribed by electoral law. The congress is now composed of more than 1000 deputies. The term of office is four years.

The congress is convened once a year by its standing committee, but it may be convened also whenever the standing committee or one fifth of the deputies may propose. When the national people's congress meets, it elects a presidium and a secretary. General for the session, and adopts an agenda for that session. The presidium presides over the sitting of the National People's Congress. Executive chairman to preside over the sittings.

Before each session of the National People's Congress is convened, the deputies in each group consult together on matters concerning preparations for the session put forward by the standing committee of the National People's Congress.

The French parliament of the fifth republic. Comprises the national assembly and senate. The senate is elected indirectly for a term of nine years, one third of its members retrying after every three years. It represents the territorially units of the Republic. French citizens living outside France are also represented in it. The National Assembly is a representative chamber elected for a term of five years by universal direct suffrage. But the house can dissolve earlier by the president of the Republic. The president of the National Assembly is elected for the duration of the legislature. The president of the senate ids elected after each partial re-election of the senate. Parliament is empowered to convene two ordinary sessions in a year. It convenes an extraordinary session at the request of the prime minister, or of the majority of the members comprising the national Assembly to consider a specific agenda. The president has the right to send messages to parliament.

Legislative functions of the French Parliament, unlike the British Parliament, the French Parliament is not a sovereign law making body. Its powers are limit, in financial matters also, the French Parliament does not enjoy supreme power. The procedure for enacting financial measures is designed to prevent parliament from using delaying tactics.

The parliament in India, the seat of union legislative action, consists of the president and two houses – the Loksabha (House of the People) and the Raja Sabah (council of states) the Raja Sabah can have a maximum of 250 members including 12 nominated by the president. Thus up to a membership of 238 members can be elected by the elected members of the legislative assemblies of the states and the union territories. The seats are allocated to the states and union territories on the basis of population.

It's a permanent house with one third of its members retiring and fresh elections held biennially the term of all members being six years. The representatives of each state are elected by the members of the state legislative assembly in accordance with the method of proportionate vote. The vice - president of India is the ex-officio Chairman of the Raja Sabah.

The Lok Sabaha (House of People) is composed of not more than 552 members as follows (a) not more than 530 members directly elected from territorial constituencies in the states (b) not mere than 20 members directly elected from constituencies in the Union Territories (c) not more than two members of the Anglo-Indian community to be nominated by the president.

Lok Sabaha has been provided with a fixed term as in the case of the popularly elected House of Representatives in the United States of America and the House of Commons in the United Kingdom. That is in accordance with the democratic principle that the government should obtain mandate of the people periodically. The term of Lok Sabaha is five years from the date appointed for its first meeting. Lok sasha elects from among its members a speaker who normally presides at its meeting

Raja Sabah in a federal system one of the house of legislatures is considered to be primarily protector of interests of the constituent states. Considering the importance of states in federation that house is given power on their behalf in terms of legislative powers, except in case of money bills the Raja Sabah has equal powers with the Lok Sabah. The council of ministers is responsible only to lok sabha. Thus Raja Sabah has no power to pass a vote of no confidence against the government. Raja sabha has equal right to election and impeachment of the president, election of vice president, equal power to amend the constitution

Lok sabha is a popularly elected house, it is therefore is supposed to act as a representative of people. Apart from law making powers along with Raja sabha, the lok sabha has been given important powers to exercise control over the finance and exective . Lok sabha participates in the election of president and vice president as also in the impeachment of presidents, justice of Supreme Court, chief Election commission.

Rule application

Meaning and Types Rule application

The executive is the implementing arm of the government. Executive which formulates and then implements various policies of govrnment, the dictionary meaning of the word 'executive' is the power to put important decisions effect. i.e. to execute. As J. W. Garnar says. '-In a broad aid collective sense the executive organ embraces the aggregate ... of all the functionaries and agencies which are concerned with the will of the state as that will has been formulated and expressed in terms of law ... thus, it comprehends the entire governmental organization. Thus tax collectors, inspectors, commissioners, policemen and perhaps the officers of the arm), and navy are a part of the executive organization."

Though the term 'executive' is understood both in broad and narrow senses. In the realm of the study of politics its narrow meaning is applied. It is the executive head and his principal colleagues who run the machinery of government formulate national policy and see that it is properly implemented.

The nominal executive may be either a monarch or an elected President. What makes him a 'nominal' executive is the fact that he does not enjoy any real powers. He is just a constitutional figurehead. Performing some ceremononial duties but enjoying little or no powers, though the entire administration is carried on in his or her name. The monarch may assume office in hereditary successions as in U.K. or through direct or indirect election as in Malaysia. The system of hereditary successions is still prevailing in some countries such **as** U. K.. Nepal, Japan and Saudi Arabia. Wherever there is constitutional monarchy, as in U. K. the real power is not vested in the monarch but in the elected council of ministers headed by the prime minister, and that council is collectively accountable to the legislature.

However, not all existing monarchs in the world are figureheads: there are still some monarchs who enjoy absolute power as they do in Jordan and Saudi Arabia. Such monarchs may be placed in the category of 'real' executives, since they enjoy absolute and limited powers.

The real executive may also be divided into two categories - singular and plural. A singular executive is one that is headed by a single leader who does not share his powers with others as in the U. S. In the U. S., the constitution vests all powers in one person, Namely the President. In the case of a plural executive, all powers are vested in a group of ministers. Its only example in today's world is found in Switzerland where the authority of the government is shared by seven ministers (called Presidents) who are elected by the Legislature for four years. It is known as the Federal Council. One of the Presidents is formally designated as the President of the Confederation and he performs the ceremonial functions normally exercised by the Head of State in any country.

Composition of Executive

The executive generally consists of two types of officials: (a) the political executive: i.e. President, Prime Minister, Cabinet or Council of Ministers; and (b) the permanent executive or the bureaucracy which remains in office for a fixed period of tenure regardless of which government consist to power. The political executive is elected directly by the people as in the U. S. where the Presidential type of government prevails or he may be elected indirectly by the legislature as in the case of India and Great Britain. In China the President is elected by the National People's Congress and is the head of state and the highest ceremonial functionary of the state.

The political executive may be further divided into three categories as shown in the tabular illustration given above. It is democratic, when its members are chosen by the people and remain accountable to their constituents. For instance The British cabinet may be removed from office by an adverse vote in the House of Commons. The American President can also be removed from office, not through a vote of no-confidence but by the process of impeachment. Recently President Bill

Clinton of the U.S. went through the process of impeachment but was able to survive because the Senate failed to crevice him.

In a totalitarian state the real executive cannot be removed by the people or their chosen representatives. In such a state, people have no freedom to criticize or censure the conduct of the government. Today. Such totalitarian states. With the executive enjoying absolute power, exist in Burma, Iraq, Nigeria or in Afghanistan. The totalitarian regimes existed in Nazi Germany headed by Hitler or in Fascist Italy headed by Mussolini. Finally, a colonial executive is one who acts under the authority of the colonial government.

The democratic model may be divided into two categories -parliamentary- and presidential forms of government. In the parliamentary form of government the government is run by a cabinet (under the leadership of the Prime Minister) collectively responsible to the legislature, as in India and U. K. The Head of State is a nominal executive in whose name governance is done by the cabinet. The President of India and the Queen of U. K. are nominal heads of state. The second variety of democratic model, namely the Presidential form of government, exists in the U. S. In the United States, the basis of executive-legislature relationship is separation of powers. The president is the real executive. He is neither a member of the legislature, nor removable by it. His tenure is fixed.

In between these two models, there is the model of French executive that can be called as quasi-parliamentary or quasi-presidential as here the President is the real executive, the Prime Minister and the cabinet arc under his control and, at the same time, they are accountable to the Parliament. So, the French model imbibes some features of both parliamentary and presidential forms of governments.

Functions of the Executive

In the modern political system, distrust in executive dominance has been replaced by a confidence in its Leadership. Today, the classical theory of the three organs of government with equal powers needs restatement because the executive has now become the government in the real sense of the term. Among its many functions, the first and the foremost function of the executive is to run the administration of the country. The government has to ensure and maintain internal peace and order. The executive has also to conduct external relations, make treaties with foreign states. Declare war and conclude peace, mobilize troops. Proclaim emergency when required, re-value or devalue currency. Fix prices of essential commodities and perform other activities relating to the well-being of the people of the state.

In recent times, the executive has started performing some Legislative functions also. Even though this work does not fall in its domain. The executive is taking considerable initiative in drafting and proposing laws to the legislature. This is particularly true of parliamentary governments as in the United Kingdom and India. In India the executive can issue ordinances when the legislature is not in session. The bills passed by the legislature are subject to the veto power of the Head of the State. Even in the U. S, where the separation of power prevails. The President manages to influence the

legislative sphere by sending his "messages' or having a bill passed by the Congress through his 'friends'. What has added to the expanding functions of the executive is the growth of delegated Legislation. The laws made by the Parliament generally do not contain the details which are subsequently filled in by the executive.

The executive also performs some judicial functions. In all the countries, the Head of the State is entrusted with the power of granting pardon or reprieve or amnesty to the offenders. This is called his 'Prerogative of mercy'' He also performs functions like the appointment of judges. And a host of disputes are also settled through administrative tribunals. In certain countries the ministers are given the power to act like appellate tribunals. In France, there is a separate system of administrative laws and courts.

The executive also controls the 'purse of the nation'. It is the executive which prepares the budget and presents it to the parliament for its approval. It is the executive that actually decides the taxation structure of the country, the parliament only puts its seal of approval. Also it is the executive which has to see that the provisions of the budget are implemented after being passed in the Parliament. The executive also has auditing and comptrolling agencies to act as the financial watch dog of the country.

The permanent executive, i.e. the bureaucracy is involved at every stage of the decision-making process and maintains the continuity of administration. Often. The political executive depends upon the bureaucrats because of their technical expertise and knowledge.

Chester Barnard: in his work titled "The Functions of the executive" relates the function of them executive 'with the determination of the objectives, the initiation of policy the manipulation of the objectives. The initiation of policy the manipulation of means control over the instruments of action and stimulation of action and stimulation of coordinated action.

Increasing Role of the Executive

Today the representative democracy has been somewhat replaced by what may be termed as 'executive democracy' or even bureaucratic democracy, according to R. H. S. Crossman. The executive is the most important organ of the political organisation. As Rodee remarks "On the one hand. The earlier enthusiasm for the wisdom and competence of representatives assemblies has declined. A century or more of experience with popularly elected executive power has dissipated earlier suspicions and established confidence. The rapidly multiplying problems and functions of democratic governments have virtually compelled the transfer of many powers from the legislature to the executive." the case with parliamentary democracies. The political executive, by virtue of being in the majority in the lower chamber of the legislature, is able to push through all legislations strict party discipline. As in the U. K. Makes the legislative control of the executive very nominal. Also usually the executive is united and single whereas the members of the legislature are divided on party lines. And this gives the executive an edge over them. What Graves has said about the English model of

government is largely applicable to the system of other countries as well- that the executive "has become in practice the first chamber in our law making mechanism"

Need of the hour demands a proper check on the leadership of the executive. The fate of the political system depends on the role of the political leaders who are hid to be entrusted with three important functions. Namely, founding, implementing and stabilizing a regime. What is thus needed is the imposition of proper checks on the authority, of the executive. This will enable it to effetely as well as properly perform the manifold functions entrusted to it. Which include the "creation of a welfare service.

Rule adjudication

Judiciary, also known as the rule-adjudication department of the government, in quite simple terms, may be defined as the third organ of government concerned with the job of doing justice. It interprets law and awards punishments for the violation of laws. The primary objective of any political system is to protect the rights of the individual, and this work is done by the judicial organ of the government.

Functions of Judiciary

The judges may be nominated by the Head of the State, or appointed by following a process of selection, or elected or co-opted by the fellow judges.

The functions of the judiciary differ from one political system to another, but generally they are as follows:

 The first and the foremost function of the courts is the administration of justice. The courts hear and decide cases of all civil, criminal and constitutional nature. In countries having written constitutions, the courts are also entrusted with the power of interpreting the constitution. They act as the guardian of the constitution. Secondly, though legislation is the work of the legislatures, the courts also legislate in a different way. Where a law is silent, or ambiguous, the courts decide what a law is and how it should prevail.

Thirdly, the courts in a federal system of government also play the role of an independent and impartial umpire between the central and regional governments. Fourthly, the courts are important agencies of legitimizing the outputs of government. It is expected that the courts should keep themselves aware of the growing urges and aspirations of the people and should interpret the meaning of law dynamically in the light of obtaining situation. They should see that any law or executive action does not infringe up on the various rights of the people.

Fifthly, the courts should also stabilize and support the existing political system. The behavior of the courts must not be obstructive or destructive so that the smooth running o f the political organisation becomes a problem. The most controversial function of the courts lies in their power of judicial review under which they have the capacity to examine the validity of a legislative or administrative

measure, and then declare it, either in part or full, 'intra vires or ultra vires of the constitution.' This power had its origin in the United States and also has its best form there. Its second best example can be found in India. Its weaker instances can be found in other countries also like Italy, Australia and South Africa.

As stated earlier, the functions of the courts differ from one political system to another, though most of them. As described above. Are common to all. And that lay down the basic line of distinction between the executive/ legislative and judicial powers.

Judicial Review and Judicial Activism

The Encyclopedia Britannica defines judicial review as -'the power exerted by the courts of a country to examine the actions of the Legislative. Executive and administrative arms of the government and to ensure that such actions conform to the provisions of the nation's constitution." Ferguson and McHain. Defined judicial review as "the power of a court to hold unconstitutional any law or official action that it deems to be in conflict with the basic law, or the constitution." Judicial review is thus a power in the hands of the courts to look into the constitutional validity of a Legislative or administrative measure and then give a judgment in regard to its being intra vires or ultra vires of the constitution.

The study of judicial review virtually relates to the two democratic countries of the world. i.e. United States and India, both having written constitutions and a federal system of government. Both the American Supreme Court and the Indian Supreme Court recognize judicial supremacy. The American judiciary can also declare an Act unconstitintional, if it fails to satisfy, the requirements of the "due process of law". The "due process" clause and "judicial supremacy" has turned the American Supreme Court into a kind of super legislature In communist countries there is no place for judicial review where judges are elected by the legislatures and they are required to honour the 'will of the people'. In Britain too the English courts cannot look into the constitutional validity of a legislative measure made by the sovereign Parliament. However, they may exercise the power of judicial review over delegated legislation. If an executive action contravenes the law of the Parliament in letter or in spirit. the courts may strike it down. The Federal Tribunal of Switzerland has the power of judicial review that it may exercise in relation to the laws made by the Cantonal legislatures only. Article 81 of the Japanese constitution also empowers the Supreme Court to exercise the power of judicial review.

 This power of judicial review in the hands of courts has led to what has recently been called as judicial activism. In recent years, at times there has been a vacuum in the executive, and the judiciary has on many occasions filled that space. In India, the first push came after the emergency phase when the supreme court came up with the device of public interest litigation (PIL), a tool meant to ensure justice for the under-privileged and the marginalized the recent regulations of that Indian Supreme Court and high Courts, like making helmet compulsory for 2-wheeler drivers, no felling of trees, bar

on vehicles more than 15 or 20 years do or ban on hoarding on the roadside in Delhi are a few examples of judicial activism. The United States supreme court's decision regarding the ban on abortions also shows how activated the judiciary has been in these countries.

It is said that judicial review opens scope for more and more judicial debates. And ushers in a - paradises for the lawyers. It leads to a confrontation between the executive and judicial departments. It makes the courts virtually a 'third chamber' or the 'super-house of the legislature'. Thus, there is politicization of the judiciary that undermines the authority of the chosen representatives of the people. On the other hand, it is by virtue of this power that the judiciary can save the people from the onslaughts of the executive or legislative despotism.

Independence of the Judiciary

The enormous powers and functions of the judiciary make the courts responsible for the well being and protection of the rights of the nation on the whole. Thus to perform these functions effectively, it is necessary that it should be independent and impartial. Even though in some countries (e.g. Switzerland and the U.S) judges are elected, in most others they are appointed by the executive, however, once appointed, they cannot be easily removed except by the process of impeachment on the grounds of proven misbehavior and imparity. Their salary and service conditions are placed beyond the control of the executive or legislative so that it cannot be altered to their ability without fear, favor, affection or ill-will.

In the words of Shri Aiyar, the supreme court " has more powers than any other supreme court in the world" A comparison of the supreme courts of India and America shows that if the former has wider jurisdiction with regard to appeals from the lower courts, the latter has advantage over the former with regard to original jurisdiction which. In addition to the settlement of disputes between the units of the federation, extends to all cases relating to ambassadrors, consuls, ministers, treatise, naval forces and maritime matters. On the appellate side, the Indian Supreme Court enjoys wider powers than its counter-part which does not deal with appeals in civil and criminal cases except the constitutional ones. The Indian Supreme court has advisory functions also which the American Supreme Court does not have, Above all, the Indian Supreme Court of record. The American Supreme Court is deprived of these privileges.

Thus, the courts have a very important share in the political process of a country, though this varies with the nature of the political system and the culture of the people. Cooperation and conflict between the real administrators and the honest adjudicators should go hand in hand so that the political system develops further and is not decayed. It is rightly observed: the courts are the political process and one should stress cooperation as much as conflict. They interact with other parts of the political system not as illegitimate outsiders but as part of the stabling ruling political alliance.

Module-V

Interest Aggregation and Party Systems - Comparative Analysis.

Political parties are essential for the effective working of modern democratic states. Professor Harold J. Laski had underlined the importance of parties when he wrote, "There is no alternative to party government, save dictatorship, in any state of modern size. Government requires leaders, leaders require not an incoherent mob behind them, but an organised following able to canalize the issues for an electorate with a free choice." Dictator like Hitler or Mussolini may also lead a party, but then it is a group of sycophants, not a competitive organisation. As Laski says government requires leaders, who in turn must be supported by organised people. A mob has no place in a democratic polity. The organised parties identify issues on which they seek popular verdict. Periodic elections provide opportunities to the parties to present these issues, and if supported by the people they become bases of governance by the representatives elected by the people.

Political parties have multifarious duties to perform. They are the most significant sub actors who participate in and regulate the political process. They put up candidates, canvass support for them, and if voted to power they govern the state for the specific period. There are different types of party systems and an opposition which, in a responsible manner, keeps the ruling party under constant vigil and check. Democratic process is not allowed to derail. Political parties are certainly essential to the functioning of democracy. They perform different functions within and outside the realm of politics. Their leadership and policies, internal practices, and the patterns of interaction with other parties and institutions can have profound consequences for the system of governance.

Political parties are the most important agencies that participate in political processes in a modern state. A party may be defined as an organised group of people, having a clear ideology and based on certain well-defined policies and having clear objectives. A party has a definite leadership, and its ultimate goal is to gain political power and regulate political process by using the power acquired, normally through democratic elections. The above two sentences should enable you to understand the meaning and purposes of political parties. Edmund Burke had defined the political parties in 1770 thus: "Party is a body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principles in which they are all agreed." These are big or small groups of people which are organised to establish their legitimate control over the government of the country, through the process of elections. Representative government cannot function without them.

Politics is the struggle for power, and in this struggle organised groups can surely be more effective than unorganised mobs. Some of the parties adopt revolutionary route, while most of them take to evolutionary process and constitutional means. The British responsible government had grown along with the evolution of political parties. The primary goal of the parties is to install its leaders in the government, and to ensure their continuation as long as possible. For this purpose, they adopt various

methods of securing popular support, including public rallies, distribution of literature, use of media and even organising musical evenings.

Nature of political Parties

Political party is a group of people that seeks to get its candidates elected to public offices by supplying them with a label-a "party identification"-by which they are known to the electorate. This definition is purposefully broad so that it will include both familiar parties (Democratic and Republican in the US for instance) and unfamiliar ones (Whig, Libertarian, Socialist Worker) and will cover periods in which a party is very strong (having an elaborate and well disciplined organization that provides money and workers to its 'candidates) as well periods in which it is quite weak (supplying nothing but only the labels to its candidates.

This definition suggests three political arenas parties in which may be found. A party exists as able in the mind of voters, as an organization that recruits and campaigns for candidates, and as a set of leaders who try to organize and control the legislative and executive branches of government.

A careful look at the above-mentioned meaning of political party shows its certain hallmarks that distinguish it from similar groups such as temporary organizations, interest groups or factions, etc. For instance Temporary political organizations like Food Price Committee or Famine Resistance Committee, etc., are formed for the single purpose of supporting or opposing a particular temporary issue. Political parties, on the other hand, have some degree of permanence. Secondly, political parties are the only associational groups that are both open to all (at least in theory) and have very wide interests. This is because of the fact that they concern themselves with problems of government and cannot concentrate on specific matters. They are open to all, because they try to enlist the support of as many members of the polity as possible. It is in this context that a political party is different from interest and pressure groups which work only for the advancement of the cause of those groups.

Thirdly, parties must have definite aims and objectives. The objectives are often a mixture of ultimate and immediate purposes. Party programmes contain ideas about law and government, ideas about the shape of political things to come and each party seeks to focus its own brand of political ideas. Fourthly, recognition, of material advantages that go with the securing of the power of government, forms a part of party programme. In fact, as we see in India today more often than not political parties give priority to capturing power though they do this in the name of ideology like opposing communalism. In this sense as well, political parties are different from interest or pressure groups as the latter do not nurse the constituencies for competing at the polls to form the government. A political party is thus a coalition of group interests pursuing general political policies. Pressure groups, on the other hand, are the living 'public' behind the parties. Like interest and pressure groups, and unlike political parties, factions are also not organized for political purposes. But at the same time they do not possess ally continuous stable organizations. Factions may thus be characterized as a

group of persons serving sectional interests within a political party rather than aggregate interests which parties usually champion for winning elections.

As the idea of a common interest and national unity sustains the constitutional appeal to the polls, the logic of party system rejects the Marxian doctrine of class struggle. This implies that parties transcend class-barriers and sectional interests by mutual recognition rights in the sense that in spite of their differences, political parties do not disagree on everything. On the basic features of the system to which they belong, there must be a consensus. Political parties may thus be defined as a group consisting of cross-sections of human beings, more or less stable and organized, with the objective, in accordance with the constitution, of securing or maintaining for its leaders the control of a government, and of giving to members of the party, through such control, ideal and material benefits and advantages.

Functions of Political Parties

Parties contribute to democratic government through the functions they perform for the political system. These functions can broadly be divided under six categories: Firstly, political parties unite sectional interests, bridge the geographical differences, and induce cohesion. In other words, various interests are aggregated through the instrumentality of parties. This ensures both order and system maintenance.

Secondly, political parties contribute to democratic government by nominating candidates for election to public office. In the absence of parties, voters would be confronted with a, bewildering array of self-nominated candidates, each seeking a narrow victory over others on the basis of personal friendships, celebrity status or name. Parties minimize this danger by setting up their candidates in different constituencies. They carry out campaigns to win elections. They also defray the cost of contesting elections where the candidate is a poor person.

Again, political parties help democratic government by structuring voting choice reducing the number of candidates on the ballot to those who have realistic chance of winning. Parties that have won sizeable portions of the vote in past elections are likely to win comparable portions of the vote in future ones also. This discourages non-party or non-serious candidates for running for the office. This in turn focuses the election on the contest between parties and on candidates with established records, which reduces the amount of new information that voters need in order to make a rational decision.

In addition, parties also help voters choose candidates by proposing alternative of programmes of government action in the form of party manifestos. 'The specific policies advocated in an election campaign may vary from candidate to candidate and from election to election, the types of policies advocated by candidates of one party nonetheless usually tend to differ from those proposed by candidates of other parties. In the case of the US, for example, even though the neutrality of the names of major political parties, namely, Democratic and Republican suggests that they are

undifferentiated in their policies, in reality; however, these parties regularly adopt very different policies in their platforms.

Besides, parties help co-ordinate the actions of public officials. A government based on the separation of powers like that of the Unites States, divides responsibilities for making public policy. The President and leaders of the House and Senate are not required to cooperate with one another. Political parties are the major means for bridging the separation of powers, of producing co-ordinate policies that call govern country effectively. Individuals of the same party in the presidency, the House, and the Senate are likely to share political principles and thus to cooperate in making policy. In a parliamentary political system, where the formation and continuance of the real executive, i. e., the Council of Ministers, depends on the support of the majority in legislature, political parties perform the task of disciplining the member of the majority to keep them united for providing the life line support to the government. This role of political parties has, in fact, made them informal governments in democracies as the powers of the legislature has now been usurped, to a great extent, by political parties.

Though victory is certainly the first commandment of a political party, in a democracy defeat of party also does not mean its demise. In that case, a party function is as a critic and watchdog of the government's policy. Political parties thus play an extremely significant role in democracies. While, on the one hand, they have to maintain and strengthen the structure of democratic norms and values; on the other, they have to secure maximal community mobilization for social and economic development. Political parties have thus to induce both political and socio-economic development.

PRINCIPAL TYPES OF PARTY SYSTEMS

Political parties represent various opinions in a democracy, a variety of political parties should characterise democratic system. In reality, however, number of viable parties differs from country to country in accordance with legal requirements and peculiar circumstances obtaining in a particular country. In Great Britain and the United States, for example, a two party system prevails, while in majority of countries including India and France, Multi-party system has come in to existence. On the other hand, in authoritarian and communist countries like China one party system operates.

One Party Systems

The one party or single party system is found upon the assumption that the sovereign will of the state reposes in the leader and the political elite. This authoritarian principle found expression first in monarchies, later in dictatorships and more recently in some democracies. As the dictatorship needs a monopoly of power for its survival, it abolishes all political parties. Though elections are conducted even in such a regime if only to show the facsade of popular support, the voter's choice is limited to only one candidate.

There may be some variations in the single party system prevailing in different countries, but some of the common features of dictatorial parties in these countries make them unique. These features are:

(1) Such party is an official party in the sense that it has a monopoly and is led by the same persons who rule; (2) membership of such a party is usually made an essential requirement for acquiring at least important government jobs; (3) this kind of party supervises the governmental efforts to ideologically indoctrinate peoples; and (4) it is characterized by its elite personality. The essential function of one-party system thus is not to elicit decisions from the mass electorate on the big issue of politics, but to ensure discipline and obedience among the people. In its organization and methods, it is more like an army than a political party.

Obviously, therefore, a one-party system becomes necessarily totalitarian. As the sole operator of a political system, the party extends its authority everywhere. The general policy is decided by the dictates of the party. Not surprisingly a single-party system involves the abolition of freedom of speech and expression, press and association. Accordingly, the line of distinction between society and the state is blurred and the latter completely swallows up the former. This type of party system was found in Fascist Italy under Mussolini who assumed power in 1922 and systematically destroyed all parties except his own Fascist Party. In Germany, Hitler came to power in 1933 and destroyed all opposition. In 1934, the party purged itself of scores of prominent members of the party by shooting them down under the pretence that they were resisting arrest. Similarly, there was only Communist Party rule in former USSR and there were several purges between 1936 and 1938 by the Communist Party.

One can, therefore, divide one-party system into two sub types : (I) authoritarian one-party systems: and (2) non-authoritarian one-party systems. On the whole, however, the emphasis of a one-party system is proverbially on the side of *authoritarianism*. It proclaims its own brand of philosophy and a peculiar way of life to which the whole society is forced to conform.

Two Party Systems

A two-party system is one where only two parties, despite the presence of other parties, have substantial support of the electorate and expectation of forming the government. Under this system, the majority of the elected candidates at a given time belong to any one of the two major parties which form the government, while the other party remains in the opposition. In such a system, there may exist more than two parties, but actual or likely transfer of power takes place between two giant parties only. The United States and the United Kingdom provide good examples of two-party system. In the former, the Democratic and Republican parties are two giant parties. In the UK, the transfer of power takes place between the two major parties, the Labour and the Conservative.

There are, of course, certain differences between the American and British party systems. While the American parties are not ideologically very much different from each other-they are broker-bargaining parties to the point that each party achieves a basically similar political consensus-the British parties, though also pragmatic, are, generally speaking, ideologically distinct from each other.

Recognizing these differences the two party system may be divided into (a) indistinct two-party system in the US, and (b) distinct two-party system in Britain.

Multi-Party Systems

A multi-party system is one in which more than two major parties exist, who struggle with each other for power but no party can alone secure absolute majority to rule. In countries like India and several countries on the Continental Europe, such a system exists, though in a variety of forms.

One can discern two kinds of multi-party systems from the point of view of stability of government: (a) unstable multi-party-systems; and (b) working multiparty systems. As its name indicates, the former does not provide stability. India today provides one of the best examples of this, where recurring 'hung' Parliaments due to plethora of parties has caused political instability at the union level since 1996. France under the Third and Fourth republics provides another example of this kind of party system, where governments formed by coalition of parties rose and fell with dismaying regularity. The working multi-party systems, on the other hand, behave like two-party system and thereby tend to provide stability to government, even though they have more than two major political parties.

Democracy has functioned as successfully in multi-party systems as in two-party systems. There are, however, certain relative advantages and disadvantages of a particular system. To begin with, the supporters of multi-party system argue that :(a) it more effectively corresponds to the division of public opinion especially in a plural society like India; (b) it represents and satisfies the aspirations of diverse interest groups; (c) under this system, a voter can choose among more parties and candidates than available under the two-party system; (d) it reduces the fear of absolutism of the majority; and filially (e) it is more flexible because under this system groups can be freely organized, can unite and separate in accordance with the exigencies of the circumstances.

Marxian Perspective

According to the Marxist view parties represent classes. This situation can be remedied only with the successful completion of class-struggle resulting in the victory of proletariat. The party that represents the working people alone has the right to exist. The bourgeois parties do not represent true democratic process. Therefore, they must be eliminated. According to Lenin, a party (i.e. the Communist Party) is a well-organized group of chosen elite intellectuals and political activists. It is said to be, a chosen group of intellectuals in the sense that their intellectual knowledge of Marxism maintains purity of Marxian principles and ideology, and shows the correct path to the party. It is a chosen group of political activists in the sense that election processes and party training enables them to be totally loyal to the party and a cause of revolution. This definition of Lenin is obviously suitable for communist parties. Such a party exists permanently in the midst of workers' movements. It propagates revolutionary ideas, and imparts training of the art of revolution. It assists the working classes in the achievements of its objectives. Prior to the revolution, during the bourgeois period, the

party must play a vital role. The party is required to be instrumental in the destruction of capitalist order, and establishment of dictatorship of the proletariat. According to Lenin, if the party has to play the role of vanguard of working people, then it is essential that it must have full knowledge of revolutionary ideas and rules. The objective of the party is to protect the interests of the proletariat. The Communist Party alone knows what is in the interest of working people. Lenin was of the opinion that the party's position is similar to a military organisation in the proletariat's struggle to secure power and in its maintenance.

The party is vanguard of the working people which has a pivotal role in class consciousness, and is ever ready to make sacrifices in the interest of the proletariat. The Marxist ideology unites the working people and the party, and its organisation makes it all-powerful.

Communist parties enjoyed constitutional sanction in socialist countries. All other parties were abolished in these countries. There was practically no difference between the party and the government. This is true even today in the socialist countries ruled by the communist parties. The 1977 Constitution of the former Soviet Union described and analysed Lenin's leadership for the success of the Great Revolution of 1917. The Constitution appreciated the role of the party in the revolution and subsequent governance.

The 1982 Constitution of the People's Republic of China declares the National People's Congress, under the leadership of the Communist Party, as the highest organ of state power. It declares the party chief to be head of the armed forces of the country. According to Marxist interpretation of political parties, the parties in capitalist countries represent the class interests. Thus, they are instruments of protection of different classes.

They become source and leaders of class conflict. In the capitalist countries, the communist parties protect the working people against capitalist exploitation. They propagate revolutionary ideas, and prepare the proletariat for revolution. Once the revolution succeeds, the communist parties ensure its protection.

Contemporary Views about the Parties

According to Coleman, had stated that political parties are groups of people, formally organised with a view to establish and maintain formal control over the policies and service-class of the actual, or likely to emerge, sovereign states. This may be done by these groups alone or in combination with other similar groups, through the process of democratic African parties as organised groups aimed at securing political power through elections. He had specified this role for already independent countries or those likely to become independent. Expressing agreement with this view James Jupp had said that any group of people, organised in some manner, with a view to establish control over political institutions of the given society may be described as a political party. Thus, a party requires to be a group of people, formally organised, and having the goal of fighting and winning elections to control the political institutions of the state. These institutions are organs of government, at various

levels, and organised groups of people, we may add, should have clearly defined policies for governance.

Sigmund Neumann analysed the nature and role of political parties on the basis of their ideologies. He drew some valuable conclusions. He opined that in view of sharp differences between the democratic and authoritarian parties, it was impossible to give a single acceptable definition. Nevertheless, he said that the purpose of setting up a party is uniformity within, and distinction from other groups. Essentially, each party has partnership within a specific organisation, and separation from others on the basis of its particular programme.

This definition is obviously true in case of two or multiparty democratic societies. On the other hand, in a one-party system there is total absence of competition and distinct policies and programmes. In fact, many people refuse to accept the parties, in a single party system, as formal political parties. For them a party must have a second part, or a competitor, which is missing in one-party states. Thus, in one-party system, the party becomes totalitarian. Once it manages to acquire power, it retains it by one means or the other. However, Neumann expressed the view that even in one party states opposition does exist in one form or the other. Even if there is no opposition, the authoritarian party always feels insecure due to fear of possible revolt or opposition.

According to Neumann, political party is representative of social interests which acts as a bridge, a link, between the individual and the society. The success of democracy depends on the efficient working of parties. Whether the government is parliamentary or presidential democracy, it cannot succeed in the absence of parties. An unorganised mob of people cannot govern the state. Its organised form is a political party. The first President of the United States, George Washington had advocated party less democracy. But that could not materialize. Soon, two parties emerged in that country. As a matter of fact, deeper study of formation of the U.S. Constitution would reveal that there were two groups even in 1787. They were supporters and opponents of a federal system, and became fore-runners of the two American parties. In India, for some time there was talk of partyless democracy. But this view, expressed under the leadership of Jayaprakash Narain, was more idealistic and hardly practical.

In his analysis of political parties, Maurice Duverger had said that the primary objective of the parties is to acquire political power, or to share the exercise of such power. Duverger wrote "… political parties have as their primary goal the conquest of power or a share in its exercise. They try to win seats at elections, to name deputies and ministers, and to take control of the government." That is why, evolution of political parties coincided with the growth of parliamentary system and electoral processes. The origin of the parties may be traced in the practice of collection of election funds for candidates and in the committees constituted to secure supporters and workers for the victory of candidates. Gradually, members of the legislatures holding similar views and beliefs in similar ideologies came together leading to the birth and growth of political parties. While common ideology became the basis of parties in Britain and other European democracies, that was not the case in the

United States. The American political parties do not have clearly distinct ideologies. These parties came into existence as an outcome of the process of selection of presidential candidates, managing their campaign, raising campaign funds and selecting candidates for numerous other electoral offices in the United States. These parties are even now more concerned with electoral processes, rather than ideologies.

Duverger is right in concluding that political parties have been established even in those countries where elections are not held and where even legislatures do not exist. Parties are found even in the countries which conduct pseudo-elections and have pseudo parliaments. The so-called elections are held with only one candidate in each constituency, who invariably wins and consequently all members of the legislature belong to only one party. These are called one-party systems. Duverger argues that these 'parties' cannot genuinely be described as parties. The word 'party' is derived from the Latin terms 'Pars', which means part. Therefore, where there is only one party, it is not a part of the whole—meaning part of many parties. Nevertheless, parties are used in the dictatorial or authoritarian regimes to create the 'farce' of elections and 'legislatures elected by the people'. Duverger says, "… the dictatorship uses the single party to establish the appearance of electoral and parliamentary process and give itself a democratic façade." Duverger held the view that in the second half of the twentieth century parties were usually associated with ideologies. Marx and Lenin had seen parties as representatives of conflicting classes, but several contemporary scholars like M.I. Ostrogoski, Roberto Michel and Maurice Duverger emphasise structure of political parties. These and other writers lay emphasis on what the parties do, not on what they are. It has become essential for comprehensive study of the parties to analyse their ideologies, social foundations, structures, organisations, and strategies. Political parties can be classified essentially on two bases. These are: structure of parties, and the party system. One cannot ignore other aspects and mutual relations of parties while analysing the structure of parties. From the point of view of structure, Duverger classified study of parties into two categories, which are internal organisation and external organisation.

CLASSIFICATION OF POLITICAL PARTIES

The classification of political parties that was presented by Maurice Duverger in 1951 became popular, and is now generally accepted. He had classified parties as (i) the elitist or traditional parties, and (ii) mass parties. Later a third category known as the intermediate type of parties was added. This classification is generally organisation based categorisations.

The Elitist Parties

The parties which are not cadre-based and do not have their support among the masses may be described as elitist or traditional parties. These parties do not throw their doors open to one and all. They are selective in admitting members. The elitist parties are normally divided into (a) the European Type and (b) the American Type.

1) **The European type:** Most of the political parties set up in the nineteenth century are elitist in nature. Many contemporary parties who follow the same approach also come in the elitist or traditional category. Whether these parties are liberal or conservative or progressive, they are against admitting anybody and everybody to their membership. These parties emphasise quality rather than numbers. They seek support of prominent and influential persons. The wealthy people occupy prominent place in these parties. The European parties have their bases in local committees, and have minimum control of central party organisation. However, unlike many parties of Continental Europe, the Liberal and Conservative Parties of nineteenth century Britain had a powerful central organisation. Now in the twenty-first century central control is increasing in many parties of European and Asian countries also.

With the growth of mass parties, even British parties tried to expand their membership, but they could not succeed. In the modern electoral fights, large number of workers is required by the parties. Therefore, they admitted large number of members, yet they did not change their basic features.

2) **The American Type:** The parties in the United States are different from British parties in several respects. But, the prominent differences are (i) the nature of presidential government in a federal set-up, as against British parliamentary democracy in a unitary state and (ii) the U.S. parties have remained limited to the elite, away from the masses. The U.S. parties, as mentioned elsewhere, are essentially election-oriented.

Mass Parties

The system of parties based on common man's support began emerging in the early twentieth century. British Labour Party had its origin in the working people's movement. Later, the communists adopted the system of mass support. Several parties in the newly independent third world countries are generally mass parties.

1) **Socialist Parties:** Initially, masses were contacted to donate funds for the labour candidates. These candidates were considered revolutionaries, and industrialists and big business houses declined to give them any financial contribution. In fact these elements were quite opposed to these candidates. In Britain trade unions provided support to these candidates. Later they organised themselves as the Labour Party. The mass parties tried to enlarge their membership, and took contributions from their members. The mass parties preferred contributions from common men and women, rather than the rich business houses. These parties, therefore, did not develop into elitist parties.

These parties believe in socialism to be brought about by the peaceful democratic means of parliamentary process. They believe in rule of law, rather than violence or revolutionary methods. They sought to abolish capitalism through legislative measures. But, with the commencement of rapid liberalisation in the decade of 1990s, the talk of destruction of capitalism suddenly gave way to adoption of a capitalist path even by democratic parties including the British Labour Party.

On the other hand, legislature is ineffective in communist and fascist countries, as the real power is vested in the party concerned. Therefore, party leadership dominates over the members. Many countries in the world had or have socialist parties as important actors in the liberal democratic processes.

2) **The Communist parties:** The communist parties based on the ideology of Marx and Lenin seek close contacts with the masses. Initially, European communist parties were organised on the pattern of socialist parties, but after 1924, they were reorganised on the directions of Communist International headquartered in Moscow. They followed the pattern of Soviet Communist Party. The communist parties everywhere are much better organised and disciplined as compared to other parties. These parties attract workers and peasants. But, unlike other parties, their local units are generally not regional in nature; they are organised at places of work. The primary units, or cells, maintain close contacts with the members in their workplaces. This makes it easier for them to convey the party directions and to have them implemented. Besides, the problems of members of a workplace are common. They enthuse greater unity.

Communist parties follow the principle of 'democratic Centralism', which implies democratic participation of members in party structure, but centralised decision-making and supervision. However, critics say that there is hardly any democracy in these parties, as all decisions are made by a handful of top leaders, who ensure strict obedience and discipline. At different levels in the party, discussion does take place, but directions of the leadership can never be violated or defied. All information about views expressed in these discussions is conveyed to the party leadership.

Parties in the former Soviet Union and in East European countries followed this pattern, which is also observed in China, Vietnam and other communist countries. No other party anywhere in the world, except perhaps the Fascist parties, is as rigidly based on ideology as the communist parties are. They try to strictly follow the Marxist-Leninist ideology. The Chinese Communist Party had its own Maoist interpretation of Marxism-Leninism. But, in the post-Mao period the party has certainly deviated from the rigidity of Mao. Liberalisation and opening up of economy in China has altered the pattern, though it still swears by Marxist ideology. Communist parties in liberal democracies, as in India, still keep on insisting on the relevance of Marxism-Leninism.

3) **The Fascist Parties:** Fascism is totally opposed to communism. Unlike the communist parties, fascists advocate an all-powerful state. However, there is one similarity. Both believe in one-party rule, and in destroying the entire opposition. They both use force to implement their policies. The fascist parties support open competition and capitalism, but they, like the communists, blindly follow one leader. The disobedience to the leader may mean elimination of members. The Italian Fascist dictator, Mussolini had himself said that his party wanted to follow the communist techniques. Fascists talk of mass-base, but they use armed forces to inculcate military discipline and impart military training to the masses. The fascist youth are not only given military training, but they even wear military uniform, carry out daily disciplined exercises, and are often punished for defiance. The

fascist leader takes the route of force to assume power, even as pretension of democratic process may be propagated. Fascism comes to power with the support of capitalists and big business houses. It is vehemently opposed to communism, and destructive of democracy. Violence and wars have been important part of fascist programme.

Intermediate Type Parties

According to Maurice Duverger, there is a third category of political parties that may be described as the intermediate type. These are different from both elitist and mass parties; yet they are closer to the mass parties. These are: 1) **Indirect Parties:** At times a number of big or small committees perform political functions leading to the setting up of a political party. This may be described as an indirect party. All these parties came into existence like traditional parties, but with the difference that their members came not from rich classes, but from amongst the workers and intellectuals.

2) **Parties in Developing Countries:** In the post-Second World War period a large number of political parties have come into existence in the third world developing countries, which Duverger prefers to describe as undeveloped countries. In some of the developing countries, the parties followed the pattern of the United Kingdom or the United States, while in some others one party was established following the Soviet example. In some of the African countries two parties each were formed in their own style. All of them have been described as intermediate type because they were yet to be fully organised as disciplined parties. In post-independent India many parties have been formed. Some of them could not last long.

Hitchner and Levine's Classification

In their classification of political parties, Hitchner & Levine opined that normally people are associated with one party or the other on the basis of their personal views, and that the party membership depends on several other socio-economic forces. Nevertheless people do associate themselves with one party or the other, taking into account their class, economic interests, hereditary interests, and interests of a particular group. Hitchner and Levine classified contemporary political parties into three categories. These are pragmatic parties, doctrinal parties and interest parties.

Pragmatic parties are normally not committed to any particular ideology. Their policies are adjusted according to the requirements of situations. Most of these parties are usually influenced more by the leader of the day and less by the party ideology. The American parties, the British Conservative Party (and now even the Labour Party), India's Congress Party all come in this category. It is believed that the parties are more pragmatic in the two party systems. This is so because they have to represent, from time to time, different socio economic interests.

The parties that are committed to a particular ideology and believe in certain principles may be described as the doctrinal parties. The policies are often changed or adjusted according to domestic or international environmental changes, but their ideologies remain unaltered. Socialist parties may be included in this category. These, for example, are: the British Labour party, the Socialist parties of

Belgium and France, United Socialist Party of Chile, or Komei of Japan. It is not that the left-oriented parties alone are doctrinal in nature.

According to Hitchner and Levine, many of the parties in the multiparty system and smaller parties even in the two-party system generally represent particular interests. Thus, these may be described as 'interest-oriented' parties. When an interest group converts itself into a party, either temporarily or permanently, it comes in this category. Nature of interests may vary from prohibition-related, to those working for farmers' interests, or those seeking interests of a caste or community. The Swiss Farmers' Party, the German Greens, the Irish Nationalist Party of the UK are some such parties. In India, there are a number of such interest-oriented parties. These, for example, include the Jharkhand Mukti Morcha, the Peasants and Workers Party of Maharashtra, or even the Bahujan Samaj Party committed to the upliftment of the dalits.

Several recent scholars have offered their classifications of party systems. There is lot of similarity between some of these classifications. Some of these are given below:

Almond's classification follows the following pattern:
1) Authoritarian Parties. One of its sub-categories is called totalitarian parties or dictatorships;
2) Dominant Non-Authoritarian (democratic) parties;
3) Competitive two parties; and
4) Competitive multi-parties.

James Jupp accepted the above classification generally, but modified it and gave his own version, which is as under:
1) Indistinct (not very clear) bi-partisan system;
2) Distinct bi-partisan system;
3) Multi-party system;
4) Dominant (one-party) party system;
5) Broad one-party system;
6) Narrow one-party system; and
7) Totalitarian system

According to Hitchner & Levine, modern party system may be classified as under:
1) Competitive two-party systems;
2) Competitive multi-party systems;
3) Dominant non-authoritarian systems;
4) Authoritarian party systems; and
5) States without party system.

Duverger broadly divided all the party systems into two. These are (i) pluralistic party systems and (ii) one-party systems and dominant party systems. In the first category Duverger included:

1) Multi-party systems; and 2) Two-party systems. In the second category Duverger included (i) one-party systems; and (ii) the dominant party systems.

Keeping in view these four and some other classifications, we may broadly classify all the parties as: Two-party systems; Multi-party systems; and One-party systems. All the three are discussed below. A reference will be made to the one-party dominant system also.

Role of party system : A comparative analysis

Political parties are essential for the working of contemporary political processes. Parties, as explained above, are of different types, as are the party systems. The role of a party depends largely on the type of polity in which it functions. Modern democracies are party governments. Persons like Jayaprakash Narain had suggested that a party less democracy would make for peace and stability. Parties, in their view cause conflict. However, these views may have some merit, but in today's environment these opinions appear to be too idealistic or utopian.

The role of political parties in a parliamentary democracy is different from the presidential system. In the former the competitive parties formulate public opinion, select candidates and seek election to secure maximum number of seats in the Parliament, so that they are in a position to form their governments. The party or parties that fail to secure majority of seats sit in the opposition and offer constructive criticism. Two-party system is best suited for the efficient working of parliamentary democracy. But, there are many democracies, like India, where many competing parties offer varied choice to the voters. Normally, in a multi-party system no single party may secure a clear majority, but a number of parties enter into coalition to form the government; the others occupy the opposition benches. One-party system is normally found in totalitarian states. It consists of only one party that is often identified with the state. There is lack of opposition which makes the rulers authoritarian. In the presidential system of democracy, parties have relevance only at the time of presidential election. They do not count in the formation of government.

The critics of one-party system find it totalitarian in which wishes of the people are suppressed. Its supporters, on the other hand, hail it as protector of national interests; as quick decisions can be taken, time is not wasted and even unnecessary expenditure is avoided. The Marxists consider parties as representatives of class interests, and if there are several parties, they lead to class conflicts, a situation in which national interest is sacrificed. One party, according to the Marxists, represents the working people and protects them against exploitation. Fascists regard their party as the instrument of governance assisting the leader, so that prestige of the nation is enhanced. Despite these merits, the one-party system is criticised for denying the people an opportunity to have their free will represented. The people have to obey the party and its leader blindly.

The system is not only undemocratic, but also destroys the initiative of the people. Western writers, such as Finer are of the opinion that an authoritarian one party should not even be called a party, because rather than being a part of the system, it is the whole, arbitrary and totalitarian political group. Such parties assume all powers, and destroy the leadership qualities of the masses.

The two-party system has several merits. It ensures stability of government; it is relatively easy for the Prime Minister to form the Cabinet. Once a person is chosen as leader of the majority party he selects the ministers and entrusts portfolios to them. In a disciplined two-party system the task of the Prime Minister is easy, unless there is a weak leader and unless the party is faction-ridden. In that case, the Prime Minister has to appease various factional leaders. Secondly, there is no room for violence or revolution to bring about change of government. People can easily withdraw their mandate at the time of next election. Even in the presidential system, the choice of the President is easily made by the people, without resorting to violent means. The task of voters is easy in a two party system, as they have only two alternatives to make their choice. Since there is a strong opposition, its voice is carefully heard by the ruling party, and its views taken into serious consideration. The ruling party remains vigilant, and the opposition knows that it may be called upon to form the next government. Therefore, it makes only workable suggestions.

The critics of the two-party system have their arguments. They say that this system presents just two alternatives to the voters. Many voters can hold views which are not represented by the two parties. They do not get opportunity to have their true representation in the legislature. Secondly, the majority party can have any legislation adopted by the legislature on the basis of its absolute majority. The opposition does get an opportunity to express its views, but the power of the Parliament is, in effect, limited. Thirdly, members of legislature merely carry out the wishes of party whips, and their initiative is often checked.

The multi-party system is indeed more democratic, as it offers wider choice to the people. Different sections of people find their voice through their representatives, who may or may not ensure proportional representation. In most of the cases, coalition governments are formed which are based on compromises on the policies of various parties. Consequently, ideology often goes into the background. On the merit side, it may be noted that it is more democratic, and none of the parties can become arbitrary or authoritarian. Secondly, the respect of legislature is enhanced as its decisions are taken after due deliberations on the floor of the House; they are not arrived at in the party caucus and then rubber stamped by the legislature. This system ensures representation to all minorities, and also protects their interests. However, on the negative side, the multi-party system breeds indiscipline, and leads to frequent formation and collapse of coalition governments. The leadership has to make compromises, and the government often suffers from indecision. Instability and lack of discipline are major shortcomings of the multi-party system. This system is most unsuitable for crises, when quick decisions are required, but cannot be taken because of the involvement of several parties, ideologies and leaders.

An objective analysis of the good and bad points of different party systems leads us to conclude that there can be no system better than well-organised, well-disciplined two party system. It is democratic and ensures stability of government.

Module –VI

Interest Articulation and Interest Groups: A Comparative Analysis of Pressure groups.

In democratic politics, pressure groups are organisations which attempt to influence the government. The International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences describes tlie groups as representilig the interest of the sections into which a society is divided. With advanced specialisation groups will be more numerous and specialised. Such groups represent interest of various sections of society viz., farmers, labourers, government employees, businessmen, professional people and even students. Pressure groups are also known as interest groups.

Almond & Powell have defined the interest groups, and discussed their role in the wider context of interest articulation. In every society, there is a process of presenting people's demands before the policy-makers. Almond & Powell say that, "The process by which individuals and groups make demands upon the political decision-makers we call interest articulation." These demands may be of temporary nature like a demonstration worldwide asking the United States not to wage war against Iraq. Or, the demand may be articulated for a long-term interest, like traders demand for tax relief, or trade unions' demands for better working conditions. As Almond and Powell have said the interest articulator may be as varied as an unorganised mob or a well-organised systematic organisation. Admitting that their definition may not be perfect, yet Almond and Powell say: "By 'interest group' we mean a group of individuals who are linked by particular bonds of concern or advantage, and who have some awareness of these bonds. The structure of interest group may be organised to include continuing role performance by all members of the group, or it may reflect only occasional and intermittent awareness of the group interest on the part of individuals. Thus, an interest group is an association of people to achieve certain specific objectives, and for this purpose it may even pressurise the institutions of the state.

Discussing the pressure groups, David Truman describes them thus, "Pressure groups are attitude groups that make certain claims upon other groups in the society." The activities of the government have direct impact on the lives of people. On the other hand, activities of the individuals cannot help affecting the decisions of the government. This work can be effectively done only by organised groups of people. Hitchner & Levine prefer the use of the term interest groups. They say that, "An interest group is a collection of individuals who try to realise their common objectives by influencing public policy." They argue that interest groups and pressure groups are not the same thing. The term pressure groups have a negative connotation as it implies use of pressure, or unwanted interference, by groups to achieve their objectives. Interest groups can be described as the non-state actors, or individuals, or modern states. But, politics alone is not the objective of their activities. According to Hitchner & Levine, "The interest group system is thus a part of both the general culture and social framework and the political structure of a particular state."

Interest groups are organisations of people for the achievement of certain specific goals, who, if necessary, pressurise the state. They may be regularly involved in the pressure politics, or may at times involve themselves in pressure politics, and at other times perform other functions to promote their interests.

Meaning of Pressure Groups

We have said above that the terms interest groups and pressure groups, despite differences in their nature, are often used as synonyms. In this sub-section, we will concern ourselves mainly with the meaning of pressure groups. Duverger was of the view that, "Most pressure groups… are non-political organisations, and pressure politics is not their primary activity. Any group, association or organisation, even those whose normal concerns are far from politics, can act as pressure groups in certain areas and under certain circumstances." It is generally believed that the pressure groups try to bring about changes in policies of the government either by influencing its institutions, or even otherwise. However, the pressure groups do not enter the legislature on their own. Carter & Herz had argued that the modern pluralist society, full of economic, professional, religious, ethical and other interest groups, is faced with the major problem of how to coordinate the activities of different groups on the one hand and government and politics on the other. Interest groups enjoy freedom to be established and function in a free democratic society. When these groups endeavour to influence the political process, and thereby get favourable decisions in matters such as enactment of legislation, imposition of taxes and duties, framing of rules and issuance of licences, etc. then these interest groups transform themselves into pressure groups. Another writer V.O. Key was of the opinion that the interest groups are such private organisations who are established to influence the public policy. They do not take part in the selection of candidates or the legislative processes. They devote themselves to pressurise and influence the government in order to promote their interests.

Writing in the context of liberal democratic countries, particularly, the United States, S.E. Finer had opined that, "…the pressure groups are, by and large, autonomous and politically neutral bodies, which bargain with the political parties and the bureaucracy irrespective of the political complexion of the government in power." The groups can adopt various methods of bargaining, in their interests, including even unconventional or corrupt methods. It is obvious that the pressure groups are associations of individuals for the promotion of the interests of their members. Every individual has numerous interests. One may be an office-bearer of a residents' welfare association, father of university-going children, and a sugarcane farmer, a shareholder in a large business house or industrial establishment and may also be a social activist as also a trustee of a religious or charitable institution. All the interests of one individual cannot be served by one group. He or she, therefore, may join several interest groups to put pressure on the state for different purposes. Interest groups, or pressure groups, are not new phenomenon in politics. These groups have existed, in one form or the other, at all times. But, these groups are deliberately organised and are much more powerful today. This is because modern governments have taken upon themselves numerous non-traditional

responsibilities. As mentioned earlier, an interest group is a voluntary association of individuals who join hands to protect and promote their particular interest. What is an interest? La Palombara defined interest as "a conscious desire to have public policy of authoritative allocation of values move in a particular, general or specific direction." We must, however, remember that there are always some groups which are not concerned with public policy. We are not concerned with them in the present unit. For our purpose, an interest group is a group which has a stake in pressure process. There is a view that the terms like pressure groups, organised interests, lobbies etc. Are all synonyms. But there are certain differences also. According to H. Zeigler, it is "an organised aggregate which seeks to influence the context of governmental decisions without attempting to place its members in formal governmental capacities." In the words of Alfred de Grazia, the pressure group is "simply an organised social group that seeks to influence the behaviour of political officers without seeking formal control of the government."

Every society is divided into a number of groups. With the passage of time, they have become more and more specialised. While there are numerous groups like those of industrialists, bank employees, university teachers, workers in industry and commerce, which operate within a country, there are other groups that transcend national borders. There are certain essential features of the pressure groups. These are (i) pressure groups are part of the political process of a country (ii) they attempt either to strengthen or change the direction of government policy and (iii) they do not seek, as pressure groups, to directly capture political power and run the government.

Mass and Traditional Groups

The interest or pressure groups may be divided into two categories, on the basis of their organisation. These are either mass groups or traditional groups. This distinction is similar to the one between mass and traditional parties.

Like the mass political parties, the mass groups also have large membership. The groups having thousands or even lakhs of members require an effective organisation. This category includes well-organised trade unions, and also organisations of farmers, associations of craftsmen, and associations of small businessmen. These are groups related to industrialists or workmen of various types. In addition, there are youth organisations, associations of athletes, and cultural committees. The earliest mass groups were set up on the initiative of socialist parties to organise the working people. Thus, the bases of both the trade unions and socialist movements can be traced to the working people. Today, there are numerous interest groups having a common objective, but operating in the social sector. Some of such groups, according to Duverger, are groups concerned with disarmament, abolition of nuclear weapons, and those fighting against casteism, communalism and fundamentalism. However, in the People's Republic of China and other former and present socialist countries several mass organisations act as subsidiaries of the concerned Communist Parties. Practically every enlightened person helps interest groups in giving them the form of mass movements, by their active association. Some of the mass groups are youth organisations, women's groups and peace movements largely, but

not essentially, in communist countries. Duverger describes them as the parallel hierarchies. Such groups are now becoming active in western liberaldemocracies.

You have read in the last unit that traditional political parties are generally associated with elitist sections. Similarly, traditional pressure groups value quality more than the members. They are relying more and more on the elitist sections. The earliest elitist groups include the intellectuals' organisations of the eighteenth century, and the twentieth century political clubs of France. For example, The Jean Moulin Club of France is one such group. It has only about 500 members. Its members (elite) include senior government officials, engineers, university professors and influential journalists. Even in India, there are a number of elite groups with limited membership. One such elite group in India is Association of Defence Officers' Wives. Similarly, there is Association of Steel Producers. The Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry (as mentioned earlier) is a very powerful elite group. Traditional, or elite group of different countries include groups of concerned country's industrialists, associations of higher administrative service officers, unions of intellectuals, of writers, of poets, or artisans etc. There are many such groups in the UK, USA, France, Germany, Japan and India.

Relationship between Interest/pressure groups and political Parties

A distinguishing feature of interest/pressure groups is that they seek to influence public policy-makers, but without attempting to take over directly the control and conduct of the government. Political parties, on the other hand, are primarily concerned with governance – to contest elections and try to secure majority of seats in the legislature, or the office of chief executive, and govern the country. Neumann pointed out the distinction between parties and the interest groups thus: Fundamentally, pressure groups are the representation of homogeneous interests seeking influence. The interest group is strong and effective when it has a directed specific purpose. Political parties, on the other hand, seeking office and directed towards policy decisions, combine heterogeneous groups. In fact it is one of their major themes to reconcile the diverse forces within political society. Theirs is an integrative function which is not the domain of the interest groups.

Maurice Duverger made a distinction between the two in the following words: Political parties strive to acquire power and exercise it—by electing—mayors and deputies, and by choosing cabinet ministers and the head of state. Pressure groups on the contrary, do not participate directly in the acquisition of power or in its exercise; they act to influence power while remaining apart from it… they exert pressure on it… Pressure groups seek to influence the men who wield power, not to place their own men in power, at least not officially… It is possible that sometimes members of a pressure group may become members of the legislatures or even the executive; but even if that happens, it is kept secret. Harold R. Bruce wrote: "In their relation to the political parties pressure groups are in the singular position of being independent of them and also cooperative with them as a given situation may dictate. Pressure groups are normally not partisan in character; they disregard party lines; they seek popular support among the voters or support of members of legislative bodies and executive

authorities…" Similar views were expressed by Duverger. He wrote, "Certain powerful groups actually have their own representatives in governments and legislative bodies, but the relationship between these individuals and the groups they represent remains secret or circumspect."

Thus, political parties are directly engaged in political activity, including selection of candidates for election, presenting formally formulated policies and a clear platform for seeking popular votes, and if successful to run the affairs of state. Those who get lesser number of votes and seats, sit in the opposition and offer constructive opposition to the ruling party. None of them come within the role of the pressure groups. The interest/ pressure groups are essentially non-political associations. Their primary functions may be economic, social, religious or humanitarian. Pressure is not their main business. They do so if necessary for the promotion of the interests of their members. Parties are committed to a wide-range of issues and policies; their goal is political power. An interest group, on the other hand, has a narrower focus. It is primarily to articulate specific demands that it comes into existence. As Professor S.R. Maheshwari wrote, "It is the task of a political party to reconcile and aggregate their competing demands of interest groups and put them into coherent programmes and action plans. Thus viewed, political parties prevent the interest groups from directly dominating the decision-making apparatus and process in a country."

The relationship between the parties and pressure groups is not the same everywhere. Each political system has different nature of parties and groups, as also their relationship. In the United States and Britain, the interest groups articulate demands, seeking to transform them into authoritative policies by influencing the political processes. While the groups are functionally specific and differentiated, the parties play the aggregative role. As Almond wrote, "… the party system stands between the interest groups system and the authoritative policy-making agencies and screens them from the particularistic and disintegrative impact of special interests." Secondly, France and Italy offer a different type of relationship. In these two, and some other countries, both the parties and interest groups exist as fairly well organised entities, but not as autonomous systems. The parties control the groups in various ways. Thus, one finds communist-controlled or socialist party-controlled trade unions. In such a situation, "the interest groups get prevented from articulating functionally specific, pragmatic demands, for their activities have become highly political." When groups allow themselves to become affiliates to parties, they, in turn, weaken the capacity of parties to aggregate various interests. Thirdly, in several third world countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, neither the parties nor the pressure groups stand very well differentiated. In the words of Gabriel A. Almond, "Associational interest groups such as trade unions and business associations may exist in the urban westernised parts of the society, but in the village and the countryside interest organisation takes the form of lineage, caste, status, class, and religious groups, which transmit pressure demands to the other parts of the pressure structure by means of information communication." In many of the Third World countries, parties tend to be adhoc arrangements, without clear policies and without grassroots organisation. Consequently, adds Almond, "… the significant political groups are neither the parties, nor the associational interest groups, but elements of cliques from the bureaucracy and the army."

Whatever pattern is followed in a political system, it is clear that the pressure groups, despite being independent of the parties, do still maintain contacts with them, in one way or the other, and try to influence legislation and decision-making process through these contacts.

Classification of interest groups

Interest groups have been variously classified by different scholars. Some of these classifications are briefly discussed below. Certain conclusions will be then drawn from these analyses.

Almond's Classification

In detailed analysis of interest groups, Almond says that there can be four different types of groups. This classification has generally been supported by Hitchner and Levine also. According to Almond, the interest groups are of following types:

i) Institutional Interest Groups;

ii) Anomic Interest Groups;

iii) Associational Interest Groups; and

iv) Non-Associational Interest Groups.

The institutional interest groups are closely connected with various institution, and even political parties. These groups also exist with in the legislatures, bureaucracies, churches, corporations and even armed forces. They are very active in the bureaucracy, for it is there that most of decision-making is done. They are equally close to legislatures. They form part of a highly organised structure, but this structure has been created for purposes other than what these groups articulate. These groups do not need any other organisation to articulate their demands. As Almond said, institutional interest groups are "formal organisations, composed of professionally employed personnel, with designated political and social functions other than interest articulation. But, either as corporate bodies or as smaller groups within these bodies (such as legislative blocs…). These groups may articulate their own interests or represent the interest of other groups in the society."

Such groups are very influential and powerful. In some of the third world countries, they are not satisfied only by exercising influence. They even seize power, as, for example, the military clique did in Burma, or Bangladesh (After Sheikh Mujib's murder),or Pakistan, or Nigeria. These are exceptions. These groups are generally concerned with better conditions for their members.

The anomic interest groups, Almond said, are "more or less spontaneous penetrations into the political system from the society." These groups often appear when normal means of expressing dissatisfaction prove ineffective. They may be concerned with religious or linguistic or ethnic disturbances, or demonstrations, even assassinations and hijackings. They are generally characterised by unconventional, usually violent means.

Such groups may influence the political system in numerous unconventional ways. They are occasionally found even in the western developed nations. The associational interest groups are closely associated with formally organised institutions. They are functionally specialised, and they articulate the interests of specific groups, such as management, labour, business and agriculture. These groups are found in those countries where right to association is constitutionally recognised. Some of them have regular paid employees on their roles to influence the concerned institution.

These groups are generally concerned with economic interests. The Federation of Economic Organisations, and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce and Industry are some of the examples of associational groups. The associations of teachers, lawyers, doctors and other professionals all come in this category. Unlike the well-organised associational system, the non-associational groups are based on factors like kinship, ethnicity, status and religious. They articulate the interests informally and irregularly. They do not have any permanent organisation.

Jean Blondel's Classification

Interest groups have been classified by Blondel on the basis of factors responsible for their formation. Broadly speaking there are two categories of groups. These are (i) community interest groups; and (ii) associational groups. Both the categories are further divided into two sub-categories each. The community interest groups are formed to promote community interests. The social relations are in the back of their formation. Community life brings people together. They share the joys and sorrows of people together. Most of the community groups are informal; only some are formally organised. They put pressure on the government to seek state protection and assistance. The community groups are divided between (a) customary and (b) institutional groups. The groups that essentially follow the customs and traditions of the community fall in the category of customary groups. The groups of castes and sub-castes in India are of this type. Blondel has described those community groups as institutional who are formed by people living together for a long time, and who develop common social relationship. Some of the examples of this type can be welfare associations of serving or retired soldiers like the veterans unions, the civil servants welfare associations, or the senior citizens' welfare bodies.

The associational groups identified by Blondel generally follow the pattern of Almond and Hitchner & Levine. These groups have two sub-categories (a) protective groups and (b) promotional groups. The protective groups try to protect the interests of their members like those of trade unions and associations of traders or professionals. They, thus, have more or less homogeneous clientele. The promotional groups, on the other hand, have membership or large cross-sections of community. The promotional groups may include group for disarmament, or the Greens seeking promotion of environmental security. Besides, the protective groups generally manage to have greater influence over policymaking process than the promotional groups. As Robert Salisbury wrote, in the context of British groups, the protective groups have "substantial influence over policy", whereas "promotional pressure, even when they mobilise a large following, tend to be regarded as having only a minor

impact on public decisions." Finally, the protective groups generally have more flexible strategies, while the promotional groups face the problem of goal adaptation following the change in political situation. The protective groups never run out of the agenda, while the promotional groups are terminal in nature, at least in conception.

Maurice Duverger's Classification

Maurice Duverger, who prefers to use the term pressure groups, talks of two main problems. These are: First, whether those groups should be called pressure groups whose only function is to exert political pressure, or even those can be called pressure groups which have multi-dimensional activities. Second, whether the term pressure groups should be used only for non-official groups or even official groups can be brought in this category. It is in the context of these two questions that Duverger offered the following classification.

In the context of his first question, Duverger distinguishes between (i) Exclusive Groups; and (ii) Partial Groups. In the first category are those groups whose only function is to put pressure on the political system. Thus, the French Parliamentary Association for the Defence of Educational Freedom is an exclusive group. There are several groups in the United States who are whole-time in the business of pressure politics, through the device of lobbying (see below). The partial groups, on the other hand, are essentially set up to be the promoters of interests of their members, but in that process do occasionally use pressure tactics. There are numerous such partial groups in every democratic country including Britain and India. Several associations of professionals (doctors, lawyers, chartered accountants, and architects), of university or school teachers, or women activists, or those concerned with cultural activities also, if needed, try to put pressure on civil servants, legislators and others. But, there can be no rigidity in this classification. Any partial group may take to whole time pressure politics.

On the second basis, Duverger makes a distinction between (i) Private Groups; and (ii) Public Groups. The first country to have experienced the pressure groups was the United States, where private institution groups had begun to use pressure on the state apparatus. Gradually, even official or public groups also joined in the process of pressure politics. The official groups may even include those officials who secretly align themselves with one or more pressure groups to serve certain interests. Duverger also refers to, what he calls pseudo-pressure groups. These groups include specialists who use pressure politics not for themselves, but for others. This is often done for monetary consideration. Duverger includes in this category, the technical experts as well as information (mass) media. A reference will be made below, while dealing with the role of pressure groups, to the role of mass media.

Role of interest/pressure groups

The role of pressure groups depends to a large extent on the type of government that a country has. Their role in the presidential system, as in the United States is more significant than that in

parliamentary democracies, like Britain and India. Their role is minimum, or non-existent, in one-party states, and particularly in authoritarian systems.

Their role is highlighted by Henry Ehrmann, while discussing the merits of pressure groups. He says: "The interests which they represent link their membership with community values. Hence groups are likely to reflect more accurately than do other bodies, the concerns of the society in which they operate." Further, where the formal system of representation proves inadequate, interest groups, represent community values more realistically than do parties. Interest groups employ all conceivable methods to promote their interests. They request and cajole, they bribe and entertain. The most popular method of pressure politics, called lobbying, was developed in the United States. Lobbying is only one of the methods of pressure politics, yet it is the most effective. Lobbying is, peculiarly American practice, and its practitioners try to directly influence the lawmakers and other officials.

Lobbying

Lobbyists, in the words of Alfred de Grazia are "highly organised; they claim large membership lists; they have agents who are skilled in persuasion and public relations; they insist that their purposes are consonant with the public welfare." Lobbying is, as mentioned above, an American practice, though it is not the monopoly of the United States. Lobbying is practised in many other democratic countries also, yet it will be appropriate to discuss this practice in the American background. The term "lobbying" is used to indicate the technique of establishing contracts with the members of Congress and state legislatures to influence them to vote for or against a measure to suit the interest of a pressure group. Very often pressure groups engage exmembers of the Congress to influence the legislators. They are familiar with the lobbying techniques. There are several hundred regular 'lobbyists' working permanently in Washington D.C. They are paid employees of interest groups. They need not necessarily influence the legislators in the lobbies of the Congress, although the term is derived from that. According to Johnson, much of the time of Congressmen is spent "at the behest of groups and individuals, in urging administrative officers from the President down to 'go easy' on enforcing certain laws, to enforce others vigorously… and so on."

Representatives of special interests haunted the environs of the First Continental Congress, but the word "lobby" was not used until 1808 when it appeared in the reports of the tenth Congress. By 1829, the term "lobby-agents" was used for favour-seekers at the capital of New York. By 1832, it had been shortened to "lobbyist" and was widely in use in the American capital.

The lobbyists build 'contacts' with the Congressmen "dog their footsteps", and try to influence their decisions and votes. Generally they seek to promote the legitimate interests of the groups, but sometimes do indulge in selfish game also. In some rare cases even methods such as bribery—direct or indirect—and blackmail are also used to influence the legislators. A strong-willed Congressman may even be coerced by arranging a flood of letters, telegrams and telephonic calls from the voters in his district. In recent years legislative provisions have been made to curb the pressure politics and

lobbying, but it cannot be said that much success has been achieved in checking the practices. Political parties, pressure politics and lobbying have become parts of American political system.

Most of the American interest groups have been economic in character. There have been labour pressure groups that seek to represent the point of view of organised labour in elections and in the Congress. On the other hand, there have been business pressure groups that sought to represent the interests of industry. In recent times, however, several groups have emerged that focus on social activities. Some such groups are, the National Council of Christians and Jews and the United Methodists. Thus, every major community has its own lobby. There are several new ideological interest groups like the Common Cause and the National Committee to Secure a Free Congress. This is a very special group known as "Save the Whale". They print bumper stickers saying "Save the Whale".

The common belief is that the pressure groups have an impact only on the legislative process. Actually, as Dr. Kirkpatrick asserts, pressure groups in America impact on decision-making process at every stage… They impact on public opinion. They have large campaigns. Advertisements get placed in newspapers." The pressure groups are very active during national as well as local elections. The groups influence the executive officers and even the judges. The French scholar Alexis de Tocqueville had once said if you put three Americans in a room together they would from an organisation. It is true. Americans have been described as "joiners". They are organisers. They form pressure group and seek solution of all their problems through them. Dr. Kirkpatrick refers to the role of organised group even in non-government spheres. She told an Indian interviewer in 1978.

Role of interest groups : A comparative analysis

Many writers have recognised that the group is the fundamental political form; this trend originated from Arthur Bentley in 1908. The group bears importance in respect of law-making, organising party activity, framing public policy and its application, decision-making in public administration, and protecting civil liberties. The political scientists have paid attention to the recognition of the significance of the study of group, and an understanding of politics, and they have also produced a good number of treatises on the nature of group organisation.

The pluralist society of America is the home of pressure groups. The open-ended nature of party, the functioning of the party system and of the Congressional system attract the attention of pressure groups. For this reason, pressure groups of the USA try to influence the elections. The organisation of American Congress demands the presence of pressure groups. For instance, if a bill goes to the appropriate committee, it is subjected to hearing, i.e. outside witnesses are nothing but the representatives of the pressure groups. Unlike the British Parliament, the American Congress is independent of the executive, and it is competent to extend or reject any legislation initiated by it. This is also the reason why the America Congress attracts pressure-group activity. This separated power structure of the government invites attention of pressure groups. The concentration upon the

executive can hardly ensure the success of pressure groups. In Britain, if a proposal is supported by the executive, it means that would have the support of the party's majority in the House of Commons. Therefore, if the approval of the minister or civil servant is obtained, the major battle for the proposal is won. But this is not the case in the USA. Federalism, bicameralism, and the system of checks and balance make unified national government as in the UK which is wholly out of the question in the USA. The system is absolutely open to the external pressure of organised opinion There are literally thousands of interest groups in the USA today, some of them are organised and the others are not. Among the organised groups both the 'associational' and the attitudinal groups exist, covering the interests of the diverse segments of American Society like the manufacturers, distributors, finance professionals, religions and minorities.

There are:

1. The business groups, the largest and most powerful of all American interest groups, like the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and the National Association of Manufacturers (NAM);

2. Farm organisations like the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, the National Council of Farmers' Cooperatives, and the Farmer's Union;

3. Labour Organisations like the American Federation of Labour and Congress of Industrial Organization (AFL—CIO) enrolling about 14 million workers;

4. Professional Organisations like the American Medical Association (AMA) and the American Association of University Professors;

5. Veterans' organisations like the American Legion;

6. Religious organisations like the National Council of Churches (NCC), the Anti-Saloon League, etc.

By means of 'lobbying' behind-the scenes bargaining, propaganda and information, and electoral support, persuasion and threats of violence, these groups have made a tremendous impact on the American political process by their involvement in the different stages in the making of policy.

Pressure groups in the UK may be mainly divided into interest groups and promotional groups. The interest groups have the function of protecting the interest of their own members though there is a widespread belief that their interest is also the interest of the nation. To this extent, they are promotional. Promotional groups are propagandist type. The members belonging to this type of association seek to promote the cause for which it is constituted.

In contrast to the American system which permits greater flexibility and a greater "substitutability of function" to use Almond's phrase the British system is more centralised. The decision-making process is highly centralised in the government and in the parties, and there is a natural gravitation of interests towards the Central government consisting of the ministers and the permanent civil service.

For influencing policy-formulation, pressure groups aim at one or all of three targets: the executive (ministers), Parliament, and the Civil Service, This, of course, depends on expediency. Generally, the more material the interest, the greater is the tendency to focus on the civil servants. If this, attention is directed to the House of Commons.

Primarily, a pressure group acts at the executive level. It always has an ambition of acquiring close relationship with the government. The crown of this ambition is 'consultative status'. In other words, the ministry recognises such a group with the rights as enjoyed by the British Sovereign— "The right to be consulted, the right to encourage and the right to warn." It is because they have so largely acquired this 'consultative status'. Generally, it is said that the most influential of the pressure groups are the most silent. The Confederation of British Industry, the Trades Union Council, the Country Councils Association and the like, attain their result in closed door consultation with the ministry.

The structure of British government includes, besides the hierarchical world of public servants and the parliamentary world of party politics, a very complex world of organised groups, and public decisions are the result of interplay between these worlds. As in other political systems, interest groups in the UK give political articulation to demands of their members, and between elections, provide the chief means by which ministers and civil servants are likely to obtain information and advice about the consequences of specific items of policy for particular groups into which the society is divided. The extent to which these groups shape and restrain government policy varies from issue to issue. Their methods of operation also differ greatly. These include: inducement to individuals, direct pressure on political parties, appeal to public opinion, providing the best information, and involvement in the making and implementation of public policy. They also differ greatly in their internal organisation, in their skill and political resources and in their significance in national political party politics. Interest groups in the UK do not really work in an unhealthy manner. They havehelped in spreading knowledge, creating public opinion, and in producing practical legislation. By drawing people together for political action, these groups have acted as a powerful check on the bureaucracy. Far from weakening democratic government, these groups played an essential part in it, providing a channel of communication between those responsible for policy and the people most affected by it.

The French political system represents "a babel of interests–labour, agricultural and industrial— which competes for the ear of the government, never a united voice".7 These interest groupspersuade the policy-makers about the justice of particular causes. They generally adopt the method of negotiation for realising their aim. The French political system provides ample scope for the interest groups to represent their views to the policymakers. The Prime Minister and the ministers habitually receive delegations from interest groups. Besides, there are thousands of advisory bodies in which interest groups themselves are represented. Informal contacts between interest groups representatives and administrators maintain a constant flow of communication. Big business probably enjoys a rather more advantageous position in this regard, for top-level management and top administrators hail from the same schools. Negotiation may not produce the desired results. When negotiation fails to satisfy

the group, it changes its level of activity. Escalation of the persuasion process can take various forms; demonstrations, strikes, or other forms of non-cooperation, or violence. Demonstrations are occasional in France; strikes are very frequent, particularly in the sphere of nationalised industries. In these cases, the massive but brief walk out is the usual form. The French political system, not frequently, witnesses anomic activity resorted to by some interest groups in order to further their interests. As in the other liberal democracies of Western Europe, the power of organised interest is a pronounced feature in France. The groups are an essential component of the decision-making process, providing a kind of balance to the system, working on the parties, the public, and at the governmental level.8 Their autonomous position and their associational character are distinctly noticeable. In the Third and Fourth Republics in France, the power of group interests was largely political. Their effect was to defeat government policies and make stable government impossible.

They were politically predominant. The assembly acted as both a shock absorber and a channel of communication between the government and the governed.9 In the Fifth Republic, with the shifting of balance of power to the government, the attention of the groups shifted to the centre of the decision-making, namely, the executive. The guiding principle of the Fifth Republic has all along been to tame the power of the political intermediaries–the groups as well as the parties. The initial 'anti-group' bias of President de Gaulle and his Fifth Republic, however, could not be retained. The accumulation of grievance and the explosion of May-June 1968 led, during Pompidou's regime, to a process of consultation in the administrative process. This was most evident in the making of the Five Year Plans. All in all, the role of modern interest groups in the French political process is increasing. As in all other developed nations, West German interest groups have increasingly become larger, less numerous and more situational in character. In fact, two major parties, particularly the Christian Democrats with its wide-ranging support-base, have developed along the Anglo-American pattern, becoming an agglomeration of interest groups. This integration of group demands has become possible owing to the fact that there has been more or less even impressive social and economic progress throughout Germany.

It is to be noted first that the Bonn Law of 1949 explicitly authorises the formation of groups so long as they are not criminal or unconstitutional. There are three major categories of economic pressure groups: trade union, employers and the agricultural interest. On many occasions, unions and employers are likely to combine when a particular region or industry is threatened in some way by a government decision. There is no difficulty in identifying interests of employers and those of employees. On many issues, they will look to the government for favourable action or decisions. If such actions and decisions are contrary to their interests, the interest groups try to modify or thwart their implementation. In Germany, the major organisation of the employers has been the Federation of Germany Industry representing the highest proportion of firms; it has the record successful intervention with governmental decisions relating to, *inter-alia*, Carte legislation and workers' participation in the firms, decision-making. For the employees, the German Federation of Trade Unions represents 16 large trade unions and has some 6.5 million members. Both these organisations

are engaged in political activity and both of these are consulted by the government on legislations pertaining to their interests. The agrarian interest is represented by several bodies, the chief of which is the German Farmers Association protecting the framing interest in the *bundestag* with the help of the representatives from the rural constituencies having heavy concentration of farmers.

So far as social groups are concerned, the influence of the church, especially the Catholic and the Evangelical denominations, is very strong. It exercises influence in regard to the matters relating to conscience, social welfare, educational policy and partly foreign policy as well. Some of the important features of student activity in politics since 1967 are that it is less highly organised, it has several separate organisational structures, and its leadership is diverse. The student movement has been broadly left-wing with reformist and revolutionary sections. Its main purpose is to bring about university reforms and oppose any thing that its leaders denounce as anti-democratic or extreme right wing, such as the emergency laws, the NPD Strauss or the Springer publishing firms, anti Americanisms expressed through oppositions of Vietnam war, etc. The movement is sporadic and anomic in character; it has found expression only in big cities like Munich and Berlin. In fact, it has been able to attract only a small section of the population, but the government has been increasingly becoming cognizant of power in political process. The army played an important part in the policy formulation in the second Empire and the World War I. It had an ambivalent attitude to the government in the Weimar period and played a political role during the Third Reich. From these, it seems to be clear that the Army too has to be reckoned with in politics, from indications available, now, the Army has become the servant of the regime rather than its arbiter. The strategies adopted by pressure groups are determined by three determinants, namely the political culture of the Federal Republic, its institutional structure, and the nature of issues under consideration. The pressure groups have the 'targets' of influencing the member of the *Bundestag* directly; in fact, they have supporters and officials among the legislators. But it should be pointed out that polarisations of the parties on different issues is so strong that it becomes extremely difficult for interest groups to mount pressure. Nevertheless, the pressure groups have an important place in aggregating, amplifying and transmitting the demands of individual citizens, and in representing sections of the community.

Despite mass illiteracy and consequent want of social communication, interest groups are very much in existence in India, although it must be admitted that they are not large in number, and are different from those in the Western countries.11 Interest groups in India are constituted mainly along occupational and economic interests, such as trade unions, peasant groups, teacher-student groups, women's associations, the business community, caste groups, and number of religious associations, etc. Like many other Asian and African states, India has a good number of community interest groups too. The trade unions are divided on political party lines. The INTUC, organised under the banner of the Congress Party in 1947, has been representing the labour front. The CPI dominates the AITUC, while the CPI (M) controls the CITU (Centre for Indian Trade Unions). Interestingly, political leaders get their apprenticeship in public life by working as organisers in the trade union field. Peasant and student groups are also divided along party lines. The Farmers' Forum and the Bharat Sevak Samaj

reflect the Congress party views on rural problems. The Kissan Sabha is the organisation controlled by the communists. In the students' forums, the All India Students' Federation AISF is controlled by the CPI, while the Student Federation of India, SFI, is led by CPI(M) and the *Chhatra Parishad* by the Congress Party, the *Chhatra Janata* has emerged as the students' wing of the Janata Party. Even some women's associations have expressed affiliations to political parties. To use the terminology of Joseph Plombara, the pressure groups tend to work through political parties in a type of 'parentela' relationship. The business community constitutes the most powerful interest group in India. Most of their associations are cautiously sympathetic to the Congress party, for it had so powerful and commanding a majority till the other day that to oppose it for attaining certain objectives would be tactically wrong. There are numerous business associations, such as the Indian Jute Mills Association (IJMA) and the Federation of Indian Chambers of Commerce, in India (FICCI), Bharat Chamber of Commerce. They publish various business journals, e.g. *Capital, Indian Finance, Eastern Economist*, etc., to ventilate the views of Indian business to those who will read them.

An interesting feature of interest groups in India is the 'caste lobby'. These lobbies try to influence the interest of particular castes and demand support for members of the same caste in the legislatures. There is no denying the fact that there exists a bond of relationship between Indian legislators and leaders of religious sectors. Interests organised around traditional loyalties to caste, religion, community, and the like are important forces in India. Of these, regional–linguistic–ethnic groups have been the most important. In the Almond–Powell typology, these represent the so called non-associational interest groups which prevail mostly in states like UP, Bihar, parts of South India and some parts of West Bengal.

Rajani Kothari, a notable analyst of Indian politics, is of the opinion that given the dominant role of government in political institutionalisation and social and economic development, the most important interests are 'crystallised in the form of 'institutional interest groups'—the political parties, the bureaucracy and the factional network. He also observes that in conformity with the larger coalitional pattern that characterises India's political system, the most interesting interest configurations are mixed rather than discrete. Myron Weiner believes that if institutional interest groups such as the army and the civil service are placed at one end of the continuum of organised interest articulation, the anomic movement would seem to be at the other end.Pressure tactics and methods have become an integral part of the prevailing political process in the country. The techniques of organised pressure, through mass campaigns, demonstrations, strikes, civil disobedience, movements, *gheraos and bandhs*, have been frequently used to make some positive concerns to their demands. Myron Weiner has rightly commented that the very frequency with which mass action has succeeded in vetoing government action, or in positively modifying public policy, has strengthened the public belief that such measures are both desirable and effective.16 The prevailing political culture also does not so much favour the operation of organised interest groups, or makes people cynical of them.

But it is equally true and inescapable that in the plural Indian society and the federal political structure, there is no alternative but to recognise the interest groups. The octopus dominance of the Congress Party in the Indian Political Parties Process up to March 1977 and even after 1980 may have been so frustrating for groups that they turned frequently to violent protest. Violence and anomic activities, however, have become an instrument of interest articulation in the so-called developed nations too. But all said and done, interest groups in India must be given opportunities to affect policies and their implementation. They must become oriented towards problem-solving and policy-making.

Criticisms of Pressure groups

Pressure group in India are basically criticized on the following grounds-

1.Focus on parochial interest-Pressure group getting influence by their sectional and local interest more as compared to their common interest.

2.Lack of effective membership-Pressure groups do not have well developed infrastructure which can help them in regular way pursuing their interest.

3.Dominance of single party system-In India for long time there have been single party dominance and these powerful political party do not want to be ruled by any pressure groups.

4.Lack of autonomous existence-Most of the pressure groups except business groups does not have an independent autonomous existence of their own. most of them dominated by political parties, which tries to divide each pressure group and have strong hold over one group at least.

5.varying life span-In India we have loose and disorganized multiparty system hence even pressure group appears big and small with varying life span that appears and disappears.

6.Unstable-Pressure group lacks stability and commitment which results in shift in their loyalties according to changing political situation.

7.Ineffective for interest articulation-pressure group like trade union in India lacked trained and competent functionaries. They have been not an effective agents of interest articulation in India.

8.Use of unconstitutional method-Pressure groups in India tries to influence the government mainly through various unconstitutional method as strikes, agitation, demonstration, lockouts etc.

9.Sometimes led to mass violence -Pressure group involves with protest and certain radicalization of political life results into mass violence. For example Naxalite movement starting after fourth general election of 1967 in west Bengal.

10.Threat to democratic set up-The tendency of pressure group to resort to coercion to secure the solution of a socio-political problem in streets could be regarded as a serious threat to democratic set up.

But despite of all these major criticism the existence of pressure group are now indispensable and helpful element of democratic setup. Pressure group promotes national and particular interests, constitute a link of communication between citizen and the government. They provide necessary information and keeps the nation politically alive. Today democratic politics has to be politics through consultation, negotiation and some amount of bargaining. These cannot happen without pressure groups. The society has became highly complex and individual cannot pursue their interests on their own, they need pressure group for this.Tom Driberge has rightly pointed out "You have only two option with pressure group if you agreed with it then accept it and embrace it and if you are not agreed then ignore it". Pressure groups are so vital that they are not confined to need of developed or developing nation or any form of government.

Module: VII

Bureaucracy (India, USA, UK , CHINA and France) - a comparative analysis

Bureaucracy commonly is used to refer to all agencies and structures involved in public administration. Bureaucracy however refers to a particular way of organising such agencies. Encyclopaedia Britannica defines bureaucracy as a professional corps of officials organised in a pyramidal hierarchy and functioning under impersonal, uniform rules and procedures to secure the goals of their organisations.

Max Weber, the German historian turned sociologist to give a systematic theory of 'bureaucracy' – the patrimonial type prevalent in 'traditional' and 'charismatic' authority systems and the ideal model of 'legal-rational' bureaucracy of legal rational authority systems of modern times. Max Weber was the first one to talk about bureaucracy as a big improvement over the haphazard administration. His is not merely the most oft-quoted theory of public administrative organisations, but also a starting point for most social science researches on bureaucracy.

Characteristics of Weber's Model

Weber's model of bureaucracy has the following characteristics:

1) Specialisation and an elaborate division of labour

2) Hierarchy of positions

3) Technical competence as the chief criterion for recruitment and promotion

4) Written rules and regulations

5) Impersonality and

6) Formal, written communication.

Division of labour

The most fundamental feature of Weber's theory of bureaucracy is a highly developed division of labour and specialisation of functions. This is done by an explicit and detailed definition of duties and responsibilities of each hierarchical unit. The allocation of a limited number of tasks to each office operates according to the principle of fixed jurisdictional areas that are determined by administrative regulations.

Authority structure

Unlike traditional authority structures, where the inferior-superior relationship tends to be on personal grounds, inferior-superior relationships in bureaucratic organisation is based on "rational" and impersonal regulation of authority. There is a definite distribution of official duties in a fixed way.

The authority to issue orders to carry out work is strictly delimited by rules. Methodical provision is made for the regular and continuous fulfilment of these duties and for the execution of the corresponding rights. Thus authority is legitimised by administrative rules and the loyalty of the incumbent is aligned to an impersonal order, to a superior position, not to the particular personage.

Position and role of the incumbent in a bureaucratic organisation

The role and status of the incumbent in a bureaucratic organisation is characterised by the following features: selection and recruitment on the basis of formal qualifications (diplomas, university degrees) that testify applicant's necessary capability to accomplish effectively his specialised duties rather than such considerations as family position or political loyalties. His office is his sole occupation, ensuring stability and continuity, a "life's work." It constitutes a "career." In other words, positions in the bureaucratic organisations are not offered on an honorary or short-term basis. There is normally an elaborate system of promotion on the basis of the principles of seniority and achievement. The system of remuneration is based on the status of his position rather than on his productivity performance per se. There is a clear-cut separation between the private and the public sphere of the bureaucrat's life.

Rules that regulate the relations between organisational members

The presence of a system of control based on rational rules is the most important and ubiquitous feature of bureaucracy. According to Max Weber, "Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge. It is this feature which makes it specifically rational". This stands in extreme contrast to the regulation of all relationships through individual privileges and bestowal of favour, which is dominant in patrimonial organisations, at least in so far as such relationships are not fixed by sacred tradition.

Formal, written communication

The management of the modern office is based upon written documents. The officials engaged in a 'public' office, along with the respective apparatus of material and the files, constitute a 'bureau.' Weber has justified the rationale of the bureaucratic organisations in a democratic regime. Firstly, there is the principle of "fixed and official jurisdictional areas", which ensures job rights to the employees. Secondly, bureaucracy has hierarchical supervision that allows the governed the right to appeal to a higher level of authority with the "full" type of bureaucracy. Weber states that an office manager receives expert training and the official receives compensation for the services one renders to the organisation.

Marxist views on bureaucracy

Marxist writers view bureaucracy in their own perspective. Whereas Lenin and other Soviet writers could not admit that bureaucracy had a permanent and "organic" positionn the Soviet system, other Marxists thought that it was at its centre and that it defined more than anything else the very nature of the regime. From their point of view, bureaucracy was not only a privileged oppressive group but a

new exploiting class, a class characterised by a new type of oligarchic regime that was neither socialist nor capitalist and that was rapidly spreading both in the East and in the West. The first systematic elaboration of this position was attempted by the Italian Marxist Bruno Rizzi in *The Bureaucratisation of the World (1939)*. For Rizzi, the Soviet bureaucracy constituted a new ruling class that exploited the proletariat as much as the capitalists had in the past. It differed from capitalism only in that the new type of domination was based not on individual but on group ownership of the means of production. In fact, in the Soviet system the means of production represented not "socialism" but "statism." They did not belong to the whole collectively but to the state and to the bureaucrats who controlled it. In the last analysis, it was these bureaucrats—the technicians, directors, and specialists holding key positions in the party and state administration—who exploited the proletarians and stole the surplus value of work. According to Rizzi this new type of regime, which he called bureaucratic collectivism, was not limited to the Soviet Union. Similar tendencies could be discerned in fascist countries and even in the "welfare state" type of capitalist democracies. The Yugoslav Communist Milovan Djilas in *The New Class* (1957), a later criticism of the Yugoslav Socialist regime, used arguments similar to Rizzi's.

Functions of bureaucracy in modern times

In modern democratic political regimes, bureaucracy is entrusted with the function to implement the rules made by the legislature. Rule-implementation is considered to be 'mechanical' and a 'quasi-automatic process'. However, according to Blondel, this view is 'oversimplified' as administrators help their ministers to prepare the decisions as they cannot draft all the rules and regulations without the help of the administrators. Hence, the help rendered by the administrators to their ministers is of immense magnitude in view of the fact that even rule-making has become a very complex function. The political regimes are involved in the preparation of both short as well as long-term socio-economic plans and policies. Thus it would be ironical to say that the administrators just play a role in the implementation of the rules and programmes formulated by the state from time to time, rather their contribution in the field of formulation of the rules, policies, and programmes is immensely significant.

However, according to Blondel, even the process of implementation should not be considered as "automatic and mechanical". Rule implementation is also a decision making process as the administrators have to choose one path from among various alternatives available to them (J. Blondel).

Much of the administrative work is 'managerial' or 'technical achievement' in nature. Technicians are specialists and their aim is the growth of the service and its achievements, though not all bureaucracies have attained the similar level of specialisation and technical expertise. For example, French civil service is involved more in technical development than the British and the American bureaucracies. However, proliferation of public functions has led to a greater emphasis on technicians in all states. Managerial demands and the consequent increase in the numbers of specialists in

positions of considerable importance, the relationship between bureaucracy and government has taken a form different from that which the theory of representative government anticipated. Bureaucracy is not merely a technical instrument. It is also a social force with interests and values of its own. As such, it has social consequences beyond its instrumental achievements.

Nature of Bureaucracy in Developing Societies

In the emerging developing societies, bureaucracy has come to acquire the following features.

Firstly, as state plays a key role in the process of development, bureaucracy has been regarded as an important instrument for modernisation, growth and development. However experiences in most third world shows that bureaucracy has not been able to deliver goods as effectively as the theorists on bureaucracy had expected. On the other hand, the structural and behavioural characteristics of Weber's bureaucracy proved to be instrumental in impeding development. Hence it has been attempted to recast and adapt Weber's construct of bureaucracy to the specific realities of developing societies. This has led to the concept of development bureaucracy.

Secondly, unlike the developed countries there is less differentiation of functions in the developing countries as a result of which the powers and importance of bureaucracy crossed its legitimate limits. Fred Riggs argues that the development process involves a clear-cut separation of spheres of activity, provision of separate structures for various functions. There has been a proper coordination between bureaucracy and other political structures.

Thirdly, appointments are done on the basis of merit, which is judged through a public competitive examination comprising both written and personality tests. However the intervention of primordial factors such as personal, caste, tribal, ethnic or religious considerations is still a harsh reality. Favours are bestowed on the basis of non-merit factors to those who qualify the written tests. Appointment to key posts is done mainly on the non-merit considerations. Ethnic considerations have emerged as a strong basis for public appointments. In some states like India there is a system of reservation of seats to the members of most and other backward castes and classes in the matters of public appointments. This is done with a view to make bureaucracy a representative bureaucracy. Such practices tend to limit the ability of states to make effective rules for the society. There is absence of uniform procedures regarding the selection and recruitment of bureaucrats.

Fourthly, the politicisation of bureaucracy is another characteristic in the developing countries. In India, the concept of "committed bureaucracy" was mooted by the then Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in the late 1960s, implying that bureaucrats should be committed to the party in power. However, because of a great public cry, Mrs. Gandhi had to later revise her stance clarifying that what she wanted was commitment to the basic law of the land rather than the government. But the fact is that there has been erosion of the principle of bureaucratic neutrality in the country. The appointment to top officials both at the centre and the states are done on the basis of personal and party loyalty. The

reshuffling and transfers of civil servants before and after the elections have become a common phenomenon. The situation in African states is worse than the

situation in Asia. In Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia, Nigeria, and Uganda as the policy of political mobilisation became an established feature of political systems, the political parties felt it necessary to look for the support of the bureaucratic apparatus. As a result of this, a variety of pattern of links between the political parties and the bureaucracy came into play in these societies. Owing to these relationships, the bureaucracies in these states seem to function in a subservient status vis-à-vis the office of the Presidency within the framework of African socialist ideology and benevolent welfare capitalism.

The enmity between the political parties and the state bureaucracies have at times become quite intensive, giving additional impetus to the office of Presidency and to the institutionalisation of patrimonialism and personal rulership. Such phenomenon is present in the Latin American countries too. However Botswana is an exception amongst the African countries where the principle of neutrality is still the basis of relationship between the politicians and the public servants.

Fifthly, another feature of bureaucracy in developing countries is the existence of rampant corruption within its ranks. It has become so menacing that it is eating into the stability, efficiency and effectiveness of public services. Not only small payments are offered to lower level officials for expediting the work, but also huge sums in bribes and kickbacks for facilitating higher financial and political interests. In Africa public officials are legally permitted to engage themselves in private business, which only accentuates the problem.

Role of Bureaucracy in Developing Countries

After the Second World War, these former colonies were to attempt a mammoth exercise to bring about development in their respective societies. The goals of rapid economic development were to be combined with the democratic political development. Development meant nation-building, growth, equity, democracy, and stability and autonomy. These countries had inherited a colonial bureaucracy. The characteristics of colonial bureaucracy included centralisation of authority, hierarchical, generalist administrators, neutrality. Such a bureaucracy was elitist, authoritarian, and paternalistic in nature. Any organisation of such characteristics as colonial bureaucracy cannot be effective in playing a role in the development process. Thus, generally, the rational legal bureaucratic organisation prescribed by Max Weber, and constructed by the colonial masters to carry out the task of policing and revenue collection, came to be doubted as the effective tool for development.

However some scholars made a plea to these countries to attempt to strengthen the centralised, efficient and strong bureaucracies, if they were to achieve the task of economic and political development. In the words of Joseph La Palombara, a powerful bureaucracy is said to be essential if one is to override the disintegrating influences of artificial political boundaries, the competitive forces of familial and tribal structures, the difficulty for organising and financing political parties, the low

energy output of the population and the tendency of the population to want to expend funds on consumer gadgets rather than on capital formation. In developing states, powerful bureaucracies are simply necessary evils that one must learn to tolerate, hoping for the best from a democratic standpoint.

Bureaucracy in USA

George wasington, the first American president, gave importance to competence in making appoinments. In later years, the development of political parties changed the situation. Political factors begin to be considered important. Whenever a new president came to power he filled up the vacancies with persons of his party. As already mentioned, this system was called spoils system which was given life by a congressional Act of 1810. It provided that terms of district Attorneys, Collectors, Surveyors of Customs, Navy Agents, Paymasters, and certain other officers should be limited to four yars. It paved the way for the rotation in office with the change of administration.

The spoil system had producd an inefficient bureaucracy in USA. Many of the leaders started to think seriously about reforms. In 1883, the Pendleton Act was passed. It created civil service commission and, paved way for the organisation of an efficient bureacracy. Later, many congressional Acts were passed to make changes in the methods of recruitment to federal offices. Now about 80 per cent of the federal posts are filled through competitive examinations and rest by political appoinments made by the president.

The role bureacracy in the decision making process of the country constitutes the most important part of the American political system. The secret of this matter lies in the fact that the bureacrats are decision makers. The job of the executive is the implementation of rules. Since the bureaucrats constitute the lower layer, they can well be found associated with the president and his secretaries forminfing the upper layer of the government and charged with the task of running the administration of the country what astonishes a student of politics at this stage is that, like Britian, bureaucracy plays quite a significant part in the operation of the political system so much so thet not only the executive but also the legislative spheres does not remain immune from its influence despite th efact the American constitutional system is based on the celeberated principle of seperation of powers.

There is a two way traffic insofar as the relationship between the president and bureaucrats is concerned in respect of influencing each other. It has its definite impact on the process of decsion making. There are several means by which the president may enforce his demands on the bureaucrats. The power of making top appoinments, skilful use of rewards and sanctions, and the power of making top appoinments, skilful use of rewards and sanctions, and the power over the organisation of the executive branc are useful instruments in the hands of the president through which he may influence the top bureaucrats.

Like wise the relationship between the bureaucracy and the Congress is like a two-way traffic, each influencing and controlling the other in its own way. Before making a decision, the bureaucrats must frequently ask themselves what the reactions of the Congress are likely to be it is due to three reasons: (1) Congress's power of the purse whereby it sanctions grants to various departments, (II) General power of th Congress relating to programme auhorisation and amendement, and (III) the commitee system in which the senior mmbers of the federal legislature act as chairman and thereby force the bureacrats to have good relationship with the legislature. An unwary bureacrats may suddenly find his funds being cut if he has forgotten to cultivate a favourable relationship with certain congressman and that he has spurned too many congressional demands.

 The bureacratic system may be found to provide an interest group with certain services or regulaing some interest group, the role of of the interest groups is usally one of encouraging the bureaucratic sub-system, giving any help it can, and forming a united front with bureacracy whenever the programme is threatend by budgets cuts or other curtailment. The various interest groups running huge establishments depend on the policies and pprogrammes of the executive departments.

Bureacracy in Britian

 The british bureacratic system considered to be one of the best in the world. It mainatains the hghest possible sandads of effciency and integrity. In England the executive branch of the government consisists elements-the amatures and experts. The ministers are amatures and the members of the higher category of the permanent civil service, known as the adminstrative class, are expert. The former are politicians and laymen in sofar as administrative is concerned. A politician is appointed minister not because he possesses expert knowledge of the functions and working of the department over which he has to preside but for many other considerations. He may be an influential leader of the party, good debater or he may be close to the prime minister.

The minister of a department has to depend on the advice of the civil servents who are a hort of "permanent brains trust". They advise and assist the minister concerning the work of the department and find solutions to various administrative problems arising outside the normal routine of the department . Although policy making is the responsibility of the minister, even in the field he is dependent upon the permanent Under Secretary whose knowledge and experince provides the necessary foundation for policy determination. Further, it is the civil servents of the department whp prepare answers which the minister has to given in Parliment.

The British executive is a strange combination of amatures and experts. The ministers who are supposed to be responsible for running the government are amatures; they have no expert knowledge of the adminstraive affairs. It is the members of the permanent civil service who actually run the government. It is, therefore, said that in England democracy exists only in name; it is the civil service that is all powerful. The bureacracy dominates all three fields of governmental functions, administration,legislation and finance.

The civil servents while imlementing the policy laid down by the cabinet and the minister heading their department perform many acts which involve policy. The minister has no time to scrutinize the day-to day policy of each department is shaped by the top ranking civil servents who are conversant with the details and their implications.

The role of civil servent in legislation is very significant. When a new bill is drafted, the foundation material for it is supplied by the officals of the department concerned; the minister concerned recieves from his party or the cabinet only broad outlines of aims and objects of the proposed bill. The bill is drafted by experts.

The ever growing volume of delegated legislation has considerably enhanced the powers of the bureaucracy. Parliment while passing a bill indicates only the broad principles and passes the law in skelton form, leaving discrtionary power to the adminstrationto fill up the details.

In England the device of the question is employed to enforce ministrial responsibility and to control acts of the administration. The questions are answered by the minister.but it is the permanent officals of the department concerned who prepare the answers. Being experts and in full know of the adminisrative details, the officals can supply answers which may obscure or confuse the issue and make it difficult for the private members to elict the information they want.

The critics, thereffore, argue that England is governed by the bureaucracy behind the facade of ministrial responsibility and parlimentary supremacy. Both parliment and the political executive, i.e, the cabinet, have abdicated their power and responsibilty to the bureaucracy it has to admitted that the British civil srvice is not as democratic as the American.

Bureaucracy in India

Civil Services, though, not in an organised form, have existed since ancient times. Advent of East India Company, the civil service constituted a group of men known as factors who carried on its trade. Gradually, with the change in emphasis of functions of the company from trade to administration, the civil service also started assuming administrative functions. There is a discussion on variour changes brought about in the civil service from 1765-1853 through various Acts. In 1853, recruitment to the civil service on the basis of patronage was replaced by open competition, since 1858 when the Indian administration came directly under the Crown. In order to meet the growing demand of Indians to secure employment in the civil service, the British government appointed various Commissions. Though certain changes were brought about, these were considered, inadequate by the Indians.

Bureaucracy in some form or the other has existed from times immemorial. In ancient India when monarchy was the predominant form of government, the various categories of courtiers constituted the bureaucracy. Modern bureaucracy in the sense of a body of persons being recruited through an open public competitive examination conducted by an independent, statutory body is credited to People's Republic of China (PRC).

In India, Lord Cornwallis is credited with creating the bureaucracy, as we know it today. The Indian Civil Service (ICS) was the culmination of steps initiated by him. This service as well as branches of colonial bureaucracy, to start with, had Indians only in the lower echelons. They were, in fact, debarred from holding higher positions. From the 1850s onwards, the doors to higher ranks were opened for Indians and many of them made their mark. One can cite names such as that of Netaji Subhash Chandra Bose, K.P.S. Menon Senior, T. N. Kaul among others who distinguished themselves in the ICS. Some of them, in fact, went onto play a crucial role in post-independent India as well. It should, however, be always remembered that the ICS was essentially a colonial creation designed to serve colonial ends. Though the Indians in the ICS were occasionally sympathetic to the 'natives' (the Indian masses), by and large they followed the line of their colonial masters. It was for this reason that the nationalist leadership fighting for independence from British rule was highly critical of the role played by the 'steel frame of the British Empire' – the popular name of the ICS (also known as the heaven born service). Jawaharlal Nehru, in particular, was its staunch critic.

The colonial bureaucracy in India largely performed what are called 'maintenance' functions, viz., maintaining law and order, collection of taxes/revenue, etc. The concept of developmental administration was not much heard of then. Fundamentally, the bureaucracy was a policing/tax collecting machinery and very far removed from being a citizen friendly administration. The colonial bureaucracy was time and again employed by the British to crush the freedom movement. This was the broad scenario at the time of India's independence.

India's Independence and the Bureaucracy. The situation obtaining as, regards the bureaucracy in the period leading up to India's independence has been described above. After attaining freedom from the British rule, the major issue at hand was the type of civilian bureaucracy the newly independent country should have; viz. what kind of structure, method of recruitment and other related questions. There was also the prickly and thorny issue of the fate of the Indian officers in the erstwhile ICS. These matters were resolved the following way: despite their criticism of the ICS, the post-independent leadership decided to let those Indian officers continue in the civilian bureaucracy constituted after August 15, 1947 who still had service years left. However, instead of being absorbed in the newly created Indian Administrative Service (IAS) – the successor to the ICS – quite a few of these officers were directly drafted into the other newly created Central Government service, viz., the IFS (Indian Foreign Service) which was to implement India's non-aligned foreign policy. For instance, KPS Menon Senior and T.N. Kaul joined the foreign service and went onto render distinguished service. Regarding recruitment, as before it was to be through an open competitive examination conducted by an independent, autonomous statutory body. This was to be the Union Public Service Commission (UPSC) headquartered in Delhi, the country's capital.

After Independence the structure of the civil services underwent a change. Three types of services viz., All India Services, central services and state services were created.

All India Services

The Constitution of lndia had recognised only two All India Services namely the Indian Administrative Service and Indian Police Service. The indian Administrative Service replaced the former Indian Civil Service and similarly in 195 1 Indian Police Service was constituted in place of the Indian Police. In 1966 another All-India Service i.e. the Indian Forest Service, was created. The members of the All India Services, like the central services are recruited and trained by the central government, but they are assigned to different states. They serve the respective state government to which they are allotted and their service conditions are also governed by the states, except that disciplinary action against them can be taken only by the President of India in consultation with the Union Public Service Commission. They also serve the central government on deputation ind after a fixed tenure, they are expected to return to their respective states. In 1951, All India Services Act was passed. By virtue of powers con~erredb y sub-section. (1) of Section (3) of this Act, the central government framed new set of rules and regulations pertaining to the All-India Services, as the old rules at certain places had become redundant.

Central Services

These services are under the control of the Union Government and are responsible for the administration of central subjects. These include, Indian Foreign Service, Indian Audit & Accounts Service, Indian Postal Service etc.

State Services

These are services exclusively under the jurisdiction of the state govemments and primarily administer the state subjects. However 33 per cent of posts in the All-India Service *are* / filled by promotion from the state services. This three-fold classification of services reflects the Constitutional pattern of division of subjects into Union, State and Concurrent. Also this is a unique feature of our federal system.

STATUTORY BODIES FOR RECRUITMENT AND OTHER RELATED MATTERS

The Union Public Service Commission (UPSC). The Union Public Service Commission or the UPSC to use its popular abbreviated form is an autonomous body created by the Constitution to recruit – personnel (officer and other ranks) for the various Central Government services. Thus, it conducts not only the annual civil services examination (for the IAS, IFS, IPS Allied Services Group A and B) but also other Central Government services such as the Indian Forest Service, the Indian Economic Service and the Indian Engineering Service. In fact, the UPSC conducts the recruitment of not only the civilian bureaucracy, but also of the defence services of the country. Thus, it conducts the examinations for the National Defence Academy (NDA) and the Indian Military Academy (IMA). The UPSC has been conducting the various examinations since 1947. It is, in fact, not only responsible for recruitment, but also acts as an advisory body regarding all career matters of the recruited personnel.

Special Provisions for Deprived Sections. It is important to note that as regards recruitment to bureaucratic positions in India, there is provision for reservation of a certain percentage of posts for deprived sections of society. Thus, from the onset of independence, 22.5% of post have been reserved for Scheduled Castes (SCs) and Scheduled Tribes (STs). In addition, since the implementation of the Mandal Commission recommendations, an additional 27% of posts have been reserved for the Other Backward Castes (OBCs). Also, the various state governments have their own state-wise quotas for government jobs. Some of the Southern Indian States – Karnataka and Tamil Nadu for instance – have always had very high quotas for which there have been historical and socio-political reasons.

Controversy over the Policy of Reservation. The policy of reservation which is based on the principle of affirmative action has been controversial from the beginning. While it has always found favour with the sections for whom it is meant, the others have not been too well disposed towards it. While this section some how reconciled itself towards reservation for the Scheduled Castes an Scheduled Tribes, it found it difficult to accept a similar treatment to the OBCs after the announcement of the Mandal Commission recommendations. This is because it was felt that the OBCs really do not have a history of religion-sanctioned social oppression the way SCs and STs and especially, the SCs have. There is merit in this argument, but as of today the recommendations have come to stay and the possibility of a change in the status quo in extremely remote, if not impossible. In fact, since government jobs are increasingly being reduced in the wake of globalisation, there has been now talk of reserving jobs in the private/corporate sector for the marginalised sections of society. This demand, though not concretised as yet, has further widened the split between those benefited by reservation and those outside the reserved slot.

State Public Service Commissions (SPSCs). Our point regarding the recruitment of the Indian Bureaucracy will not be complete without a reference to the State Public Service Commissions. As the very nomenclature indicates, a state public service commission is responsible for recruitment to government service at the state level. In terms of organisation and functioning, State Public Service Commissions correspond to the UPSC at the central level. However, in terms of credibility, a wide gulf exists between the State Public Service Commissions and the UPSC. In recent times, a lot of State Public Service Commissions have come under a cloud for their partisan, biased and politicised functioning. It, certainly, is a fact that the members of State Public Service Commissions are, generally, political appointees and therefore, susceptible to extraneous pressures. After having examined aspects like recruitment, etc., we can go to an overview of the bureaucracy in India after independence up to the era of globalisation. The postglobalisation era has been treated separately for obvious reasons.

POST-INDEPENDENCE BUREAUCRACY UPTO THE COMMENCEMENT OF GLOBALISATION

Bureaucracy after independence set about implementing the agenda of its political masters (as it is supposed to do). Following achievement of Independence, the Congress headed by prime minister Jawaharlal Nehru assumed the reigns of power. The Congress Party was broadly committed to democratic socialism, secularism and non-alignment (in its foreign policy). The bureaucracy set about implementing this. Since the country was a fresh, newly independent nation free after centuries of colonial rule, initially there was a lot of enthusiasm amongst the political leadership as well as the bureaucracy regarding nation-building. Barring some black sheep in their ranks, the bureaucrats, by and large, exhibited high standards of professional and personal conduct. Of course, even then as now, they had 'Burra Sahib' attitude but rarely were they accused of professional and personal misconduct (unlike now). Though professionally, the desire to get ahead was there, the desire for personal aggrandisement was rare.

State Assembly Elections: A Watershed. The year 1967 to be precise marked a watershed in Indian Politics and administration. This was the year in which the Congress Party's hegemonic hold over India's politics was broken. It lost power for the first time in several assembly elections to the non-right anti- Congress forces basically put together by the late Prime Minister Chaudhary Charan Singh. This had a tremendous impact on national politics and on the society. It was recognised by the political class as well as the common citizenry that the all powerful Congress Party which had spearheaded India's fight against colonial rule could be defeated. It was not possible earlier. The recognition of this fact had far reaching implication for India's politics, society and administration. The impact of 1967 can be felt in the times that we are passing through now.

The support base of the political forces that had dealt a massive electoral and psychological blow to the Congress and which was largely consolidated by Charan Singh comprised, essentially, the Other Backward Castes. These forces got a filip after the 1967 elections. Their fairly impressive representation in the bureaucracy today, an offshoot of the Mandal Commission Recommendations, can be traced back to the watershed elections of 1967. Indeed, the setting up of the Mandal Commission itself which in the last decade has affected India's polity so decisively was a recognition of the growing power of socio-political forces unleashed in the wake of the 1967 Vidhan Sabha elections.

Churning Within the Congress Party. There was a great churning within the Congress itself. The then prime minister Indira Gandhi who ever since assuming power in 1966 had been facing a tough time from the old guard (the Syndicate) within the Congress found her position further weakened. To reclaim her position as well as that of her party, she then undertook a series of steps that were to overwhelmingly change India's political landscape as well as the world of civilian bureaucracy. The Congress Party split in 1969 with the Syndicate getting marginalised. The party's official nominee in the presidential elections N. Sanjeeva Reddy was defeated after Mrs. Gandhi herself put her weight

behind V.V. Giri. A series of populist radical measures endearing Indira Gandhi to the Indian Left, such as the nationalisation of banks and the abolition of privy purses of the Indian princes followed which helped Mrs. Gandhi and her party to become popular once again. Later on, in 1971, her slogan of 'Garibi Hatao' and victory in the Indo-Pak war helped the Congress under Mrs. Gandhi to win the Lok Sabha elections by a landslide margin. Thus, the wheel had come full circle. However, the intervening four years led to new ideas such as the one of a committed bureaucracy emerging.

The Idea of a Committed Bureaucracy. The idea most fundamentally, entailed that a bureaucrat should be hundred percent committed to the policies and programmes of the political party in power. By extension, this also implied full commitment to the individual politicians holding power. A bureaucrat was not to be guided by any other consideration. This development was, essentially, a consequence of the belief in the Congress circles that the electoral debacle the party had suffered in 1967 was in no small measure due to the fact that the civil bureaucracy had not faithfully delivered on the party's programmes, thus alienating the voters from the party. Whatever may be the merits of this argument; the idea of a committed bureaucracy gathered momentum and eventually, became a part and parcel of Indian public administration.

This had very far reaching and basically negative consequences. Once the idea gained legitimacy, bureaucrats began currying favours from their political masters. Plum postings were offered to those who did the bidding of their political bosses, while those who insisted on following an independent line based on professional opinion were punished. Punishment took the form of arbitrary transfers, postings to insignificant departments and in some cases, even suspension from service. A system of rewards and punishments got institutionalised in due course of time with civil servants being rewarded and punished on the basis of their loyalty and commitment to politicians or parties and not on the basis of their professional performance. As indicated above, over a period of time, the politician-bureaucrat nexus grew into a powerful force immensely benefitting both the parties, but spelling a blow to the concept of development and citizen friendly administration. This was, in fact, the 'politicization of the bureaucracy' about which we hear so much laments now.

Bureaucrat – Politician – Businessman Nexus. A parallel – though not always – development was the addition of the businessman to the unholy combine of the politician and the civil servant. In the democratic socialist or the Nehruvian Socialist to be more correct, framework of development that India followed after independence, government permission or license was required for every small and big thing necessary for setting up a business. The discretionary power rested with the bureaucrat who could grant the license against favours granted by the concerned businessman or alternatively, withhold the permission on the concerned party's refusal to please the government official. Very often, the bureaucrat and the political boss to whom he reported shared in the spoils, as the ultimate sanctioning authority was the politician. This was the genesis of the notorious 'Licence-Permit-Quota Raj' which in about 20-30 years from independence completely derailed India's socialist pattern of development. The planning process, the mixed economy, all got off track because of the immensely

powerful and corrupt troika of the officer-politician-businessman often contemptuously described as the "Babu-Neta-Bania' syndrome.

The ineffective and inefficient mixed economy brought about by the license-permit-quota raj coupled with the politicisation of the bureaucracy remained the contexts of India's civilian bureaucracy till the onset of globalisation. The globalisation era going back to the 1990s marked another watershed in the world of Indian bureaucracy, just as the 1967 elections had done. It is to this that we turn our attention now.

INDIAN BUREAUCRACY IN THE ERA OF GLOBALISATION. The era of globalisation worldwide commenced about one and a half decades back; sometime around the mid to the late 1980s. What is accepted, generally, as globalisation today is actually the spread of the process of liberalisation of the economy on a global scale. By liberalisation of the economy is meant freeing a national economy from governmental control and letting it run as per the market forces. It is against this definitional context that we have discussed the bureaucracy in this section.

In India (as indeed in many other countries), it was increasingly felt that the democratic socialist model of development had failed to deliver the goods. Of course, it is debatable whether there was something intrinsically wrong with the democratic socialist framework or it had gone wrong as regards the implementation part. Whatever may be the truth, the fact was that liberalisation of the economy entailing a slackening, if not total elimination, of governmental regulation over the economy gained currency. This process was of course actively encouraged by the US influenced bodies such as the IMF (International Monetary Fund) and the World Bank.

Once liberalisation of the economy was accepted, changes in the bureaucracy were inevitable. In India (as elsewhere) in the last more than ten years, there has been a slackening of governmental rules and regulations, which certainly has been a welcome development. We may mention here that in this unit, we are not debating the merits and demerits of globalisation. In this unit, we are only concerned with the impact of globalisation on the bureaucracy and that too in the Indian context.

As already mentioned, in the era of globalisation or alternatively, Economic Reforms, there has been a doing away of the plethora of government rules and to this extent, the developmental process has been speeded up. However, it is still not clear if it has brought down corruption arising from the acts of commission and omission of the Bureaucrat – Politician-Businessman combine. Even as the process of economic reforms consequent to liberalisation has been on, there have been consistent reports of India continuing to be amongst the most corrupt countries of the world. This naturally raises questions about the very rationale of liberalising the economy. Be that as it may, the process of liberalisation is currently very much on in the country.

Attitude of the Bureaucracy. Subsequent to the structural adjustment of the economy consequent to liberalisation, there have been perceptible shifts in the attitude of the bureaucracy. When liberalisation first commenced, a lot of bureaucrats were openly hostile to it as they obviously felt that

in a regime of slackening governmental control, the quantum of power wielded by them as well as their importance would come down. This has indeed happened. The 'redeeming' feature in that over the years, some bureaucrats have seen the writing on the wall, and become 'facilitators' rather than obstructers of development. The Indian media in the last few years has carried quite a few lead stories on the personal initiatives of the post-90s bureaucrats in the domain of citizen friendly administration. A lot of the comparatively younger bureaucrats have grown up in the new, liberalising India and are, therefore, more amenable to the new ideas of development. However, in so far as corruption is concerned, as we have already stated above, it is difficult to say whether it has gone down, up or remained at the pre-economic reforms level.

SOME CONTROVERSIES/PROBLEMS ASSOCIATED WITH THE BUREAUCRACY.

The Indian Bureaucracy has had some continuing problems/controversies associated with it from the very beginning. It may be mentioned that these problems are to be found in bureaucracies worldwide.

Minister Versus Civil Servants. The inter-relationship between the political (ministers) and the permanent (government officials) executive in India (as elsewhere) has been complex, to say the least. To a great extent, this is because of the inherent nature of the relationship between the ministers and the civil servants. In any form of government and more so in a democracy, such as India's, the civil servants are subordinate to the ministers. However, this is not always the case. Where the minister is ignorant and incompetent, the officers under him have a field day doing exactly as they please with the minister unable to do a thing. On the other hand, when the minister is powerful the officers are generally too willing to do the minister's bidding; often in contravention of all rules and regulations.

Also, as we have already pointed out, ministers and bureaucrats in India have often enjoyed a highly mutually beneficial relationship based on a quid pro quo basis; i.e. a relationship based on mutual exchange of favours. The net result of all this has been a highly politicized bureaucracy and this fact, has not changed much even in the post-globalisation era.

Generalists Versus Specialists. This again is a controversy that has plagued the bureaucracies the world over. Each country has tried to find its own solution to the problem. In India, the genesis of the problem can be traced back to the days of Lord Cornwallis who is credited with laying the foundation of the civil services in India. The Britishers needed English knowing Indians and general awareness to man the lower ranks of the bureaucracy. No specialist knowledge was required. This set the precedent for Indians from the pure stream of Arts and Humanities and later on Sciences and Commerce (though not to the same extent) making it to the civil services. Professionals and Specialists (medicos, engineers, etc.) very rarely thought of a career in the bureaucracy. However, this has changed over the years. As governance has become more complex, need has been felt of 'candidates with a more specialised background. This is because civil servants with a generalist background have increasingly been found unequal to the task. The recruiting bodies such as the

UPSC have also been encouraging aspirants with a specialist background, viz., medicos, engineers, lawyers, chartered accountants, etc.

The controversy is mainly centred on the fact that one school of opinion holds that a person with a general background (especially in Humanities/Social Sciences) is better suited for the task of civil administration as s/he can take an overall, macro view of the tasks and the issues at hand. The other school, however, holds that in the present globalised era with a lot of emphasis on I.T. (information technology) and on issues of economic and commercial significance, a specialized background is more conducive to effective and productive administration. The solution perhaps lies in effecting a grand mix of the two approaches and in India, this has been attempted. For instance, the department of science and technology has often been headed by professional scientists rather than career bureaucrats, even though one has to mention that the bureaucrats have resented this.

Under-representation of the Minorities. The minorities, especially, the Muslims-India's largest minority – have often complained of their poor representation in the country's premier civil services such as the IAS and the IPS. However, there is no hard core evidence to support that this has been deliberately the case. Poor levels of education and motivation have been a major cause. Solutions such as a separate quota for the minorities have been suggested, but it requires a consensus amongst the political class.