BPSC - 109
POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

ignou
THE PEOPLE'S
UNIVERSITY

POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

School of Social Sciences
Indira Gandhi National Open University

PRINT PRODUCTION	SECRETARIAN ASSISTANCE
	Mr. Rakesh Chandra Joshi
	AE (DP), SOSS, IGNOU, New Delhi

EXPERT COMMITTEE

Prof. D. Gopal (Chairman)
Faculty of Political Science
School of Social Sciences, IGNOU
MaidanGarhi New Delhi

Prof. A. P. Vijapur
Dept. of Political Science
Aligarh Muslim University
Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh

Prof. Jagpal Singh
Faculty of Political Science
School of Social Sciences, IGNOU
MaidanGarhi New Delhi

Prof. Abdul Nafey (Retd)
Centre for American, Latin American
and Canadian Studies, School of
International Studies, JNU, New Delhi

Prof. P. Sahadevan
Centre for South Asian Studies
School of International Studies,
JNU, New Delhi

Prof. S Vijayasekhara Reddy
(**Course Coordinator**)
Faculty of Political Science
School of Social Sciences, IGNOU
MaidanGarhi New Delhi

Prof. R.S. Yadav (Rtd)
Dept. of Political Science
Kurukshetra University,
Kurukshetra, Haryana

Prof. Anurag Joshi
Faculty of Political Science
School of Social Sciences, IGNOU
MaidanGarhi New Delhi

COURSE PREPARATION TEAM

Unit 1	Political Culture	Dr. Borun Dey, Asst. Professor, Dept of Political Science, Dibrugarh University, Dibrugarh, Assam
Unit 2	Political Modernisation	Dr. Dr. Chakali Bramhayya, Asst Professor, Dept of Political Science & Human Rights, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Amarkantak, MP
Unit 3	Political Development	Dr. Chakali Bramhayya, Asst Professor, Dept of Political Science & Human Rights, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Amarkantak, MP
Unit 4	Functioning of Political Parties	Dr. Vikash Chandra, Assistant Professor, Dept of Political Science, Kashi Naresh Government Post-Graduate College, Bhadohhi, Uttar Pradesh
Unit 5	Party System	Dr. Tulika Gaur, Guest Faculty, Non-Collegiate Women's Education Board, University of Delhi, Delhi
Unit 6	Pressure Groups	Dr. Kishorchand Nongmithen, Consultant, Faculty of Political Science, School of Social Sciences, IGNOU
Unit 7	Electoral Systems and Electoral Processes	Dr. Tulika Gaur, Guest Faculty, Non-Collegiate Women's Education Board, University of Delhi, Delhi
Unit 8	Evolution of State in Western Europe	Dr. Gazala Fareedi, Asst Professor, Department of Political Science, Southfield College, Darjeeling, West Bengal
Unit 9	Post-Colonial State	Prof. Ashutosh Kumar, Chairperson, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
Unit 10	Pluralism, Nation and State	Dr. Neha Kishore, Asst Professor, Dept of Political Science, PGDAV College, University of Delhi
Unit 11	Process of Democratisation in Post-Colonial Countries	Prof. Ashutosh Kumar, Chairperson, Department of Political Science, Panjab University, Chandigarh, India
Unit 12	Democratisation in Post-Authoritarian and Post-Communist Countries	Dr. Raj Kumar Sharma, Asst Professor, RashtriyaRaksha University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat
Unit 13	Decentralisation -Brazil, India and Britain	Dr. Priyamvada Mishra, Asst. Professor, Symbiosis Law School, Sector 62, NOIDA, Uttar Pradesh
Unit 14	Federalism -Canada, Australia and India	Dr. Vikash Chandra, Asst Professor, Dept of Political Science, Kashi Naresh Government Post-Graduate College, Bhadohhi, Uttar Pradesh

EDITORS

Prof. S. Vijayasekhara Reddy
Faculty of Political Science
School of Social Sciences
IGNOU, New Delhi

Dr.D. Ananda
Associate Professor
Faculty of Political Science
School of Social Sciences, IGNOU

Course Contents

POLITICAL PROCESSES AND INSTITUTIONS INCOMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

The idea of democracy has played an important role in taking forward the world civilization. It has helped in transforming the world from power structures of monarchy, empire and conquest to rule by the people, self-determination and peaceful co-existence. Following the Third Wave of democratization in the 1980s and the collapse of the Soviet Union, many political scientists believed that liberal democracy has emerged as the only model of governance. However, globalisation that gathered momentum in the 1990s has thrown up contradictory trends. In both the developed and the developing countries, a variety of protest movements, including pro-democracy movements took root. Democracy, indeed, seemed to have gained deeper and wider footing. But then, a host of ultranationalist movements seeking to impose their own brand of authoritarianism have also taken root. Moreover, there was also a creeping authoritarianism in many established democracies. A recent journal article in *Democratisation* (March 2019) noted that the world is now well into a sustained surge of more autocratic politics.

How do we account for such changes? What were the conditions that spurred the Third Wave of democratisation? Why do economic development, urbanization, education and migration promote political stability and a common sense of identity in some cases, while in other instances such force engender sectarianism, religious bigotry and even civil war? In what ways has globalisation impacted political institutions and processes? In short, how can we make sense of the world we live in? This course explores some of these questions, particularly as they relate to the challenges of democratization and decentralisation.

We begin this course by looking at the new methods and approaches that have emerged in the study of comparative politics as it shed its 'formal and legal' approach and went on to explore more informal political activities such as political socialisation, decision making, pressure/interest group activity etc. This also led to the adoption of new frameworks and tools from other social science disciplines, especially sociology, economics, psychology and anthropology. The theoretical approaches, the political system and it offshoot, structural-functional approach provided the framework to study informal politics. With the emergence of 'traditional' societies as independent states, comparative politics began to focus on the politics of 'new', the 'emerging', the 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' nations. It is in this context that the theory and approach of the new comparative politics-called political modernisation, political culture and political development, emerged.

Given the centrality of the state as an institution in modern political affairs, block three of this course introduces you to the evolution of this institution in the Western Europe and post-colonial context. As almost all modern states are multi-ethnic, regulating ethnic conflict has become a challenge to ensure the integrity of the state. We therefore look into the mechanisms evolved by modern states to deal with the challenges of pluralism.

In block two, we examine public participation and representation. No state can be democratic without providing for the basic rights. The right of assembly and freedom of speech are essential for individuals to create or join groups to influence public policies or acquire power to shape those policies. Here the role of two institutions, political parties and pressure groups, that link society and the government are examined along with the processes involved in the representation, that is, the electoral systems or rules. As you will notice, electoral rules vary widely and how the votes are cast, counted, and translated into legislative seats have a huge difference in the distribution of political power.

Finally, the specific forms that democratic states, both large and small, take to cope with the challenge of governance are examined in block five with examples drawn from both developed (Britain, Canada, Australia) and developing (Brazil and India).

All units of this course have a uniform structure. Each unit begins with Objectives to help you find what you are expected to learn from the unit. Please go through these objectives carefully. Keep reflecting and checking them after going through a few sections of the unit. Each unit is divided into sections and sub-sections for ease of comprehension. In between these sections, some Check Your Progress Exercises have been provided. We advise you to attempt these as and when you reach them. This will help you assess you study and test your comprehension of the subject studied. Compare your answers with the answer or guidelines given at the end of the unit. Some key words, unfamiliar terms and ideas have been provided as box items or at the end of each Unit.

While the units in this course are carefully designed and written by specialists, it must however be added that the units are by no means comprehensive. For deeper understanding of the themes dealt with in this volume, you are advised and encouraged to read as much of the books, chapters and articles listed in the Suggested Readings given at the end of this course book.

BLOCK I

Approaches to Studying Comparative Politics

APPROACHES TO STUDYING COMPARATIVE POLITICS

In the years after decolonisation set in, the understanding of relationships between nations, and specific political and social phenomena, was informed by various approaches, viz., institution, political sociology and political economy. These were geared primarily towards examining how social values were transmitted and also the structures through which resources were distributed. All these would eventually form the bases or standards along which different, countries and cultures could be classified on a hierarchical scale of development, and could be seen as moving along a trajectory of development and change. Several theories were advanced as frameworks within which this change could be understood. Among these was the modernisation theory, which emerged in the historical context of the end of Japanese and European empires and the beginning of the Cold war. In this block, we explore three approaches to studying comparative politics that are derived from the modernisation theory, namely, the political culture, political modernisation and political development.

UNIT 1 POLITICAL CULTURE[*]

Structure

1.0 OBJECTIVES:

Political culture approach has been very popular for conducting comparative studies and making empirical analyses of transitional societies. Scholars of comparative politics have developed this approach using concepts from Sociology and Anthropology. After going through the unit, you should be able to:

- Explain the basic assumptions of political culture approach in comparative politics.

- Explain the meaning and concept of political culture

- Identify different types of political culture with their distinct features, and

- Estimate the value of political culture approach in understanding the dynamics of comparative politics.

[*]Dr. BorunDey, Assistant Professor, Dept of Political Science, Dibrugarh University, Dibrugarh, Assam

1.1 INTRODUCTION

Political culture remains one of the very important approaches to understand politics in general and comparative politics in particular. This approach has been very popular for conducting comparative studies and making empirical analyses of transitional societies. Scholars have liked to investigate political behaviour and processes of the political systems in the context of their political cultures. In other words, how people view their country's politics can be explored through political culture.

Political culture is a distinctive and spotted form of political philosophy that consists of a set of beliefs, values, norms and assumptions concerning the ways on how governmental, political and economic life is being carried out or ought to be carried out. Political culture, thus, creates a framework for political change and is unique to nations, states and other groups. Thus, in essence, this approach examines a sociological aspect of the subject of political development. It is potentially a powerful, unifying approach to comparative politics.

In general, political culture is referred to as a set of shared views and normative judgments held by a population regarding its political system. Therefore, it is often seen as the foundation of all political activity, or at least as a factor determining the nature, characteristics and level of political activity. It, for that reason, essentially includes historical experience, memory, social communities and individuals in politics, their orientation, skills, influencing the political behaviour and this experience primarily contains a summary, transformed form of impressions and preferences in foreign and domestic policy. It is for this reason that this political culture approach does not refer to the attitudes to specific actors, such as the current president or the prime minister; rather it denotes how people view the political system as a whole, including the belief in its legitimacy. In the sections to follow, an attempt has been made to give you a conceptual understanding of political culture.

1.2 POLITICAL CULTURE APPROACH: GENESIS, MEANING, DEFINITION, NATURE AND CLASSIFICATIONS

A longstanding argument in the literature on comparative politics is that political culture has an important effect on the emergence of political democracy. In part, the focus on political culture is rather a natural extension of the behavioural revolution in political science and a product of economic modernization. With modernization came changes in values regarding the role of the individual in the political system.

Political culture is a simple concept, but it can easily be misunderstood. The fact that we may characterize a given nation's culture in some way should not lead us to underestimate the importance of diverse subcultures within it. Similarly, the fact that political culture may be an explanatory factor should not lead us to overlook the possibility that objective conditions within a country may be responsible for behaviour often attributed to culture.

We study political culture because it helps us understand political life. For example, why do different ethnic groups cooperate reasonably well in Switzerland but not in Bosnia or Lebanon? Why are Russians more inclined than Canadians to support an all-powerful political leader? Why has political corruption been a serious and long-standing problem in Mexico but not in Chile? Political culture may provide at least partial answers. (Ethridge Marcus, Howard Handelman, 2010).

It is extremely difficult to define the term political culture. It is elusive and comprehensive at the same time. In the extant literature in political science, political culture has been defined in many ways but essentially it involves the basic values, ideas, beliefs, attitudes, and orientations about politics. This involves issues of right and wrong, good and bad, what is acceptable in politics and what is not.

To understand the dynamics of political culture, it will be useful to begin with a meaning of the term 'culture'. The term culture has many different meanings and it affects everything people do in their society. Culture is a derivation of the German word "*kultur*". *Kultur*indicates the distinctive higher values of enlightenment of a society. Culture thereby was defined as "the sway of man over nature" (Kroeber, Alfred andKluckhohn, 1952).

The term 'culture' was first used by Edward B. Taylor, the pioneer English anthropologist in his book, *Primitive Culture* (1871). Taylor used the term culture to refer to a universal human capacity. It is the complex whole that includes knowledge, belief, art, ethics, morals, law, traditions, traits, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society. Culture is a powerful human tool for survival, but it is a fragile phenomenon. It is constantly changing and easily lost because it exists only in one's mind.

Culture, thus, represents the shared psychological orientation of the people of society towards societal objects. People of a society acquire and form, more or less, a distinct pattern of orientations towards societal objects. This is, in fact, the culture of the people of the society or the 'Societal Culture', and 'Political Culture' is a distinct part of this societal culture.

The political culture approach can be seen as a natural evolution in the growth of behavioural approach in political analysis in the 1960s. More specifically, the concept was developed to address the need to bridge a growing gap in the behavioural approach between the level of micro-analysis and macro-analysis. It is a set of attitudes and practices held by people that shape their political behaviour includes moral judgment, political myths, beliefs and ideas about what makes up for a good society (A R Ball, 1971).It is a reflection of government, but it also incorporates elements of history and tradition that may predict the current regime. It is said to matter because it shapes a population's political perceptions and actions. It is associated with the concept of political ideology, national ethos and spirit, national political psychology, the fundamental values of people etc. For example, the United States and Great Britain have been both democracies, but each has a distinctive political culture. American government derives its power from a written constitution and is dominated by two political parties. In

contrast, Britain has a long history of monarchy and has never had a written constitution.

There is a close relationship between political culture and the political system. Political culture is the basis of the survival of all old and modern political systems. A political community, even without having 'state', can exist as a polity or political system. Whatever be the form of a political system – developing or developed, it does possess some form or pattern of political culture. Stateless political systems like the United Nations Organization, many international and regional organizations, are more or less, operating on the basis of some form of political culture.

1.2.1 Defining Political Culture

There are several definitions of political culture by different scholars dealing with different perspectives. The *International Encyclopaedia of the Social Science* defines political culture as "the set of attitudes, beliefs and sentiments that give order and meaning to a political process and what provides the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behaviour in the political system."

Gabriel A Almond and Sidney Verba in 1963 stated that political culture refers specifically to the political orientations and attitudes towards the political system and its various parts, and attitudes towards the role of the self in the system.

Sydney Verba defined political culture as "the system of beliefs about the pattern of political interaction and political institutions" and those beliefs are fundamental, usually unstated, and unchallengeable, assumptions or postulates about politics. He also established a denotative criterion of political culture for subsequent political culture studies by distinguishing it from other specific political psychological constructs such as partisan affiliation and attitudes or beliefs about domestic and international policy issues.

Moreover, Almond and Verba have identified five important dimensions of political culture namely:

(a) A sense of national identity

(b) Attitudes towards one's self as a participant in political life

(c) Attitudes towards one's fellow citizens

(d) Attitudes and expectations regarding governmental output and performance and,

(e) Attitudes towards knowledge about the political process of decision making

Patrick O'Neil defines political culture as the norms for political activity in a society. It is a determining factor in which ideologies will dominate a country's political regime; it is unique to a given country or group of people.

Andrew Heywood states that political culture is the people's psychological orientation. It implies a pattern of orientation to political objects such as parties, governments and constitutions expressed in beliefs, symbols and values.

On the other hand, Robert A Dahl gives an opinion that political culture as a factor explains different patterns of political opposition whose salient elements are:

- Orientation of problem-solving

- Orientation to collective actions

- Orientation to the political system and

- Orientation to other people (Dahl, 1971)

Almond and Powell (1966) regarded the concept of political culture as a specifying variable in the explanation of political behaviour. It is a particular pattern of political orientation,attitudes towards the political system and its various parts and attitudes toward the role of the self in the system (Almond and Powell, 1966).They elaborate it in three directions:

- Substantive content: this can be interpreted as system culture, process culture and policy culture.

- Varieties of orientation (cognitive, affective and evaluative)

- Systematic relations among these components

According to Lucian Pye (1965), political culture involves attributes including attitudes, feelings, sentiments, beliefs, and values which concern the nature of politics that give form and substance to political processes.

From the above, it can be derived that political culture is a shorthand expression to denote the emotional and attitudinal environment within which the political system operates. In this process, a set of political beliefs, values, and attitudes influences people's political behaviours, and their political behaviours then become a pattern and their political culture. In other words, it is the overall distribution of citizens' orientation to political objects. It gives the impression of the very political processes of a given political system. Thus, this approach of political culture can be used to distinguish one political system from the other. It is, therefore, an important approach in understanding the varied dimensions of comparative politics.

1.2.2 Components and Shifts of Political Culture

Political culture is an analytical approach to comparative politics that is elusive in nature. It has already been mentioned that political culture's intellectual antecedent can be traced back to antiquity. Its immediate antecedents can be found in the works of Montesquieu (1689-1755), Johann Gottfried Herber (1744-1803) and Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-59). Its genesis in modern comparative politics can be traced to Almond's seminal writing of 1956 "comparative political system". Later, political culture research took off as a sub-field of political science and in 1963 Almond and Verba published *The Civic Culture,* a cross-national study offering a theory of political stability and democracy that implicitly celebrated Anglo-American representative government. It also became a major work of the political culture approach. From then on onwards, this approach gained momentum in comparative politics.

During the 1950s and 1960s, the rise of the concept was part of the more general ascension of culture 'to explanatory prominence in the social sciences and history'. Initially, political scientists were excited by the possibility of measuring variations among the political cultures of different nations, but they eventually turned to the study of such entities as 'elite political culture', 'ethnic political culture' etc. In 1966, Elazar proposed that each American state includes one of the three kinds of political culture-individualist, traditionalist or moralist whereby state political culture studies examined variations among states in government activities, administrative goals, innovative capability, popular participation in the election and party competition (Formisano, 2001).

The 1970s saw that political culture literature contained the normative bias that cultural symbols are shaped deeply by all or most actors in a society, thus promoting stability and a conservative ideology.

The perception that the political culture studies tended to privilege the status quo grew stronger amid the rise of Marxist and rational choice perspectives. Whereas with a strong argument for the causal efficacy of political culture, Eckstein and Inglehard defended the Almond and Verba line and argued that different societies embody durable cultural attitudes that have significant economic and political consequences, in a subsequent book he added that cultural change in a post-modernist society was much more important than it had been during early industrialization (Eckstein, 1988). In this way, there are different opinions regarding the very effectiveness of this approach of political culture.

On the other hand, alongside political culture as a whole, there is the elite political culture that consists of the beliefs, attitudes and ideas about politics held by those who are closest to the centres of political power. The values of the elites are more coherent and consequential than are those of the population at large.

Although most of the studies of political culture focus on its dynamics within the state, the importance of global political culture is worth mentioning here. Global political culture looks at the ambit of the whole world from a macro perspective to understand the all-encompassing aspects of political culture. For example, Samuel P Huntington in his classic work *The Clash of Civilization* takes the analysis of political culture into the international realm. But global political culture may primarily be a Western product.

From the above, it may be understood that the political culture approach has been viewed differently by different scholars.

The political culture of a system is a result of several factors. These factors/components over the period of time shape or reshape the political culture. Listed below are some very important components.

- Political beliefs and values
- Political process
- Decision making encompassing the whole system and different agencies including the party system, pressure groups etc.
- Symbols
- Political action

- Orientations
  - Cognitive orientations implying knowledge, accurate or otherwise, of the political system
  - Affective orientations implying feelings of attachment, involvement, rejection, and the like about political objects, and
  - Evaluative orientations implying judgments and opinions about the political objects, which usually involve applying value standards to political objects and events
- Tradition and modernity
- Culturalism
- Societal structure
- Geography
- Ethnic realities or differences
- Role of state
- Ideologies
- Histories of state
- Socio-economic structure
- Form of governance
- Role of the elites

Check Your Progress 1

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) Define political culture??

…………………………………………………………………………..…………
…………………………………………………………………………………...…
……………………………………………………………….................…..………

2) What is elite political culture??

…………………………………………………………………………..…………
………………………………………………………………………..………………
……………………………………………………………….…………..………..………..

1.3 CLASSIFICATION OF POLITICAL CULTURE

There are different typologies of political culture offered by different scholars based on their research studies. The understanding of some of these types will help us to distinguish the political culture of different systems. Let us examine the classification of political culture taken up two prominent political studies, one by Gabriel A Almond and Sidney Verba and the other by Samuel E Finer.

1.3.1 Almond and Verba's Classification

The Civic Culture by Almond and Verba (1963) isbased on their surveys conducted during 1959-60 in the USA, Britain, West Germany, Italy and Mexico. This study which pioneered the study of political culture as a subfield hasidentified three pure types of political culture. These are as follows:

(1) Parochial Political Culture: This refers to a political culture where citizens are only distantly aware of the existence of central government- as with remote tribes whose existence is seemingly unaffected by national decisions made by the central government. Further, there is no political orientation towards political objects. People have neither knowledge nor interest in politics. They have no orientations towards all components of politics. This type of political culture is compatible with a traditional political structure. This type of orientation is found in a passive society where there is hardly any specialization of roles, and therefore, people are indifferent towards governmental authority. Thus, in this type of political culture people have low awareness, expectations and participation.

(2) Subject Political Culture: In this political culture, citizens see themselves not as participants in the political process but as subjects of the government - as with people living under a dictatorship. In other words, citizens under this political culture have a passive orientation towards a political system and conceive themselves as having a minimum influence on the political process. In this type of political culture, citizens are aware of the central government, and are heavily subjected to its decisions with little scope for dissent. The individual is aware of politics, its actors and institutions. Citizens have orientations toward the output aspects of the system. People know about decision-making mechanisms. There is a political awareness but no confidence to air political views, thus there is an absence of participatory norms. This type of political culture is compatible with a centralized authoritarian structure. In this model, the people have a higher level of awareness and expectations, but low participation.

(3) Participant Political Culture: In this political culture, citizens believe that they can contribute to the system and that they are affected by it. They, therefore, respond positively to all political objects and have an active orientation to political activities. Here citizens can influence the government in various ways and they are affected by it. The individual is oriented toward the system towards all four components of politics, i.e., input, output, political system, and self-role. This encourages more and more participation and participation is the highest value. There is an ability to criticize the authority and hold a positive orientation towards the political system. In this model, people have a high level of awareness, expectations, and participation.

Almond and Verba argue that there is never a single political culture. The three categories of political orientations which have been mentioned above are not always present in a pure form; rather they are intermixed in many situations of political culture. Thus, they re-classified political culture into three sub-types. These are discussed below:

(1) Parochial and Subject: This type of political culture represents a shift from parochial orientation to subject orientation. Here the parochial loyalties gradually get weathered and the inhabitants develop a greater awareness of the central authority.

(2) Subject and Participant: This typeof political culture represents a shift from subject political orientation to participant political orientation. In such a political culture, people generallyon the one hand develop an activist tendency and participate in the process; but on the otherhand, thereare those individuals too who possess passive orientations and remain at the receiving end of the decision-making process.

(3) Parochial and Participant: This type of political culture represents the parochial orientation in the individuals whereas the norms introduced require a participant political orientation. In such type of political culture, there emerges a problem of harmony between the political culture and political norm. However, Almond and Verba suggest that a participatory political culture fits a liberal democratic regime. The participant political culture is the type of political culture is congruent with a democratic political structure and the same has been called by them as "Civic Culture"

1.3.2 Finer's Classification

Attempting to understand the phenomena of military intervention in the politics of developing countries, Samuel E Finer (*The Man on the Horseback*, 1962)came to relate civil-military relations with political culture. In his analysis, there are four levels of political culture:

(1) Mature Political Culture: In this type of political culture, there is widespread public approval of the procedure for transfer of power; a belief that the persons in power have the right to govern and issue orders; the people are attached to the political institutions and there is a well mobilized public opinion.

(2) Developed Political Culture: In this type of political culture, the civil institutions are highly developed and the public is well organized into powerful groups but from time to time there arises a dispute on the questions of who and what should constitute the sovereign authority and how power should be transferred.

(3) Low Political Culture: At this level of political culture, the political system is weak and narrowly organized; there is a lack of consensus on the nature of the political system and the procedures and the public attachment to the political system is fragile.

(4) Minimal Political Culture: At this low level of political culture, articulate public opinion does not exist in the political system and the government can easily ignore public opinion; political cultures are decided by force or the threat of force. A person or institution capable of asserting itself can enforce its will and the extent of one's authority is directly related to the degree of force at one's disposal. Finer argued that developing countries with weak legitimacy are prone to experience coup d etat or extreme forms of military intervention.

1.4 POLITICAL CULTURE IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE

Based on Gabriel A. Almond's classification of political culture and his analysis of its applied factors in different political systems, the following aspects have been highlighted.

According to Almond the four-fold classification of the political system is based on some terms and these are:

- First, a political system is a system of action.

- The unit of the political system is the role.

- The distinguishing property of the political system is the legitimate monopoly of physical coercion over a given territory and population.

- The fourth concept is the orientation to political action.The political culture is not the same thing as the general culture, although it is related to it.

Now, here an attempt has been made to throw light on the classifications of Almond regarding political systems and the related culture.

1) Anglo–AmericanPolitical System: Associated with the advanced countries of the West, even termed as matured political culture, it incorporates the political consensus and higher degree of organization. It is the operating system that acts as the benchmark which is being borrowed by other nationalities.The political culture of this system happens to be homogeneous, secular:

- A multi-valued, rational-calculating, bargaining, and experimental political culture. It is a homogeneousculture in the sense that there is a sharing of political ends — the values of freedom, mass welfare, and security — and means.

- A secularized political system involves individuation of and a measure of autonomy among the various roles. Each one of the roles sets itself up autonomously in the political business, so to speak. The political system is saturated with the atmosphere of the market. The secularized political process has some of the characteristics of a laboratory; that is, policies offered by candidates are viewed as hypotheses, and the consequences of legislation are rapidly communicated within the system and constitute a crude form of testing hypotheses.

- The basic principles of the system:Liberty, Equality, Democracy, Civic duty, Individual Responsibility, Trade Unionism, etc.Bargaining politics: between rulers and rule (the elected and electors, leaders and its followers)

- Plural society- the society is heterogeneous and therefore different parties and interest groups operate to influence the decision-making process in response to their respective interests.

- Checks and balances- there is a diffusion of power and influence where legal institutions are checked by the channels of mass communication and mass education so that the prospect of authoritarian rule is mitigated, even eliminated.

- Separation of power and stability of differentiated roles

- Political ideologies – multiculturalism, libertarianism, welfare state, utilitarianism, individualism, egalitarianism etc.

- Political folklore- use of symbol

- Civil supremacy

2)Continental European Political System – These are the western countries of Europe like Italy, France, and Norway etc. It's even considered a developed political culture because in these societies public is highly organized.

- Fragmented political culture- the political culture is fragmented where different sections of society establish different patterns of cultural development, while some are more developed than others. Thereby, political culture incorporates distinctive sub-cultures.

- No political bargaining- the process of political bargaining is virtually non-existent that creates a situation in which politics becomes like a game. The result is that various sub-cultures are at war. It is a race of superiority and power.

- Expected criteria- stability of institutions guaranteeing democracy, the rule of law, human rights, protection of minority etc.

- Form of governance- it imbibes both monarchism, republicanism, presidential, semi-presidential, parliamentary republic, parliamentary republic etc. For instance, countries like Belgium, Netherland, Sweden, Spain etc. have constitutional monarchies

- Formation of International Organization: for example, the European Union

- Legitimacy of institutions

- Civilian government

3) Developing Countries Political System- This category includes countries that emerged from the days of long colonial domination.

- Master and subjects-the political culture of the masters is superimposed over the political culture of the subjects. The result is the erosion of the political culture of the subjects and the super-imposition of the political culture of the rulers that is deemed to be superior in all respects

- New source of legitimacy by the rule over time

- Single structure multivariate political culture

- Commonality of history

- Primacy to the subject through providing voting rights and peoples participation in governance

- Agro-industrial fused society.

- 4) Totalitarian Political System –The countries included here are the Soviet Union and China.

- Legitimacy of centre: the quality of the acceptance of the legitimacy is artificially created. the characteristic orientation to authority tends to be some combination of conformity or apathy produced by the central control or the means of communication and of the agencies of violence

- concentration of power

- hierarchy of bureaucracy, police and army

- coercion as the hallmark of the exercise of authority

- single pattern of cultural development

- unitary system

- lesser people participation

Therefore, from the above, it is clear that the different political systems have different sets of political culture depending upon the basic factors/constituents as has been discussed earlier.

1.5 CRITICAL APPRAISAL OF POLITICAL CULTURE APPROACH

Political culture approach, for some scholars, may never be the final word in comparative political analysis but, carefully handled, (for them) it can be a useful springboard. Like any other approach, political culture as an approach to the study of comparative politics has both its advantages and disadvantages. Here an attempt has been made to highlight some of the strengths and lacunas of the approach of political culture as pointed by different scholars:

One of the important criticisms against this approach of comparative politics is that it cannot be described as a very precise variable for presenting a morphological study of the modern political system. The approach cannot be taken as a correct barometer of individual behaviour because of the very distinguishing and varied nature of the same.

Lucian Pye criticizes this approach by stating that in no society there is a fundamental distinction between the culture of the rulers and that of the masses. Therefore, any attempt to distinguish them may not bring any productive result.

Some others argue that the approach is ambiguous. The political culture is itself a subsystem of the culture in general. In fact, the political culture approach is a by-product of modernization and development theories. It is not certain whether they regard it independent variable or dependent variable, a cause or an effect. As such, the whole perspective happens to become conservative, static and anachronistic. On the other hand, some others question the very assumption of the approach that a system of government continues because it is in tune with a country's political culture. Many descriptions of a political culture are often little more than an exercise in stereotyping which invariably ignores diversity within the country concerned.

In some cases, descriptions of political culture tend to be static as well as simplistic, lacking sensitivity to how a culture continually evolves in response to

political experiences. The approach is not progressive but reactionary in character.

Having been understood the disadvantages of the approach of political culture for understanding the dynamics of comparative politics, this approach is not without its merits.The approach of political culture has certainly heightened the ability of political scientists to examine the psychological environment of the political system broadly and scientifically. It has codified and synthesized into a style, a well-developed concept, all that was studied in an abstract and crude fashion through such traditional concepts as national morale, national character, national psychology and the like.

Political culture approach has made it easier for political scientists to systematically and comprehensively analyze the social, psychological and sociological environment of the political system; thereby has contributed to conducting both micro and macro studies of political systems as well as to explain the gap between micro-macro politics. Further, through the political culture approach, political scientists can systematically explain the differences in the behaviour of different political systems, particularly the differences in the behaviour of similar political institutions working in different societies.

Political culture approach has also fortified political scientists to conduct studies in the process through which the political culture of society passes from one generation to the next generation, i.e., the process of political socialization. This can be used for analyzing the path of political development of a political system. The political culture approach has also been used by several political scientists to investigate the nature and dynamics of possible political changes, violent changes- revolutions and coups, in numerous political systems.

Check Your Progress 2

Note: i) Use the space given below for your answer.

       ii) Check your answer with the answer given at the end of the unit.

1) In Almond's analysis, what are the features of political culture in totalitarian states?

…………………………………………………………………………...……
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………..………………………...……

2) Point out some of the principal drawbacks of political culture as an approach of comparative politics.

…………………………………………………………………………...…………
………………………………………………………………...………………
………………………………………………………………...………..…………
………………………………………………………………………………….

1.6 LET US SUM UP

In the above, the different dynamics of political culture as an important approach to the study of comparative politics has been discussed from where it may be derived that political culture has made Political Science a more complete branch of social science through its insistence on a combined micro-macro approach. It has focused our attention on the study of the political community or society, as a dynamic collective entity as distinct from the individual and on the total political system. Moreover, it encourages political scientists to take up the study of social and cultural factors which are responsible for giving the political culture of a country its broad shape.

As an approach, its pros and cons have also been discussed where it was found that there are arguments both in favour and against its utility in understanding the dynamics of comparative politics. Whatever may the arguments but it may safely be summed up that through the understanding of this approach the political processes of the different systems can best be known - these may be compared.

1.7 REFERENCES

A. R. Ball. (1971). *Modern Politics and Government.*London:Macmillan

Almond, Gabrial A. and Sydney Verb. (1972). *The Civic Culture.*New Jersey:Princeton University Press

Almond, Gabriel and Powell, Bingham G. (1966).*Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach*: Boston:Little Brown and Company

Andrew Heywood. (2019).*Politics.*London: Red Global Press

Eckstein, (1988).*A Culturalist Theory of Political Change.* LXXXII, 1203-1230.

Ethridge E Marcus, Howard Handelman. (2010). *Politics in a Changing World: A Comparative Introduction to Political Science.* Boston Massachusetts: Wadsworth Cengage Learning

International Encyclopaedia of the Social Science.(1968), *Definition of Political Culture.*New York: Macmillan

Patrick O'Neil. (2017). *Essentials of Comparative Politics*. New York: WW Norton and Company

Ronald P. Formisano, (2001). The Concept of Political Culture, '*The Journal of Interdisciplinary History.* Vol. 31, No. 3 (Winter, 2001), The MIT Press. pp. 393-426

1.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS EXERCISES

Check Your Progress Exercise -1

1) There are many ways political culture has been defined. Almond and Verba refer to it as the political orientations and attitudes towards the political system and its various parts, and attitudes towards the role of the self in the system

2) Elite culture consists of the beliefs, attitudes and ideas about politics held by those who are closest to the centres of political power. It is generally more coherent and influential.

Check Your Progress Exercise -2

1) Political culture in totalitarian states is marked by some combination of conformity or apathy produced by the central control or the means of communication and of the agencies of violence. Coercion is the hallmark of the exercise of authority and there is low peoples participation.

2) Your answer should list the following: Its not a precise variable for study of modern political systems, difficulties in distinguishing elite and mass culture, ambiguity arising from itbeing a subsystem of culture, and, can become an exercise in classifying with no explanation of change.

UNIT 2 POLITICAL MODERNIZATION[*]

Structure

2.0 Objectives

2.1 Introduction

2.2 Modernization Theory: Evolutionary and Functional

    2.2.1 Parsons Pattern Variables

    2.3. Political Modernization Approach

    2.3.1 Differentiation

    2.3.2 Secularisation

    2.3.3 Cultural Modernization

    2.3.4 From tradition to modernity

2.4 Critique of Political Modernization Approach

    2.4.1 Dependency Theory

    2.4.2 Critical Variable Approach

    2.4.3 Dichotomous Approach

2.5 Political Order in the Third World Countries

    2.5.1 The Process of Democratization

2.6 Let Us Sum Up

2.7 References

2. 8 Answers to Check your Progress

2.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit aimsintroduces you to political modernization as an approach to studyingcomparative politics. It will examine some of core features,assumptions and limitationsof the political modernization approach. After going through this unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the evolution and origin of political modernization

- Examine the various approaches and perspectives of political modernization

[*]Dr. ChakaliBramhayya, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & Human Rights, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University(Central University), Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh

- Analyze the contemporary issues and challenges of political modernization

- Elucidate the criticism and significance of the political modernization

2.1 INTRODUCTION

It is not very easy to give a precise meaning of term political modernization. However, the term is generally used to refer to changes in political attitudes and the transformation of political institutions. It is the process of transmutation of a traditional political system into a modern system. In the West, changes in political culture and political institutions occurred over a long period, resulting in the development and performance standards through the rational utilization of resources. Modern society, as it emerged in the West, is characterized by science and technology, social interdependence, urbanization, literacy, social mobility etc. In politics, modernization referred to the transition from the traditional political system to the modern democratic system.

Political modernizationemerged as a major approach in comparative politics in the late 1950s. It is concerned with changing the characteristics of the political system and social life in diverse spheres. It refers to the changes in political structure and culture characteristics, transformed by modern ideas like liberalism, secularism, transparency industrialization. It is also concerned with a change in the outlook, political culture, and rural and urban social life. This process, it was said, involved, among other things, the ending of the dominance of religion/church and the establishment of a secular and central political authority.

The political modernization approach, however, lost its steam by the end of the 1960s as a result of challenges emerging from within and from scholars in the non-Western world. Nevertheless, with the onset of the Third Wave of democratization since the 1980s and the growing interdependence of nations since the 1990s, there has been a revival of interest in political modernization. Some of the feature of the modernization process such as differentiation, secularisation, rationalization, economic development and its linkages with sustainable democracy are gaining significance in comparative analysis. The unit examines the core features and assumptions modernization approach. It also examines some of the limitations of this approach and its contemporary significance.

2.2 MODERNIZATION THEORY: EVOLUTIONARY AND FUNCTIONAL

In the 1950s, modernization theory began to affect the research agenda of several disciplines of social sciences, including political science. This occurred as a result of the intellectual ferment in the discipline and the insights based on advances in understanding of individual and group behavior, drawing on psychology, sociology, and economics were incorporated into the theoretical domain of politics. It also occurred because of the historical circumstances of the post-World War years. The United States of America had emerged as a superpower after the Second World War, while Britain, France, and Germany

had grown weak. America emerged as a world leader, especially after implementing the Marshall Plan to reconstruct and rebuild the war-ravaged Western Europe. In the 1950s, America started dominating the affairs of the world. At the same time, there was the spread of the communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union extended its influence to East European countries and China and Korea in Asia. America wanted to contain the spread of communism. The disintegration of the European colonial empires in Asia and Africa had given birth to many new nation-states in the post-War period. The newly emerged independent nation-states were faced with two alternative development models, the Socialist and the Capitalist models, to promote their economy and consolidate their independence. In such historical circumstances, it was natural that American political elite encouraged their social scientists to study the 'new', the 'emerging', the 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' nations to promote their economic development and political stability so as to avoid losing them to the Soviet communist bloc (Chirot 1981, p. 2.61-262). With the support and patronage from the American government and private foundations, political scientists, economists, sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, and demographers ventured into studies on non-Western societies, especially those that were emerging out of decolonization.

Much of the research on development of the non-Western societies was influenced by two theories of modernization- the evolutionary and functionalist theories. The **evolutionary theory** explained modernization in terms of a transition from traditional to modern society. This theory was an outcome of the Industrial Revolution and the French Revolution which destroyed the old social order and laid the foundation for a new social order. The Industrial Revolution resulted in rising productivity with the advancement of science and technology. The new order was a new factory production system with intensive division of labour and the take-over of the world markets. The basic path of modernity is known as increasing differentiation and scale. Societies most successful at developing an intensive division of labour were able to become highly productive. The process of division of labour accelerated with the advancement of science and technology and changed the nature of the political system as well.

On the other hand, the French Revolution created a new political order based on liberty, equality, fraternity, and parliamentary democracy. The classical evolutionary theory assumed that human society invariably moves from a primitive to an advanced stage. Thus the fate of human evolution is predetermined. The evolution from a simple, primitive society to a complex, modern society is a constant process that will take centuries to complete. It imposed a value judgment on the evolutionary process. The movement toward the final phase is good because it represents progress, humanity, and civilization. Underlying the evolution theory is the assumption that the rate of social change is slow, gradual, and piecemeal, that is, it is evolutionary, not revolutionary.

Another part of the theoretical heritage of the modernization school is **the functionalist theory** of Talcott Parsons, whose concepts include system, functional imperative, homeostatic equilibrium, and pattern variables. Parsons was initially a biologist, and his early training greatly influenced his formulation of a functionalist theory. For Parsons, human society is like a biological organism

and can be studied like an organism. To understanding Parsons's work, the organism illustration is very crucial. The different parts of a biological organism correspond to the different institutions that make up a society. Just as the parts that make up a biological organism such as the eye and the hand are interrelated and interdependent in their interaction with one another, the institutions in a society such as the economy and the government are closely related to one another. Parsons used the concept of system to denote the harmonious coordination among institutions. As each part of a biological organism performs a specific function for the whole, the same way each institution performs specific functions for the stability and growth of the society. Parson formulated the concept of 'functional imperatives', arguing that there are four crucial functions that every society must perform; otherwise, the society will die. These four are called AGIL functions (for adaptation, goal attainment, integration, latency).

1) Adaptation: to the environment-performed by the economy

2) Goal attainment: performed by the government

3) Integration: linking the institutions together performed by the legal institutions and religion

4) Latency: pattern maintenance of values from generation to generation performed by the family and education (Alvin Y. So: 1990:20)

2.2.1 Parsons Pattern Variables

Parsons has formulated the concept of 'pattern variables' to distinguish traditional societies from modern societies. Pattern variables are the key social relations in the cultural system, the most important system in his theoretical framework. For Parsons, there are five sets of pattern variables. The first set is affective versus affective-neutral relationship. In traditional societies, social relationships tend to have a preference for personal, emotional, and face-to-face interaction. In modern societies, social relationships have an affective-neutral, which means impersonal, detached and indirect. The second set of pattern variables is the pluralistic versus universalistic relationship. In traditional societies, people are inclined to join together with members of the same social circle. In modern societies, people are bound to interact with unknown people in their day to day life, and they tend to interact using established standards due to the vast population. The third set of pattern variables is collective orientation versus self-orientation. In traditional societies, loyalty is often owed to the family and community. In modern societies, self-orientation stresses encouragement to be individual, develop personal talent, and build a career. The fourth set of pattern variables is ascription versus achievement. In traditional societies, aperson was evaluated by their ascribed status, the social status of a person assigned by birth or assumed involuntarily later in life. For instance, the recruitment process depends on whether the employer is a good friend or the applicant's relative. In modern societies, a person is appraised by his or her achieved status, like educational qualifications. During job recruiting, the employer cares more about the applicant's qualifications and past job experience. The fifth and final set of pattern variables is functionally diffused versus functionally specific relationships. In traditional societies, roles tend to be

functionally diffused. For example, the employer's role is not just to hire employees; but also involves the team member's training through apprenticeship and being the guardian of employees take care of livelihood and welfare. In modern societies, roles are functionally specific. The employer has limited responsibility to the team member, and their relationship hardly ever extends beyond the professional field (Alvin So, 1990, 21-23).

Check Your Progress 1

Note i) Use the Space given below for your answer.
　　　ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) Explain the evolutionary theory of political modernization.

....
....
....
....
....

2.3 POLITICAL MODERNIZATION APPROACH

The modernization approach in comparative politics can be traced to the evolutionary explanations of the social change in 19th century Europe. The French philosophers and founders of modern sociology Auguste Comte and Emile Durkheim, the British philosopher Herbert Spencer, Max Weber and Karl Marx, gave different explanations of the transformation from pre-industrial to industrial society. The modernization theory has long been divided into two major streams. The first is the Marxist description, which argues that economy, politics, and culture are intimately associated since economic development determines a society's political and cultural characteristics. The second, Weberian version, maintain that culture shapes the economy and political life. Despite a continuing debate between the two streams, they have the same opinion on a central point, that the socio-economic change follows consistent and relatively expected patterns. Thus they imply that crucial social, political and economic characteristics are not randomly related; they tend to be closely connected.Two elements that were common in their explanations of social change were the belief in continuity and progress. The change was not only continuous but also progressive. For these thinkers, change implied advancement and improvement from agriculture to industry, from feudalism to capitalism, from traditional to modern. This kind of change involved two sets of processes, increased complexity and greater specialization of human organization and activity. These processes were described in terms of greater differentiation in society. The industrial capitalist societies of the West supposedly have achieved greater differentiation than other societies. A transforming society, in other words, was the one that acquires most of the characteristics common to most developed countries.

2.3.1 Differentiation

French philosopher and sociologist Emile Durkheim has propounded social differentiation and strongly advocated the idea of division of labour in society. Social activities have been divided among various institutions. Division of labour was extended due to communications, urbanization, and population. Differentiation has been defined in terms of more significant heterogeneity and institutional specialization in society. The family played many roles in traditional societies. In contrast to that, modern societies have specialized institutions for education, socialization. The role of the family has been restricted, and new institutions have played numerous roles in modern societies. The specialization of political roles has been reflected in the modern polity as per the analysis of neo-evolutionists. S. N. Eisenstadt (1966) has argued that structural differentiation has affected stratification. The modernization process has led to fragmentation. Military leaders, intellectuals, bureaucrats, political élites, and entrepreneurs have played a pivotal role in the process of political modernization.

2.3.2 Secularisation

Societies have become more rationalized due to secularisation. Secularisation enables the individual to differentiate between sacred and not sacred. Finally, it will lead to rational scrutiny. Max Weber, a German sociologist, was the pioneer in developing modernization theory based on social action. Social action has been distinguished between actions determined by reason and actions determined by habit or emotion (Weber 1965). Weber's bureaucracy system was based on rational government. The rational-legal authority has combined the idea of means and ends based on rules and regulations. Greater rationality has been supported by technological and scientific knowledge. Political modernization has been associated with institutions, which will contribute to the development of human knowledge.

Rustow has defined modernization as a rapidly widening control over nature (1967). Barrington Moore has equated modernization with the process of rationalization of social behaviour and social organizations. Modernization has resulted from increasing control over nature. To understand the significance of the political modernization approach, it is essential to know the salient features of the traditional societies (Higgott 1978, Smith 2003) whose institutions and values were considered as obstacles to political modernization.

2.3.3 Cultural Modernization

Rationalization and secularisation have resulted in changes in the dynamics of cultural modernization. It has been recognized and described by Talcott Parsons as pattern variables. It has been associated with values, and people make judgments about their society. Social changes help to understand the dynamics of territorial communities, social organizations, the family and occupations. Further, Parsons has argued that modern societies represent universalism. Modern society also makes judgments at universal criteria irrespective of social relationships.

Further, as we saw, Parsons has contrasted ascribed status with achieved status. Ascribed status means implied the inherent qualities of the individuals. The achieved status means acquired qualities of the individual like educational qualifications. Individuals attain status in modern society due to their educational qualifications. In traditional societies, individuals will acquire status by inheritance. A person occupies the office in the ascriptive society based on the hereditary principle, whereas bureaucrats are appointed based on merit and educational qualifications. Parsons has analyzed cultural patterns of affectivity with neutrality. Affectivity' leads to emotional feelings and sentiments among the people. Neutrality leads to personal relationships. Finally, he has contrasted diffuseness with specificity. Diffuseness implies a complex web of interconnections (Smith 2003). Specificity enables the social system to diffuse relations between employer and employee, landlord or tenant. Individuals play multiple roles in modern societies. Specificity indicates the division of social relations and relative independence. Diffuse relations enable the individual to play multiple tasks in society. These variables indicate the transition and progress of modern society. Finally, these developments have played a vital role in the development of the political modernization approach.

2.3.4 From Tradition to Modernity

In the 18th and 19th centuries, political modernization was associated with the emergence of the national-state and industrialization. In the latter half of the 20th century, political modernization came to refer to the transformation of traditional or feudal and semi-feudal political systems to modern democratic systems. Political modernization describes the political system in terms of changes in social, economic and cultural aspects. Early political modernization scholars have argued that economic development leads to cultural and social change, which in turn leads to changes in the political behaviour of citizens. Thus, there is a correlation between political and economic factors. As countries progress and modernize economically, the transition takes place from agriculture to industrialization. Industrialization leads to urbanization which in turn results in better access to media, information and education. It leads to the emergence of the middle class that takes an active part in the political decision-making process.

Karl Deutsch (1961), the American political sociologist, building on Parsons's work, developed the concept of social mobilization. He regarded social mobilization as a vital component of political modernization. Social mobilization implies changes in society and the transition from traditional to modern as countries progress towards industrialization, urbanization creating a conducive atmosphere for citizens to participate in politics. Education, social networks, urbanization were considered to be crucial aspects of social mobilization as they created political awareness among the citizens. Citizen's awareness, in turn,have raised demands for the introduction of various welfare schemes for the holistic development of the citizens.

Seymour Martin Lipset (1959) has argued that modernization will lead to the emergence of democracy and its consolidation in the developing world. As countries develop economically, they witness the rise of the middle class, which

actively participates in civil society and politics. Further, he has argued that education contributes to the empowerment of the citizens. It has been evident that educated citizens have actively participated in politics and decision-making Governments will be implementing various welfare schemes and providing sops to the educated middle class. This process will be leading to the emergence of more robust democracies in the contemporary global world.

It was however the framework evolved by Gabriel A Almond, the head of the Committee on Comparative Politics that heralded a number of studies on political modernization. In the Politics of Developing Areas (1960), Almond presented his functionalist framework that relied on modernity-tradition dichotomy and input-output functions of Easton's political system.

In Almond's framework, all political systems had these things in common:

1) There are political structures. Comparisons could be made according to the degree and form of structural specialization. Almond rejected the state/non-state distinction: political functions take place in all societies, though they might be discharged by very different structures.

2) They have the same political functions. Comparisons could be made based on what structures perform these functions and how regularly they do so. A main task of political theory is to identify these functions. Almond, like David Easton, divided the functional elements of political systems into "inputs" and "outputs." The political inputs were (a) political socialization and recruitment; (b) interest articulation; (c) interest aggregation; and (d) political communication. The outputs were (a) rule making; (b) rule application; and (c) rule adjudication.

3. All political structures are multifunctional. The 'degree of specificity' could be compared. The degree of 'political modernity' or 'political development' was essentially to be determined by this degree of specificity.

As we can see, Almond's preference for tradition - modern dichotomy and linear path to development were built into the framework. In fact, he made this clear when wrote that "The political scientist who wishes to study political modernization in the non-Western areas will have to master the model of the modern, which in turn can only be derived from the most careful empirical and formal analysis of the functions of modern Western polities". He drew his categories from the experience of the 'advanced' countries. For example, it was evident that the categories of rule making, rule adjudication, and rule application mapped almost identically onto the Western legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

With the Committee on Comparative Politics (CCP) that was headed by Almond receiving generous support from the US government and private endowments, Almond's functionalist framework and studies on political modernization received a big boost in comparative politics. Several members of the CCP such as Lucian Pye, Myron Weiner, Joseph La Palombara, Robert Ward, Sidney Verba, Leonard Binder, and James Coleman came out with a number of studies dealing with political modernization themes. With several universities also getting into similar studies, political modernization emerged as the broad approach to study developing countries in comparative perspective in the 1960s.

2.4 CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL MODERNIZATION APPROACH

The political modernization approach in comparative politics has been challenged in the latter half of the 1960s. It has been argued that underlying the categorization of states as traditional and modern is the implicit prescription that the developing countries have to adopt the characteristics of the political systems of Western Europe and the United States. Apart from this charge of ethnocentrism, modernization theory has also been challenged for its excessive emphasis on the correlation between political and economic development. Further, dependency theory has studied and explains the political systems of few Latin American countries that have criticized modernization theory for neglecting external factors that affect economic and political development.

2.4.1 Dependency Theory

Dependency theory has criticized the political modernization approach and argued that economic development might undermine social mobilization and democratic political system instead of promoting them. Dependency theory has pointed out that the country's development can be explained based on its historical role in the economic development of the global world. Scholars who studied Latin America pointed out that in the economic relations between the highly industrialized developed countries and predominantly primary good producing underdeveloped countries, the terms of trade have always been in favour of the economically developing countries in the world.

They have therefore argued that integration into the world economy is not suitable for developing countries. It indicates that stable economic growth will not be possible unless they overcome their dependence on developed countries. In his *The Development of Underdevelopment,* Andre Gunder Frank (1970) studied Latin American countries and showed that these countries have been trapped in the cycle of economic underdevelopment and that their integration with the world economy has immensely benefited the developed countries rather than Brazil and Chile. When financial investment is affected in the global world, these countries have also suffered.

However, in the early 1980s, the dependence theory has been discredited due to various reasons, prominent among them being that its forecast of underdevelopmenttrap, Argentina, Brazil and few other developing countries have emerged economically strong in the 1970s and 1980s.

2.4.2 Critical Variable Approach

Critique also came from scholars working within the American universities and reached its apogee in the essay written by Dean Tipps in 1973. In this essay he was critical of the two broad approaches that modernization studies were pursued.The first was the *critical variable* approach, which equated modernization with some other singular factor, such as industrialization, rationalization, or differentiation. Some advocates of this approach had equated

modernization with industrialization (Marion Levy, for instance) and others had used "modernization" to indicate the social and political *consequences* of industrialization. Since this substitution of terminology spawned needless confusion, Tipps suggested that it would make more sense to drop the word "modernization" and instead use the more specific term.

2.4.3 Dichotomous Approach

Tipps and other social scientists also became critical of the other more common variety of modernization theory, the dichotomous approach. Dichotomizing theories of modernization, as we noted earlier, posited an evolutionary relationship between the ideal-types of 'tradition' and 'modernity'. This approach was criticized at three levels: (i) ideological, (ii) empirical, and (iii) methodological.

1. The Ideological Critique: dichotomous tradition was highly criticized since it was a product of an ethnocentric worldview. Social evolutionists have developed a dichotomous approach during the late nineteenth century. Critics have condemned the explicit racism of the theory. Thus, political scientists have criticized the ideology and the terminology of the dichotomous approach towards orientations. Scholars have argued that *'"modern" means being Western without the onus of dependence on the West'*. Modernization theorists have analyzed non–Western societies according to the prevailing socio, economic, political and cultural conditions of the developing countries (Bendix, 1967, Rudolph and Rudolph, 1967, Tipps 1973). The dichotomous approach has been shaped on the lines of tradition-modernity contrast and enabled the political modernization scholars to have an analytical outlook on modern political systems. The ideological critique of modernization theory has addressed the cognitions, motivations, and purposes. Analyses of the ideological bases of modernization theory will facilitate the prediction of its empirical shortcomings. Thus, the ideological critique has to be supplemented by other critical perspectives.

2. The Empirical Critique: Theories of political modernization has been criticized for analyzing the transformation of societies as a result of processes of change (Bendix, 1967, Collins, 1968, Nisbet, 1969, Tipps 1973).). Political cognitions and modernization have extensively focused on indigenous aspects of culture and social structure. Modernization theorists have ignored the significance of practical aspects and external sources or influences on the political system. As Huntington has pointed out, "modernity and tradition are essentially asymmetrical concepts. The modern ideal is set forth, and then everything which is not modern is labelled traditional" (Huntington, 1971).

3. The Metatheoretical Critique: The final critique *is methodological, or 'metatheoretical',* and it has focused on conceptualizing the political modernization approach. Modernization is a *multifaceted process involving changes in all areas of human thought and activity* (Huntington, 1968: 32). Durkheim has condemned the developmental theory of Auguste Comte. Social scientists have criticized the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of political modernization (Tipps, 1973).

2.5 POLITICAL ORDER IN THE THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

Samuel P Huntington, in his seminal work *Political Order in Changing Societies* (1968), has posed challenges to the political modernization approach. Huntington has analyzed that political development and economic modernization are not the same but have distinct processes. Further, instead of leading to stable democracies, rapid social changes and economic development will lead to the decay of the political institutions. Modernization has witnessed that it has encountered challenges in the early stages of economic growth. Socio, economic changes will result in higher aspirations that the political institutions are unable to meet. This will lead to the decay of the political system (Huntigton 1968; Sokhey, 2011). Huntington has therefore argued that a stable authoritarian system is better than an unstable democratic political system. Some scholars have argued it has undermined the significance of the political modernization approach in democratic political systems.

2.5.1 The Process of Democratization

Modernization acts as a catalyst in the process of the democratization of societies. As discussed above, societies have become more rationalized and secularised in the process of modernization. Industrialization incorporated the division of labour, which led to massive production, leading to economic development. Economic prosperity creates room for democratization as economic freedom creates pressure on the political system for political freedom and rights. The industrial revolution gave stimulus to capitalism, which created a business class. The business class wants more control on taxation and property rights and is hard-pressed for a representative, limited and accountable government. Thus rationalization, secularisation and industrialization resulted in democratization. Substantive democracy focuses on creating an environment for the involvement of all sections of the society in the democratic processes.

It has delineated the correlation between the policy realm and academic theories. In their *The Civic Culture* (1963), Almond and Verba have detailed the prerequisites for democratic systems. In his *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Rostow suggested a policy framework designed a policy to prevent the spread of Communism to South Vietnam and Indonesia. Rostow argued that policies for economic development are the prerequisite for the successful functioning of democratic political systems. In his *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (1991), Huntington has pronounced that democracies will flourish in stable political systems. However, economic growth may not be the single factor responsible for establishing democratic political systems (Sokhey, 2011)

In *the Logic of Political Survival*, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (2003) has analyzed the types of political regimes and their implications for foreign policy. Free and fair elections, freedom of the press, human rights, and civil liberties have immensely contributed to establishing democratic political systems. It has been recommended that incentives should be given to the political leaders to establish

stable democratic systems (Mesquita 2003). Aron Acemoglu and James Robinson (2006), in their *Economic Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy*, have suggested that the success of democracy depends on the nature of political elites. (Sokhey 2011).All these suggest that the relationship between economic development and democracy postulated during the early days of political modernisation continue to resonate in contemporary comparative politics.

Check Your Progress 2

Note i) Use the Space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) Explainchallenge posed by Dependency Theory to Political Modernization.

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

2) Explain the process of democratization in Third World Societies.

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………

2.6 LET US SUM UP

Political modernization means the discarding of feudal and traditional structures and cultures. It is also becoming free from religion and church domination by establishing secular political authority. It is the process of transforming the traditional political system into a modern one. Change in political culture and political institutions has led to the development and improved performance standards. Political modernization has played a vital role in democracy, industrialization and economic growth in the contemporary global world. The political modernization approach has explained the political outcomes and processes in the political systems.

Further, the analysis of political modernization has been explained with the help of the duality of structure. The political modernization approach had lost its credibility in the 1970s as military and authoritarian regimes swept through most of the developing countries. It was the dependency theory that came to the fore. However, there has been a revival of political modernization. There is now being acknowledged that political and economic changes have a vital role in determining the social structures and social values. The secularisation process has consequences for the political system, political recruitment and political behaviour of the individual. Economic growth and forms of democracy are therefore being redefined. Democracy and economic growth have to be analyzed based on the freedoms in society and the political system. Political modernization will be leading to democratization which will enrich the citizens

2.7 REFERENCES

Almond, G., &Verba, S. (1963). *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations.* Princeton, NJ:Princeton University Press.

Alvin Y. So. (1990). *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency, and World-system Theories.* New Delhi: Sage publications India Pvt. Lld.

Deutsch, K. (1961). Social Mobilization and Political Development.*American Political Science Review, 55*(3),

Eisenstadt, S. N. (1966) *Modernization: Protest and Change.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Frank, A. G. (1970). The Development of Underdevelopment.In R. I. Rhodes (Ed.), *Imperialism and Underdevelopment: AReader* (pp. 4 17). New York: Monthly Review Press.

Huntington, S. (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies.*New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ingelhart, R. (1990). *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Lipset, S. M. (1960). (Ed.), *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics.* New York: Anchor Books.

Robinson, J. (2006). 'Economic Development and Democracy'.*Annual Review of Political Science, 9,* 503 527.

Smith B.C. (2003). *Understanding Third World Politics: Theories of Political Change and Development.* New York: Palgrave

Sokhey Sarah Wilson. (2011). 'Political Development and Modernization'. In 21st Century Political Science: A Reference Hand Book. London: Sage.

Tipps, D. (1973).'Modernization Theory and the Comparative Study of Societies: A Critical Perspective', *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, vol. 15.

2.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1) Evolutionary theory has shaped the political modernization paradigm that dominated studies on non-Western countries in the 1950s. It explained political modernization in terms of a transition from traditional to modern society. This theory was an outcome of the Industrial Revolution and the French Revolution. These two revolutions destroyed the old social order and laid the foundation for a new one.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Dependency theory argued that economic development might undermine social mobilization and the emergence of democratic political systemDependency

theory has pointed out that the country's development will be explained based on its historical role in the economic development of the global world.According dependency, development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin and that the development of one led to the underdevelopment of the other.

2)Various scholars have explained the process of democratization in their seminal works. Huntington's The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century (1991)" has delineated that democracies will flourish in stable political systems. Policies of economic development are the prerequisite for the successful functioning of a democratic political system. Economic development will be leading to democratization.

UNIT 3   POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT*

Structure

3.0 Objectives

3.1 Introduction

3.2 Modernization Theory and Political Development

    3.2.1 The Economic approach

    3.2.2 The Sociological approach

    3.2.3 The Political approach:

3.3. The Dependency Theory

3.4 Statism

3.5 Democratisation

3.6. Let Us Sum Up

3.7 Let Us Sum Up3.8 References

3.9 Answers to Check your Progress

3.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit aims to explain the origin and the evolution of the political development approach in Comparative Politics. It will be analyzing political development as an approach to studying comparative politics. After reading this unit, you will be able to:

- Trace the evolution of political development studies in comparative politics

- Describe the modernization, dependency and statist theories that shaped studies on political development, and

- Assess the significance of the political development approaches.

3.1 INTRODUCTION

Political development gained recognition as a subfield of comparative politics in the 1960s. It has its roots in modernization theory that had begun to influence

---

* Dr. Chakali Bramhayya, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & Human Rights, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University (Central University), Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh

several disciplines of social sciences in the post-War years. Prior to the 1960s, comparative politics had tended to focus on the forms of government that prevailed in the advanced industrial world, that is, Europe and the former Soviet Union. However, with the emergence of a number of states in Asia and Africa as a result of the breakup of Europe's empires and the cold war conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union, which provided alternative paths to development, comparative politics began to focus on what became known as the 'new', the 'emerging', the 'underdeveloped' or 'developing' nations.

With modernization theory emerging as a new paradigm in social sciences, studies on comparative politics became preoccupied with the linkages between economic development, social change and democratization. In the early 1960s when political modernization became a preoccupation of comparative political studies in America, the term was used as synonym for political development. Political development was seen as a transition towards democratic politics as reflected in the growth of interest group activity, development of bureaucracies and political parties and development of capacities of democratic institutions. The dependency theory which developed in Latin America alongside the modernisation theory replaced the latter as a dominant explanatory theory in comparative politics in the 1970s. As we shall see, the dependency theory drew attention to the external constraints, in particular, the constraints placed by the global capitalism on political development. However, as several Asian countries and Argentina in Latin America registering rapid economic growth the dependency theory lost its credibility as an explanatory theory. In the 1980s, Statism emerged as a new perspective to explain political development. But this was also the period when a fresh wave of democratisation swept through all continents, weakening, and often ending, military, authoritarian and communist regimes. . In this unit, we examine theinfluence that modernisation, dependency and statism had on shaping research on political development in comparative politics.

3.2 MODERNIZATION THEORY AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

In comparative politics, explicit efforts to theorize political development began in the latter half of the 1950s. These efforts were shaped by the modernization theory, about which you have read in the last unit. To recapitulate, modernization was informed by two theories- evolutionary and functional theories. The core assumptions of the evolutionary theory were that social change is unidirectional, progressive, and gradual, irreversibly moving societies from a primitive stage to an advanced stage and making societies more like one another as they proceeded along the path of evolution. The other set of assumptions came from the functionalist theory that stressed the interdependence of social institutions, the importance of pattern variables at the cultural level, and the built-in process of change through homeostatic equilibrium.

As we saw in the last unit, ideas about development and change in economics and sociology were being shaped by the modernization theory in the post-World War years.

3.2.1 The Economic Approach

In the discipline of economics, development emerged as a major preoccupation following Karl Polanyi's work, *The Grand Transformation* during World War II. In the 1950s, Bruce Morris and Everett von Hagen and in the 1960s W. W. Rostow and Robert Heilbroner worked on economic development in the emerging nations. In these studies, the rich and developed countries of the west (the United States and European nations) became the reference points. It was assumed that the less developed countries would follow the same trajectory of development and eventually catch up with the advanced countries.

W.W. Rostow's *The Stages of Economic Growth* is illustrative of this thinking on development. In this book, Rostow argued that there were five stages of development through which all societies passed. *Traditional societies* are characterized by the dominance of agricultural production and limited productivity. The *preconditions for take-off* are the second stage that resulted from scientific innovations, which led to surpluses that can be used for investment. The *take-off stage* is a phase of self-sustained growth, when manufacturing, initiated by entrepreneurial elite, becomes the driving force of development. The *drive to maturity* leads to the replacement of original growth sectors by new ones, such as heavy industry during the Industrial Revolution in Europe in the Eighteenth and Nineteenth centuries. The final stage is the *age of high mass consumption* leads to an emphasis on consumption rather than production. Rostow argued that the most politically difficult period in a nation's development was the "preconditions" stage. During this stage, the social dislocation of traditional society and attendant psychological insecurities would be accelerating, but few of the concrete material benefits of modernization would yet be manifesting themselves.

Rostow's stages of development and his emphasis on economic factors as the driving force of development shared similarities with the classical Marxists who talked about the transition from feudalism to capitalism and then to socialism. However, while Marx emphasized that the transition was through a dialectical process and necessaries involved a clear break with the past, often characterized by the violent destruction of the earlier stages, Rostow, who described his work as a 'non-Communist manifesto' saw a smooth and unilinear path of development for all countries.

Like Rostow, other economists who were formulating economic development plans in the 1960s, believed that development problems are internal and can be solved through external stimulation, the development of science and technology, and entrepreneurship. They also assumed that political and social development would follow economic growth and industrialization.

3.2.2 The Sociological Approach

As we saw in the last unit, Talcott Parsons advanced a set of categories, which he called pattern variables, for comparing 'modern' and traditional societies. Although Parsons presented these pattern variables as ideal types with real societies being a mixer of ascription and merit, of particularism and universalism,

and diffusion and specificity, misplaced polarities found a place in most sociological studies

For instance, Daniel Lerner, who studied the effects of increased means of communications on modernization and development in the Middle East, assumed that the transition from traditional to modern was liner, that is, all countries will move from traditional systems to modern systems. In other words, modernization resulting from the introduction of new communication media will inevitably result in egalitarianism, democracy etc.

Similarly, Karl Deutsch, who focused on social mobilization, concluded that society is required to meet certain social requirements before it could become developed or democratic. These social requirements were high literacy, economic development, mobilization of peasants and workers, modern communications etc. Thus, by the early 1960s, many sociologists were convinced that economic growth would result in social mobilization, leading to democracy. As economists, sociologists were silent about political factors in development.

3.2.3 The Political Approach

In the early stages of its evolution, political development shared the assumptions of modernization that were already embraced by economics and sociology. For instance, almost all studies in the 1960s regarded a politically developed state as the one which was democratic. They regarded political development as a process of transition towards democracy.

As we saw in the Unit 2, Seymour P Lipset in his classic work on the emergence of political democracy, *Political Man* (1959) had argued that there was a direct relationship between economic modernization (industrialization) and the development of political democracy. Economic modernization, he posited, created the social requisites for the emergence of political democracy (a large, vibrant and literate middle class and wealth.). Others gave a more nuanced in explaining the relationship between economic development and political democracy. Karl Deutsch (1961), for instance, in his *Social Mobilisation and Political Development*, argued that industrialization and economic modernization do not necessarily lead to the development of political democracy as Lipset had argued in 1959. Instead, they lead to the erosion of old social, economic and psychological commitments and new patterns of socialization and behaviour in this process, and people may gradually give up their local rural identities and identify with the nation. Social mobilization generates pressure on the existing political systems resulting in violence, social disorder or political stability depending on how the political system deals with those pressures. Almond and Coleman advanced a similar argument in their influential work The *Politics of the Developing Areas* (1960) in which they argued that economic modernization creates 'crises' that systems must resolve. In this volume, Gabriel Almond also presented a functionalist framework to study politics that found much favour with the Committee on Comparative Politics (CCP). Several members of the CCP like Lucian Pye, Myron Weiner, Joseph La Palombara, Robert Ward, Sidney Verba, Leonard Binder, and James Coleman undertook a number of studies dealing with political development themes. Some like FA Organski, (*The Stages of Political*

Development, 1965) and Barrington Moore (*The Social Origin of Democracy and Dictatorship*, 1966) adopted a historical approach to analyze political development. Most others used the structural, functional framework to explain political development. Prominent among them are Almond and Verba (*The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*, 1963), Lucian Pye (*Aspects of Political Development*, 1966) and David Apter (*The Politics of Modernization*, 1965). What is common to all these studies is that they were shared the assumptions of the modernization theory that change is linear, progressive, and gradual, irreversibly moving societies towards an advanced stage and making societies more like one another.

The political development approach's break with modernization came in the latter half of the 1960s principally in the works of Samuel P Huntington. In his writings, especially *Political Order in Changing Societies* (1968), Huntington rejected the notion that modernization was a progressive, convergent, or inevitable force. According to him, economic development did unleash profound social changes, but these changes were not necessarily benign or progressive. He argued that societies amid economic development and social change lead people to have increased expectations for a better life. When political institutions are unable to meet such expectations, there is bound to be disappointment and frustration at the national level leading to disorder or even revolution. Huntington, therefore, defined political development as the institutionalization of political organizations and procedures. He identified political development with the strength or capacity of government institutions--"whatever strengthens governmental institutions" (Huntington 1965:393). For Huntington, political order was necessary for economic development to take place. He thus prioritized political development or order over economic development and social change.

Samuel Beer took a similar, non-democratic approach to development. He argued that political development is equivalent to the expansion of the bureaucratic state. His book *Patterns of Government: the Major Political Systems or Europe* (1973) posited that economic development leads to social complexity and the need for specialization and division of labour (which he calls as patterns of interests). These patterns of interest create demands for more specialization and bureaucratization (what he calls patterns of power). The creation of new patterns of power leads them to generate their own interests, making new demands for access and representation, creating a new pattern of power ad infinitum. Political development, therefore, results in differentiation and expansion of the realm of the state activities.

Thus by the end of the 1960s, students of comparative politics were confronted with various definitions of political development. Lucian Pye once counted over ten distinct ways the term political development has been used. For political sociologists, political development meant greater differentiation and specialization of functions. For political scientists, political development meant the growth of political institutions such as interest groups, political parties, bureaucracies and similar institutions. Other political scientists used the term to refer to progress towards a democratic setup. Still, others, like Huntington, equated the term with stability and order. As Weirda and Skelley point out, most scholars "probably incorporated all of the meanings …specialization and

differentiation, institutionalization, democracy, stability-without being very exact about it" (p59). The lack of consensus on what 'political development' actually meant made it impossible to posit a theory of change (Eckstein, 1982, p. 466; Cammack, 1997, pp. 28–30).

Political modernization and development had found rapid acceptance in comparative politics in the 1960s. However, by the end of that decade, there was a breakdown of consensus undergirding the political development. As Weirda and Skelley pointed out, there were broader changes in the larger society. The optimism that was characteristic of 1960s America began to wane. The civil rights movement and war in Vietnam had begun to erode the societal and foreign policy consensus. Both the subdiscipline of political development and the scholars who had contributed to the field came into question. In these circumstances, the dependency or or"world systems" theory emerged as an alternative to the modernization paradigm as a lens through which to interpret political, social, and economic change in Third World countries.

Check Your Progress 1

Note i) Use the Space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1. What is the social precondition necessary for political development, according to Karl Deutsch?

……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………...

3.3. THE DEPENDENCY THEORY

The main argument of the dependency theory was that development could be explained only by considering a country's historical role in the global political and economic system.

Latin American dependency theory consisted of two positions: reformist and Marxist. The reformist position is reflected in the work of authors such as Cardoso, Faletto and Furtado, while the Marxist-inspired dependency theorists include Andre Gunder Frank, dos Santos and Marini. Weirda and Skelley point that because of these two schools and the predominance of the Marxist position, "it was not clear if a dependency was a new and serious approach in comparative politics or simply a political position". (Kay, p135).

Dependency theorists argue that the Latin American states are underdeveloped not because of their domestic factors but because of the structure of the world economy. They perceive the world economy as consisting of two types of states: core and periphery, metropolitan and satellite, developed and underdeveloped, and dominant and dependent. The core consists of advanced industrialized states of Europe and America, while the periphery is made of the developing states of Asia, Africa and Latin America. According to Frank, development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin; two poles of the same process-

metropolitan capitalist development on a world scale create the "development of underdevelopment" in the Third World. In the analyses of dependency theory, economic development was experienced in Latin America only when the metropolitan linkages were weakened, such as during the interwar period- when the metropolitan countries were preoccupied with war and *Great Depression.*

According to dependency theory, the establishment, maintenance and deepening of dependent economic relations between core and periphery had a strong distorting effect on the course of social and political development in the dependent countries. Samir Amin (1976), the dependency theorist of the Marxian school, has argued the relations between core and periphery created 'enclaves of modernity generally in cities near the coast where import/export are pursued. The bourgeoisie that emerges in these enclaves is not quite like the industrial bourgeoisie that had played a progressive role in Europe in dismantling feudalism and paving the way for the emergence of political democracy. It is a comprador bourgeoisie that derives its wealth from trade rather than industrial production As they benefit from this system, they have little incentive to change the system Far from playing a progressive role, they enter into alliance with the feudal landlords (with whom they have common economic interest) to maintain the status quo. Political democracy has, therefore, dim prospects. In the 1970s, Immanuel Wallerstein and several dependency theorists developed a social-scientific interpretation of the history of the capitalist world system. This world-system approach gradually occupied the place of dependency theory. Wallerstein's historical-sociological interpretation of the rise and expansion of the capitalist world-economy since the 'long sixteenth century' (1450-1600) revolves around the notion of the single division of labour. In other words, the unit of analysis in the world-system is the world itself and not the nation-state as in the dependency theory. In terms of its research focus, the world-system focuses on the periphery as well as on the core, the semi-periphery and the periphery unlike the dependency theorists who focused on the periphery.

Both the dependency and world-system theories have been criticized for their emphasis on the material and economic dimensions of their explanatory model and the seemingly deterministic nature of the explanations of development processes. The rise of Japan from the periphery to the core in the past and the rapid economic growth experienced by Argentine in the latter half of the 1970s could not be adequately explained by the dependency theory. Its explanation of the connection between political and economic development lost its credibility.

While it has lost its explanatory value, the importance dependency theory accorded to the state in overcoming the cycle of underdevelopment has led to the rise of Statism in the 1980s.

3.4 STATISM

In the early 1980s, scholars who influenced the dependency began to offer alternative explanations for 'dependent development. They questioned the applicability of dependency outside Latin America as evidence of countries from the periphery such as the Asian Tigers (Hong Kong, Taiwan, South Korea and Singapore) became available. Scholars like Evans (*Dependent Development: The Alliance of Multinational, State,*

and Local Capital in Brazil, 1979), Reuschmeyer and Skocpol (*Bringing the State Back In*, 1985), therefore, began to focus on state-led industrialization, which seemed to help in breaking the bonds of economic dependency. The statist approach to politics relied on the Weberian conception of the state which differed from the Marxist or liberal conceptions of the state. In the Marxist conception, the state was merely a tool in the hands of the ruling classes. In the liberal conception state, the states were an arena in which different interests compete. On the other hand, Weber thought of the state as "a human community which claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force within a given territory" (Weber, 1946, p76). In this conception, states are like any other human community, having interests of their own. Among these interests, the most important is the need to survive. States pursue modernization and development goals not because of benign concerns or accommodate changes happening in the economic environment, either internally as modernization theory suggested or externally as the dependency theory suggested. States pursue economic growth and development primarily to increase their capacity to face external threats, military threats and even economic threats. The statist explanation of development thus accords primary to politics. Economic transformation is possible as a result of the voluntaristic action of the state. In other words, political development is an independent variable that acts upon the environment and not a dependent variable conceived by modernization and dependency theories.

Check Your Progress 2

Note   i) Use the Space given below for your answer.

ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1).What are the Output functions of political systems according to Gabriel Almond?

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………...

2). Explain the factors responsible for the underdevelopment in Latin American countries according to the Dependency Theory.

…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………….

3.5   DEMOCRATIZATION

In a great historical irony, just as political modernization and political development were being set aside, another wave of democratization began gathering force- sweeping across continents, toppling authoritarian regimes and setting up democracies in their place. This has given rise to a whole new approach and body of literature in comparative politics (see block four of this course).

These democratic transitions also seem to follow impressive periods of economic development or correlate with a shift to a free market economy. This has led to revival of interest in political modernization and development, although more nuanced. One of the key participants in the debate, Adam Przeworski in his *Democracy and Development: Political Institutions and Well-Being in the World, 1950–1990* (2000) has assessed Seymore Lipset's thesis about the impact of economic development on political regimes and finds that Lipset's arguments regarding the association between a high level of economic development and stability is supported. In his other works, Przeworski has argued that the developmentalism of the 1960s has erred in its failure to differentiate between the establishment of democracy (democratization) and its sustainability (consolidation). His finding is that economic development played an important role in fostering the latter but not the former.

Another participant in the debate on modernization and development is Ronald Inglehart (*Modernization, Cultural Change, and Democracy: The Human Development Sequence*, 2005). Using a vast amount of data gathered from the World Values Survey, Inglehart has argued that mass cultural and attitudinal changes are the crucial intervening variables between economic development and political outcomes. Others have argued that the most important intervening variable is the changing balance of class forces in society.

In the post-Cold war years, the predominance of liberal democracy has led to dynamic changes in the nature and scope of political development. The State has provided opportunities for the citizens to participate in the decision–making process actively. Human rights have attained much significance in the discourse of political development. Political development plays a vital role in the implementation of constitutional rights, affirmative action policies in the political systems of Third-world countries (Kingsbury 2007).The current focus of comparative politics is now on autonomy, freedom, equality, and justice in democratic political systems.

3.6 LET US SUM UP

In this unit, we have traced the changes in political development as an approach to explain pollical changes in the developing world. As we saw, the Committee of Comparative Politics in the United States played an important role in encouraging political science to come out with a theory of political development and change and contribute to the policy goals of the US government. But these could not progress to build theories of development and change. This was in large measure due to the lack of clear definition of what constituted political development.

As military coups and authoritarian politics swept across the developing world in 1960, political development based on modernization theory lost much of its appeal and the dependency theory came to the fore. Dependency theory argued that underdevelopment is the product of dependent relations between the world periphery and the capitalist core. The unit of analysis for the dependency theory was the world-capitalist system. The underdeveloped countries had no chance of

breaking out of the underdevelopment trap without first breaking the global system.

As evidence of rapid economic growth came from some Asian countries and Argentine in the 1970s, the dependency lost its explanatory value. Statism which gave primary to state-led development emerged in the 1980s.

Since the late 1970s, there has been a fresh wave of democratization, often described as the third wave of democratization. This wave has affected the developing countries in the post-colonial world and communist and authoritarian regimes. This democratic transition has led to the revival of the political development approach. Today there is a broad consensus that the economic environment in which political development occurs (whether it originates from internal sources– social, cultural or political– or external sources) is a crucial explanatory factor for the emergence of various political forms including political democracy.

3.7 REFERENCES

Adeniran, T. (1975). 'The Search for a Theory of Political Development', *Transition*, (48), 25-28.

Almond A Gabriel, G.Bingham Russell J Dalton, Kaare Storm. (2011). *Comparative Politics Today: A World View*. New Delhi: Pearson Education

Brode, John. (1969). The Process of Modernization: An Annotated Bibliography of the Sociocultural Aspects of Development. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Hagopian, Frances. (2000). 'Political Development Revisited'. Comparative *Political Studies*, 33 (6/7): 880-911

Huntington S.P (1968). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven; Yale University Press

Kingsbury Damien (2007). *Political Development*. London: Rutledge

Nettl J.P (1969). """Strategies in the Study of Political Development"""" in Colin Leys (ed.) Politics and Change in Developing Countries. London: Cambridge University Press

Pye, Lucian W (1968). "Typologies and Political Development". *Politico*, 33(4), 725-733.

Smith B.C. (2003). *Understanding Third World Politics: Theories of Political Change.* New York: Palgrave

So, Alvin. (1988). *Social Change and Development: Modernization, Dependency and World- System Theories*. New Delhi: Sage Publications

Thomas George (2011). "What Is Political Development? A Constitutional Perspective". *The Review of Politics*, 73 (2), 275-294

Wiarda Howard J and Skelly Esther. (2007). *Comparative Politics: Approaches and Issues.* New York: Rowman & Little Filed Publishers

3.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1). The essential social requirements before political development were high literacy, economic development, zmobilization of peasants and workers, modern communications etc. Check Your Progress 2

1) Output functions identified were: Rulemaking, Rule execution, and Rule adjudication.

2) Dependency theorists have argued that the Latin American states are underdeveloped not because of their domestic factors but because of the structure of the world economy. According to A.G. Frank, development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin; two poles of the same process-metropolitan capitalist development on a world scale create the "development of underdevelopment" in the Third World.