



# Civil Society in Comparative Politics

**Nelson Emerson**





# **CIVIL SOCIETY IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS**



# **CIVIL SOCIETY IN COMPARATIVE POLITICS**

Nelson Emerson



Civil Society in Comparative Politics  
by Nelson Emerson

Copyright© 2022 BIBLIOTEX

[www.bibliotex.com](http://www.bibliotex.com)

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any manner without the prior written permission of the copyright owner, except for the use brief quotations in a book review.

To request permissions, contact the publisher at [info@bibliotex.com](mailto:info@bibliotex.com)

Ebook ISBN: 9781984662415



Published by:

Bibliotex

Canada

Website: [www.bibliotex.com](http://www.bibliotex.com)

# Contents

Chapter 1	Introduction .....	1
Chapter 2	The Political Economy Approach and Civil Society .....	33
Chapter 3	Globalization and Competition in Comparative Politics .....	75
Chapter 4	Constitution and Government's Governing Structures .....	91
Chapter 5	Comparative Analysis in Political Science .....	151





## **Chapter 1**

# **Introduction**

## **Comparative Politics Compares**

To compare and contrast is one of the most common human mental exercises. In the study of politics, the use of comparisons dates in the Western world at least from Aristotle. He categorised Greek city-states in the fourth century BCE according to their form of political rule: rule by a single individual, rule by a few, or rule by all citizens. He also distinguished “good” from “bad” versions of each type, according to whether those with power ruled in the interest of the common welfare of all citizens or only in their own interests. The modern study of comparative politics refines and systematises the age-old practice of evaluating some feature of A by comparing it to the same feature of B in order to learn more about A than isolated study of it would permit. Comparative politics is a subfield of the larger academic discipline of political science.

As you have probably already learned, political science is particularly concerned with the study of power: how it is gained, lost, used, abused, organised, distributed, and contested. The focus of comparative politics is the domestic, or internal, politics of different countries. In addition to comparative politics, most political science departments in the United States include courses and academic specialists in three other subfields: political theory, international relations, and American politics.

In the United States, the study of American politics is often considered a separate subfield from comparative politics. The pattern of distinguishing the study of politics at home from the study of politics abroad is also common in other countries. Students in Canada study Canadian politics as a distinct specialty, and Japanese students are expected to have particularly in-depth knowledge of Japanese politics. However, there is no logical reason why the study of the United States should not be included within the field of comparative politics even in the United States—and many good reasons to do so.

In fact, many important studies integrate the study of American politics with the study of politics in other countries. Comparative study can place U.S. politics into a much richer perspective and at the same time make it easier to recognise what is distinctive and most interesting about other countries. Indeed, as the prominent political scientist and comparativist, Seymour Martin Lipset once wrote, “Those who know only one country, know no country.”

## **The Central Importance of Countries**

We believe the best way to study comparative politics is to focus on countries. Countries comprise distinct, politically defined territories. They usually have their own political institutions, cultures, economies, and ethnic and other social identities. Most people see themselves as citizens of a particular country, and national citizenship is one of the most important, but not the only, source of the way people around the world connect to politics. Within a given country, the most powerful cluster of institutions is referred to as the state.

In the United States, the word *state* usually refers to the fifty states in the federal system—California, Illinois, New York, Texas, and so on. But in comparative politics, the “state” refers to the key political institutions responsible for making, implementing, enforcing, and adjudicating important policies: for instance, the “German state” and the “Mexican state.”

In this context, the state roughly means the same thing as the “government.” For example, we might talk about the declining role of the state in managing the economy in China over the last two or three decades. The most powerful state institutions in most countries are those that are part of the national executive branch—usually headed by the president and/or prime minister and the cabinet, which is made up of individuals who are in charge of the most important government departments and agencies. In some cases, the chief executive leader might be the head of the communist party, a military officer, or the supreme religious leader. The executive branch also includes the administrative bureaucracy that carries out laws and regulations.

It also includes institutions that are legally allowed to use force, such as the police and military. Other important state institutions are the legislature, courts, and local governments. All states claim the right to issue rules—notably, laws, administrative regulations, and court decisions—that people within the country must obey. Even democracies can survive only if they use force as a backup to make sure that citizens obey the law. However, in democratic regimes, representatives elected by citizens pass laws. As a result, there is by and large a much greater degree of voluntary compliance with laws in democracies than in non-democratic states.

In dictatorships, the state relies more heavily on the military and police to maintain order. But even then, long-term stability requires that the rulers have some measure of political legitimacy. A large percentage of the population, in particular, more influential citizens and groups, must accept that the state has the right to issue commands and to use force against those who do not obey them. Political legitimacy is a crucial concept in the study of comparative politics. It is determined by many factors, including, as suggested, emphasise, the state's ability to deliver satisfactory economic performance and an acceptable distribution of goods, services, and resources among its citizens.

There are big differences in the ways that states are organised from one country to another. The eight country studies in this book are each written by a comparativist who specialises in studying the politics of that country. The studies devote considerable attention to the description of national political institutions and processes. Each country study begins with an analysis of state formation, that is, how the state has evolved historically to reach its present form. Our country studies also explore the extent to which citizens in a country share a common sense of nationhood, that is, a belief that the state's geographic boundaries coincide with citizens' collective identities, particularly ethnicity, language, and religion. When state boundaries and collective identities coincide, political stability is usually easier to maintain. But often they do not coincide.

The result may be instability and even violence. In some countries, nationalist movements seek to secede from the existing state and form their own state, sometimes in alliance

with movements from neighbouring countries with whom they claim to share a common heritage. The Kurds, for instance, have large populations in both Turkey and Iraq, and have long sought and fought to establish an independent nation-state of Kurdistan. When a nationalist movement has distinctive ethnic, religious, and/or linguistic ties opposed to those of other groups in the country, conflicts are likely to be especially intense.

Nationalist movements may pursue their separatist goal peacefully within the established political system, as has generally been the case with those who support independence for the French-majority province of Quebec from English-majority Canada. Or they may act outside established institutions and engage in illegal, sometimes violent activity. This has often happened in countries around the world, including Spain, Russia, Sri Lanka, China, and Ethiopia. Separatist movements tore apart the once-united country of Yugoslavia. One result of this was the “ethnic cleansing” slaughter in the Balkans region of Southern Europe.

## **Comparative Analysis**

We have already emphasised the need to apply a clear framework to the study of comparative politics in order to make sense of major and often confusing developments that have shaped the contemporary political world. We have also explained the subject matter of comparative politics and described some of the tools of comparative analysis. This section describes the four themes we use in *Introduction to Comparative Politics* to organise the information on state institutions and political processes in the country chapters.

These themes help explain similarities and differences among countries. We also suggest a way that each theme highlights a particularly important question—or puzzle—in comparative politics.

Our first theme, *a world of states*, is a bit of a play on words. It is meant to reflect the facts that individual states are the most important actors on the world stage and that all states must be understood from the perspective of their place among other states on the world stage. For about 500 years, states have been the basic building block of global politics. International organisations and private actors like transnational corporations—and ordinary citizens organised in political parties and social movements—have certainly come to play a crucial role in world politics. But it is still, for the most part, states that determine the decisive outcomes in international affairs. It is the rulers of states who send armies against other states.

The legal codes of states make it possible for businesses to operate within their borders and beyond. States are the main source—to greatly varying degrees—of resources for human welfare by providing assistance for the sick, poor, elderly, orphaned, or unemployed. States regulate the movement of people across borders. States negotiate and sign treaties or agreements on the most critical issues facing individual countries and the world as a whole, be they war and peace, nuclear proliferation, trade, or pollution.

A state's position in the world of states has a powerful impact on its domestic politics. In 1796, George Washington warned the United States not to “entangle our peace and prosperity” in

alliances with other nations. He believed the United States would be more successful if it could remain detached from the global power politics of the time.

That kind of disengagement might have been possible then. But not today, particularly in this post-9/11 era of globalisation. Thanks to radio, television, and the Internet, people nearly everywhere can become remarkably well informed about international developments. This knowledge may lead citizens to demand that their governments intervene to stop atrocities in faraway Kosovo, Rwanda, or Dafur, or rush to aid the victims of natural disasters, as happened after the great tsunami struck South and Southeast Asia in late 2004. Heightened global awareness may encourage citizens to hold their own government to internationally recognised standards of human rights and democracy.

The recent spread of the so-called colour or flower revolutions illustrates how what happens in one state can influence popular movements in other states, particularly in this era of globalised media and communications. Such movements have adopted various symbols to show their unity of purpose: the “Rose Revolution” in Georgia, the “Orange Revolution” in Ukraine, the “Tulip Revolution” in Kyrgyzstan all led to the toppling of dictatorial leaders.

The “Cedar Revolution” in Lebanon didn’t force a change of political leadership, but it did cause the withdrawal of unpopular Syrian troops from that country, and the “Blue Revolution” in Kuwait has emerged as an important movement in support of granting women greater political rights. States may collapse altogether when challenged by powerful rivals for

power. And a similar outcome may occur when leaders of the state violate the rule of law and become predators, preying on their own people. Political scientist Robert Rotberg suggested the term failed states to describe this extreme situation, and cited as examples Sierra Leone, Somalia, and Afghanistan before and under the Taliban. *Foreign Policy*, a highly respected journal on current affairs, compiles an annual ranking of failed states. In 2007, Sudan headed the list. Iraq, even under American military occupation, was ranked second. The seventeenth-century English philosopher Thomas Hobbes, who lived in a time of great political disorder that included the beheading of a king, warned in his classic book, *Leviathan*, that the absence of effective state authority produces a war of every person against every other person.

This desperate situation, he observed, involves “continual fear, and danger of violent death; and the life of man solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.” For the nearly two billion people that *Foreign Policy* estimates live in states that are in serious danger of failing, Hobbes’ dire warning may be all too true. Although few states collapse into complete failure, all states today are experiencing intense pressures from external influences. But international political and economic factors do not have the same impact in all countries, and a few powerful and privileged states have the capacity to shape the international system as much as they are shaped by it.

The more advantages a state possesses, the more global influence it will have. At the same time, countries with fewer advantages are more extensively molded by other states, international organisations, and transnational corporations. Our case studies also emphasise the importance of similarities



and contrasts in state formation and organisation among countries. We discuss how states have developed historically: key events like colonial conquest, defeat in war, economic crises, or revolutions that had a durable impact on the character of the state. Furthermore, the world-of-states theme draws attention to the importance of variations in the organisation of states.

This is the overall mix of their political institutions that distinguishes, for example, democratic from authoritarian regimes. This theme also highlights variations in institutions within a given regime type, such as the contrast between presidential and parliamentary systems of government in democratic states.

### **A World-of-States Puzzle**

How do states today deal with the many challenges to their authority from both internal and external forces? Increasingly, the politics and policies of states are shaped by diverse international factors from “above” often lumped together under globalisation. At the same time, many states face groups within their borders who confront the power and legitimacy of central governments from “below.”

In reading the country case studies, try to assess how pressures from both above and below—outside and inside—affect the state in carrying out its basic functions. To what extent are even the most powerful states influenced by global and social forces that they cannot fully control? In what ways are the poorer and less powerful countries especially vulnerable to the pressures of globalisation and disgruntled

citizens? In this world marked by globalisation and increasing interdependence, can states any longer achieve desirable outcomes on their own?

The success of states in maintaining the support of their people depends to a great degree on their ability to meet the economic needs and desires of their populations. An important reason for the rejection of communism and the disintegration of the Soviet Union was the poor performance of the Soviet economy.

People simply became fed up with long lines to buy daily necessities, with the shoddy quality or even total lack of consumer products, crowded housing, unavailable or outrageously expensive foreign goods—to name just a few of the economic woes inflicted on its people by the Soviet state. In contrast, communist rule has survived in China in large part because of the stunning growth of the Chinese economy and the rapidly rising standard of living for the large majority of the people.

How a state organises production and the extent and character of its intervention in the economy—that is, how it “governs the economy” —reflects one of its most important functions and is a key element in its overall pattern of governance and political legitimacy. It is important to analyse, for example, how the economies of various countries differ in the balance between agricultural and industrial production, why some countries do so well in competing with other countries that offer similar products in international markets, and the relative importance of private market forces versus government direction of the economy.

The term political economy refers to how government policy affects economic performance and how economic performance in turn affects a country's political processes. We believe that politics in all countries is deeply influenced by the relationship between the government and the economy and that a political economy perspective should be part of any thorough approach to the study of comparative politics.

How do those of us who study comparative politics—we call ourselves comparativists—go about comparing? What do we compare? Because *countries* are the basic building blocks of the international system and *states* are the most significant political institutions within countries, these are the two critical units for comparative analysis.

The comparativist measures and tries to explain similarities and differences among countries or states. One influential approach in comparative politics involves developing what are called causal theories that try to explain why “If X happens, then Y is the result.” In other words, how does X. This is a basic method of any study that claims to be scientific, whether in the natural, or “hard,” sciences like physics and chemistry, or the social, or the “soft” sciences, which include anthropology, economics, and sociology, as well as political science.

To illustrate what causal theories mean in the political science, let's say that we wanted to understand what causes conflict (Y) to intensify among various kinds of groups in a particular country. Many scholars have noted that if a country's economic pie (X) suddenly shrinks, the competition between groups for pieces of that pie will intensify, and conflict is likely to be the

result. In other words, a decrease in X (economic pie) will cause an increase in Y (conflict). This kind of causal relationship might be tested by statistical analysis of a very large number of cases, a project facilitated in recent years by the creation of data banks that include extensive historical and contemporary data. Another way to study this issue would be to focus on one country, or several, to analyse how the relevant relationships between X and Y have varied over time and with what effect. Comparativists look at a variety of cases and try to identify similarities and differences among countries and discover significant patterns that will, hopefully, help us to better understand what causes important political outcomes. It is important to recognise the limits on just how “scientific” political science—including comparative politics—can be.

Two important differences exist between the natural and the social sciences. First, social scientists study people with free will. Because people have a margin for free choice, even if one assumes that they choose in a rational manner, their choices, attitudes, and behaviour cannot be fully explained or predicted. This does not mean that people choose in a totally random fashion. We choose within the context of economic constraints, institutional dictates, and cultural prescriptions. Comparative politics systematically analyses how such factors shape political preferences and choices; indeed, one recent study claimed that political beliefs are, to a significant degree, genetically determined, that is, our political values and opinions are, at least partly, inherited biologically from our parents.

A second difference between the natural and social sciences is that in the natural sciences, experimental techniques can

isolate how distinct factors contribute to a particular outcome. In a laboratory setting, it is possible to change the value or magnitude of a factor—for example, the force applied to an object or mix of chemicals—and measure how the outcome has consequently changed. But political scientists and comparativists rarely have the opportunity to apply such precise experimental techniques. Some political scientists have conducted experiments with volunteers in controlled settings to test, for example, the influence of political advertisements on voter opinions.

But laboratories provide crude approximations of natural settings, since, only one or a few variables can be manipulated. The real world of politics, by contrast, consists of an endless number of variables, and they cannot easily be isolated or manipulated.

It simply is not possible to predict with absolute certainty how someone will vote once he or she gets into the voting booth; nor is it possible to know fully why voters cast their ballots the way they do. Some political scientists try to get deeper into the question of cause and effect by using statistical techniques to identify the specific weight of different factors in explaining variations in political outcomes.

But it is difficult to measure precisely how, for example, a person's ethnicity, gender, or income influences her or his voting choices.

Nor can we ever know exactly what mix of factors— conflicts among elites, popular ideological appeals, the weakness of the state, the organisational capacity of rebel leaders, or the discontent of the masses—leads to the success or the failure of

a revolution. Indeed, similar outcomes of different revolutions may result from different combinations of factors. No single theory, therefore, can explain the outcomes of all revolutions—or why people vote the way they do.

## **Challenge of Globalisation and Comparative Politics**

Comparative politics has traditionally focused on studying single countries or domestic institutions and processes in several countries. Comparativists considered that studying the international system fell within the subfield of international relations. However, for nearly two decades, globalisation has been a critical factor in analysing politics within and among countries. Today, business and trade, information technology, mass communications and culture, the environment, immigration and travel, as well as politics, forge deep connections—and often deep divisions—among people worldwide.

To appreciate the complexity of politics in any country, comparativists now recognise that we must look beyond and across borders at the growing interdependence among nations. We have learned that we must develop a truly global perspective in order to understand the politics of individual countries and to compare them. The terms *globalisation* and *global era* identify the growing depth, extent, and diversity of today's cross-border connections.

Discussion of globalisation usually begins with economic activities—the great increase in international trade, finance, and overseas investment, as well as the worldwide reorganisation of production and redistribution of the

workforce that has led to the creation of the so-called global factory in which very few manufactured products are, in fact, produced in just one country. Globalisation also involves the movement of peoples through migration, employment, business, tourism, and educational opportunities.

The Internet and other new applications of technology now blur distinctions between what is around the block and what is around the world. These technologies link producers and contractors, headquarters, branch plants, suppliers, and consumers in real time anywhere in the world. Employees may be rooted in time and place, but they can take advantage of the ebb and flow of a global labour market. On the flip side: a secure job today may be gone tomorrow if an employer decides to move a business to another country. Globalisation has provoked challenges from grassroots movements in every region of the world that are concerned with its negative impact on, for example, poor people, the environment, and labour rights.

Conferences convened by governments and international organisations to develop rules for global commerce have been the sites of demonstrations by coalitions of environmental, labour-based, and community activists. Activists from around the world have recently assembled in places such as Mumbai, India, and Porto Alegre, Brazil, to exchange ideas and develop alternatives to the current form of economic globalisation. Globalisation in its many forms challenges the ability of even the strongest countries to control their destinies. In today's world, no country can be an island unto itself and protect its national culture from outside influences, seal off its economy, or isolate its people.

Many of the most important problems confronting individual states are related to globalisation, including pandemics like AIDS, global climate change, financial panics, the arms trade, and international terrorism.

The study of comparative politics has, in many ways, become the study of global politics. The events of September 11, 2001, made it painfully clear that international terror networks, such as Al Qaeda, are an evil form of globalisation. Terrorists, and the causes that motivate them, move around the world.

They can attack anywhere. But such issues have not replaced concerns about economic globalisation, which has an impact on many more countries and peoples than does terrorism. Rather these issues remind us how multifaceted globalisation has become and underline the urgency of developing a more complex understanding of globalisation and how it influences both politics throughout the world and the study of comparative politics.

## **The Origins of Comparative Study of Politics**

In its earliest incarnation, the comparative study of politics comes to us in the form of studies done through the Greek philosopher Aristotle. Aristotle studied the constitutions of 150 states and classified them into a typology of regimes. His classification was presented in conditions of both descriptive and normative categories *i.e.*, he not only called and classified regimes and political systems in conditions of their kinds *e.g.*, democracy, aristocracy, monarchy etc., he also distinguished



them on the foundation of sure norms of good governance. On the foundation of this comparison he divided regimes into good and bad—ideal and perverted.

These Aristotelian categories were acknowledged and taken up through Romans such as Polybius and Cicero who measured them in formal and legalistic conditions. Concern with comparative study of regime kinds reappeared ‘ in the 15th century with Machiavelli. The preoccupation with philosophical and speculative questions regarding the ‘good order’ or the ‘ideal state’ and the use, in the procedure, of abstract and normative vocabulary, persisted in comparative studies of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries signified the era when liberalism was the reigning ideology and European countries enjoyed dominance in world politics.

The ‘rest of the world’ of Asia, Africa and Latin America were either European colonies or under their sphere of power as ex-colonies. Comparative studies throughout this era man Finer’s *Theory and Practice of Contemporary Governments* and Carl J. Friedrich’s *Constitutional Government and Democracy*, Roberto Michels, *Political Parties* and M.Duverger, *Political Parties* were mainly concerned with a comparative study of organizations, the sharing of power, and the connection flanked by the dissimilar layers of government. These studies were Eurocentric, i. e, confined to the study of organizations, governments, and regime kinds in European countries like Britain, France, and Germany. It may therefore be said that these studies were in information not genuinely comparative in the sense that they excluded from their analysis a big number of countries. Any generalization derived from a study confined

to a few countries could not legitimately claim having validity for the rest of the world. It may be accentuated here that exclusion of the rest of the world was symptomatic of the dominance of Europe in world politics—a dominance—which though, was on the wane, and shifting slowly to North America. All modern history had Europe at its centre, obliterating the rest of the world whose histories were bound with and destined to follow the trajectories already followed through the advanced countries of the West. Therefore the works manifest their rootedness in the normative values of western liberal democracies which accepted with it the baggage of racial and civilizational superiority, and assumed a prescriptive character for the colonies/former colonies.

## **The Second World War and After**

In the nineteen thirties the political and economic situation of the world changed. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917, brought into world politics, Socialism, as an ideology of the oppressed and, as a critical alternative to western liberalism and capitalism.

With the end of the Second World War a number of important growths had taken lay, including the waning of European hegemony, the emergence, and entrenchment of United States of America as the new hegemon in world politics and economy, and the bifurcation of the world into two ideological camps *viz.* capitalism and socialism.

The majority of the 'rest of the world' had, through the time the Second World War ended, liberated itself from European imperialism. For an era after decolonization the notions of

growth, modernization, nation-structure, state-structure etc., evinced a degree of legitimacy and even popularity as 'national slogans' in the middle of the political elite of the 'new nations'. Ideologically, though, these 'new nations', were no longer compelled to tow the western capitalist path of growth. While socialism had its share of sympathizers in the middle of the new ruling elite of the Asia, America, and Latin America, quite a number of newly self-governing countries made a conscious decision to aloofness themselves from both the power blocs, remaining non-aligned to either. A number of them evolved their own specific path of growth akin to the socialist, as in the case of Ujjama in Tanzania, and the mixed-economy model in India which was a blend of both capitalism and socialism.

It may be worth remembering that the comparative study of governments till the 1940s was predominantly the study of organizations, the legal-constitutional principles regulating them, and the manner in which they functioned in western liberal-democracies. In the context of the growths, a powerful critique of the institutional approach appeared in the transitional of 1950s. The critique had its roots in behaviouralism which had appeared as a new movement in the discipline of politics aiming to give scientific rigour to the discipline and develop a science of politics.

Recognized as the behavioural movement, it was concerned with developing an enquiry which was quantitative, based on survey techniques involving the examination of empirical facts separated from values, to give value-neutral, non-prescriptive, objective observations and explanations. The behaviouralists attempted to study social reality through seeking answers to questions like 'why people behave politically as they do and

why as a result, political procedures, and systems function as they do'. It is these 'why questions' concerning differences in people's behaviours and their implications for political procedures and political systems, which changed the focus of comparative study from the legal-formal characteristics of organizations.

Therefore in 1955 Roy Macridis criticized the existing comparative studies for privileging formal organizations in excess of non-formal political procedures, for being descriptive rather than analytical, and case-study oriented rather than genuinely comparative. Harry Eckstein points out that the changes in the nature and scope of comparative politics in this era illustrates sensitivity to the changing world politics urging the need to re-conceptualize the notion of politics and develop paradigms for big-level comparisons.

Rejecting the then traditional and approximately exclusive emphasis on the western world and the conceptual language which had been urbanized with such limited comparisons in mind, Gabriel Almond and his colleagues of the American Social Science Research Council's Committee on Comparative Politics sought to develop a theory and a methodology which could encompass and compare political systems of all types - primitive or advanced, democratic or non-democratic, western or non western.

The broadening of concerns in a geographic or territorial sense was also accompanied through a broadening of the sense of politics itself, and in scrupulous, through a rejection of what was then perceived as the traditional and narrowly defined emphasis on the study of formal political organizations. The

notion of politics was broadened through the emphasis on 'realism' or politics 'in practice' as distinguished from mere 'legalism'.

This incorporated in its scope the functioning of less formally structured agencies, behaviours and procedures *e.g.* political parties, interest groups, elections, voting behaviour, attitudes etc. With the deflection of attention from studies of formal organizations, there was simultaneously a decline in the centrality of the notion of the state itself. The emergence of a big number of countries on the world scenes necessitated the growth of frameworks which would facilitate comparisons on a big level.

This led to the emergence of inclusive and abstract notions like the political organization. This notion of the 'organization' replaced the notion of the state and enabled scholars to take into explanation the 'extra-legal', 'social' and 'cultural' organizations which were crucial to the understanding of non-western politics and had the added advantage of including in its scope 'pre-state'/'non-state' societies as well as roles and offices which were not seen as overtly linked with the state. Also, with the transform of emphasis to actual practices and functions of organizations, the troubles of research Game to be defined not in conditions of what legal powers these organizations had, but what they actually did, how they were related to one another, and what roles they played in the creation and execution of public policy. This led to the emergence of structural-functionalism, in' which sure functions were called as being necessary to all societies, and the execution and performance of these functions were then compared crossways a diversity of dissimilar formal and

informal structures. While the universal frameworks of systems and structures-functions enabled western scholars to study a wide range of political systems, structures, and behaviours, within a single paradigm, the appearance of 'new nations' provided to western comparatives an opportunity to study what they perceived as economic and political transform.

Wiarda points out that it was in this era of the sixties that mainly modern scholars of comparative politics came of age. The 'new nations' became for mainly of these scholars [ironically] 'livelihood laboratories' for the study of social and political transform. Wiarda describes those 'exciting times' which offered unique opportunities to study political transform, and saw the growth of new methodologies and approaches to study them. It was throughout this era that some of the mainly innovative and exciting theoretical and conceptual approaches were advanced in the field of comparative politics: study of political civilization, political socialization, developmentalism, dependency and interdependency, corporatism, bureaucratic-authoritarianism and later transitions to democracy etc.

This era saw the mushrooming of universalistic models like Easton's political organization, Deutsch's social mobilization and Shil's centre and margin. The theories of modernization through Apter, Rokkan, Eisenstadt and Ward and the theory of political growth through Almond, Coleman, Pye and Verba also claimed universal relevance. These theories were claimed to be applicable crossways cultural and ideological boundaries and to explain political procedure everywhere.

The growth of comparative political analysis in this stage coincided with the international involvement of the United States by military alliances and foreign aid. Mainly research in this era was not only funded through research foundations, it was also geared to the goals of US foreign policy. The mainly symbolic of these were the Project Camelot in Latin America and the Himalayan Project in India. This era was heralded through the appearance of works like Apter's study on Ghana. Published in 1960, *Politics of Developing Regions* through Almond and Coleman sharply defined the character of the new 'Comparative Politics Movement'. The publication of a new journal in the US entitled *Comparative Politics* in 1969 reflected the height of this trend. 'Developmentalism' was possibly the dominant conceptual paradigm of this time. To a considerable extent, the interest in developmentalism emanated from US foreign policy interests in 'developing' countries, to counter the appeals of Marxism-Leninism and steer them towards a non-communist method to growth.

### **The 1970s and Challenges to Developmentalism**

Towards the 1970s, developmentalism came to be criticized for favoring abstract models, which flattened out differences in the middle of specific political/social/cultural systems, in order to study them within a single universalistic framework. These criticisms accentuated the ethno-centricism of these models and focused on the Third World in order to work out a theory of underdevelopment. They stressed the need to concentrate on solutions to the backwardness of developing countries. Two largest challenges to developmentalism which arose in the early 1970s and gained widespread attention were corporatism.

Dependency theory criticized the dominant model of developmentalism for ignoring international market and power factors in growth. It was particularly critical of US foreign policy and multinational corporations and suggested, contrary to what was held true in developmentalism that the growth of the already-industrialized nations and that of the developing ones could not go jointly. Instead, dependency theory argued, that the growth of the West had approach on the shoulders and at the cost of the non- West.

The thought that the diffusion of capitalism promotes underdevelopment and not growth in several sections of the world was embodied in Andre Gundre Frank's *Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America*, Walter Rodney's *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa* and Malcolm Caldwell's *The Wealth of Some Nations*. Marxist critics of the dependency theory, though, pointed out that the nature of use by surplus extraction should not be seen basically on national rows but, as section of a more intricate pattern of alliances flanked by the metropolitan bourgeoisie of the core/centre and the indigenous bourgeoisie of the margin/satellite as they operated in a worldwide capitalist organization. The corporatist approach criticized developmetalism for its Euro- American ethno-centricism and indicated that there was alternative organic, corporatist, often authoritarian methods to organize the state and state-community relations.

### **The 1980s: The Return of the State**

Throughout the later 1970s and into the 1980s, still reflecting the backlash against Developmentalism, a number of theories and subject matters appeared into the field of comparative



politics. These incorporated bureaucratic-authoritarianism, indigenous concepts of transform, transitions to democracy, the politics of structural adjustment, neo-liberalism and privatization. While some scholars saw these Approaches growths as undermining and breaking the unity of the field which was being dominated through developmentalism, others saw them as adding healthy variety, providing alternative approaches and covering new subject regions. Almond, who had argued in the late 1950s that the notion of the state should be replaced through the political organization, which was adaptable to scientific enquiry, and Easton, who undertook to construct the parameters and concepts of a political organization, sustained to argue well into the 1980s on the importance of political organization as the core of political study. The state, though, received its share of attention in the 60s and 70s in the works of bureaucratic-authoritarianism in Latin America, especially in Argentina in the works of Guillermo O'Donnell *e.g.*, *Economic Modernization and Bureaucratic Authoritarianism*. Ralph Miliband's *The State in Capitalist Community* had also kept the interest alive. With Nicos Poulantzas's *State, Power, Socialism*, and political sociologists Peter Evans, Theda Skocpol, and others bringing the *State Back In*, focus was sought to be restored onto the state. That comparative politics is distinguished from other disciplines which also use the comparative method, through its specific subject matter, language, and perspective. In that case, we might well enquire the question, is there at all a separate field of *comparative political analysis*, or is it a *sub-discipline subsumed within the superior discipline of Political Science*. The three characteristics of subject matter, language, vocabulary, and perspective, we necessity keep in mind, are inadequate in establishing the distinctiveness of comparative

politics within the broad discipline of Political Science, mainly because *comparative politics shares the subject matter and concerns of Political Science, i.e. democracy, constitutions, political parties, social movements etc.* Within the discipline of Political Science therefore the specificity of comparative political analysis is marked out through its *conscious use of the comparative method to answer questions which might be of common interest to political scientists.*

## **Identification of Relationships**

*This stress on the comparative method as defining the character and scope of comparative political analysis has been maintained through some scholars in order to dispel frequent misconceptions in relation to the relative politics as involving the study of 'foreign countries' i.e., countries other than your own. Under such an understanding, if you were learning a country other than your own, you would be described comparatives. More often than not, this misconception implies merely the gathering of information in relation to the individual countries with little or at the mainly implicit comparison involved. The distinctiveness of comparative politics, mainly comparatives would argue, lies in a conscious and systematic use of comparisons to study two or more countries with the purpose of identifying, and eventually explaining differences or similarities flanked by them with respect to the scrupulous phenomena being analyzed. Comparative political analysis is though, not basically in relation to the identifying similarities and differences. The purpose of by comparisons, it is felt through many scholars, is going beyond 'identifying similarities and differences' or the 'compare and contrast approach', to ultimately study political phenomena in a superior framework of*

*relationships. This, it is felt, would help deepen our understanding and broaden the stages of answering and explaining political phenomena.*

## **Comparative Politics and Comparative Government**

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

It may, though, be pointed out that for extensive comparative politics concerned itself with the study of governments and regime kinds, and confined itself to learning western countries. The augment in numbers and variety of unit/cases that could be brought into the gamut of comparison was accompanied also through the urge to formulate abstract universal models, which could explain political phenomena and procedures in all the units. Simultaneous to the augment and diversification of cases to be studied was also an expansion in the sphere of politics therefore as to allow the examination of politics as a total organization, including not merely the state and its organizations but also individuals social groupings, political parties, interest groups, social movements etc.

Sure characteristics of organizations and political procedure were especially in focus for what was seen as their usefulness in explaining political procedures, *e.g.*, political socialization, patterns of political civilization, techniques of interest articulation and interest aggregation, styles of political recruitment, extent of political efficacy and political apathy, ruling elites etc. These systemic studies were often built approximately the concern with nation-structure *i.e.*, providing a politico-cultural identity to a population, state-structure *i.e.*, providing institutional structure and procedures for politics and modernization *i.e.*, to initiate a procedure of transform beside the western path of growth. The attendance of divergent ideological poles in world politics, the rejection of western imperialism through mainly newly liberated countries, the concern with maintaining their separate identity in the form of the non-aligned movement and the sympathy in the middle of mainly countries with a socialist path of growth, slowly led to the irrelevance of mainly modernization models for purposes of global/big stage comparisons. Whereas the fifties and sixties were the era where attempts to explain political reality were made by the construction of big level models, the seventies saw the assertion of Third World-ism and the rolling back of these models. The Eighties saw the constriction of the stages of comparison with studies based on areas or smaller numbers of units became prevalent. With globalization, though, the imperatives for big stage comparisons increased and the field of comparisons has diversified with the proliferation of non-state, 'non-governmental actors and the increased interconnections flanked by nations with economic linkages and information technology revolution.

## **Scaling Down of Systems**

Much of the growth of comparative political analysis in the era 1960s to 1980s can be seen as an ever widening range of countries being incorporated as cases, with more variables being added to the models such as policy, ideology, governing experience, and therefore on. With the 1980s, though, there has been a move absent from common theory to emphasis on the relevance of context. In section, this tendency reflects the renewed power of historical enquiry in the social sciences, and especially the emergence of a 'historical sociology' which tries to understand phenomena in the extremely broad or 'holistic' context within which they happen. There has been a shying absent from models to a more in-depth understanding of scrupulous countries and cases where more qualitative and contextualized data can be assessed and where explanation can be taken of specific institutional conditions or scrupulous political cultures. Hence we see a new emphasis on more culturally specific studies countries, and nationally specific countries, and even institutionally specific countries. While emphasis on 'grand systems' and model structure diminished, the stress on specific contexts and cultures has meant that the level of comparisons was brought down. Comparisons at the stage of 'smaller systems' or areas, though, remained *e.g.*, the Islamic world, Latin American countries, Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia etc.

Civil Community and Democratization Approach brought into currency the notion of the 'end of history'. 'The End of History?', which was urbanized later into the book *The End of History and the Last Man*, Francis Fukuyama argued that the history of ideas had ended with the recognition and triumph of

liberal democracy as the 'final form of human government'. The 'end of history', invoked to stress the predominance of western liberal democracy, is in a method reminiscent of the 'end of ideology' debate of the 1950s which appeared at the height of the cold war and in the context of the decline of communism in the West. Western liberal scholars proposed that the economic advancement made in the industrialized societies of the west had resolved political troubles, *e.g.*, issues of freedom and state power, workers rights etc., which are assumed to accompany industrialization. The U.S. sociologist, Daniel Bell in scrupulous, pointed in his work of *Political Ideas* in the 1950s, that in the light of this growth there was an ideological consensus, or the suspension of a require for ideological differences in excess of issues of political practice. In the nineteen eighties, the thought of the 'end of history' was coupled with another late nineteen eighties phenomenon — globalization. Globalization refers to a set of circumstances, scientific, technical, economic and political, which have connected jointly the world in a manner therefore that occurrences in one section of the world are bound to affect or be affected through what is happening in another section. It may be pointed out that in this global world the focal point or the centre approximately which measures move worldwide is still western capitalism. In the context of the therefore described triumph of capitalism, the approaches to the study of civil community and democratization that have gained currency provide importance to civil community defined in conditions of defence of individual rights to enter the contemporary capitalist world.

There is, though, another important trend in the approach which seeks to lay questions of civil community and

democratization as its primary focus. If there are on one hand studies conforming to the modern interest of western capitalism seeking to develop market democracy, there are also a number of studies which take into explanation the resurgence of people's movements seeking autonomy, right to indigenous civilization, movements of tribal, dalits, lower castes, and the women's movement and the environment movement. These movements reveal a terrain of contestation where the interests of capital are in clash with people's rights and symbolize the language of transform and liberation in a period of global capital.

Therefore concerns with issues of identity, environment, ethnicity, gender, race, etc. have provided a new dimension to comparative political analysis.

### **Information Collection and Diffusion**

An important aspect and determinant of globalization has been the unprecedented growths in the field of information and communication technology *viz.*, the Internet and World Wide Web. This has made the manufacture, collection and analysis of data easier and also assured their faster and wider diffusion, worldwide. These growths have not only enhanced the availability of data, but also made possible the emergence of new issues and themes which extend beyond the confines of the nation-state. These new themes in turn form a significant/influential aspect of the political environment of the modern globalized world. The global network of social movement's institutions, the global network of activists is one such important aspect. The diffusion of ideas of democratization is a significant outcome of such networking.

The Zapatista rebellion in the southern Mexican state of Chiapas used the Internet and the global media to communicate their thrash about for rights, social justice and democracy. The concern with issues concerning the promotion and defence of human rights which is dependent on the collection and dissemination of information has likewise become pertinent in the modern world.



## Chapter 2

# The Political Economy Approach and Civil Society

## Political Economy

Political economy was the original term used for learning manufacture, buying, and selling, and their relations with law, tradition, and government, as well as with the sharing of national income and wealth. *Political economy* originated in moral philosophy. It urbanized in the 18th century as the study of the economies of states, *polities*, hence the term *political economy*.

In the late 19th century, the term *economics* came to replace *political economy*, coinciding with publication of an influential textbook through Alfred Marshall in 1890. Earlier, William Stanley Jevons, a proponent of mathematical ways applied to the subject, advocated *economics* for brevity and with the hope of the term becoming “the recognized name of a science.”

Today, *political economy*, where it is not used as a synonym for economics, may refer to extremely dissimilar things, including Marxian analysis, applied public-choice approaches emanating from the Chicago school and the Virginia school, or basically the advice given through economists to the government or public on common economic policy or on specific proposals. A rapidly rising mainstream literature from the 1970s has expanded beyond the model of economic policy in which

planners maximize utility of a representative individual towards examining how political forces affect the choice of economic policies, especially as to distributional conflicts and political organizations. It is accessible as a region of study in sure colleges and universities.

## **Etymology**

Originally, political economy meant the study of the circumstances under which manufacture or consumption within limited parameters was organized in the nation-states. In that method, political economy expanded the emphasis of economics, which comes from the Greek *oikos* and *nomos*; therefore political economy was meant to express the laws of manufacture of wealth at the state stage, presently as economics was the ordering of the house. The phrase first emerged in France in 1615 with the well recognized book through Antoine de Montchrétien: *Traité de l'économie politique*. French physiocrats, Adam Smith, David Ricardo and German philosopher and social theorist Karl Marx were some of the exponents of political economy.

In the United States, political economy first was taught at the College of William and Mary; in 1784, Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* was a required textbook.

## **Current Approaches**

In its modern meaning, political economy refers to dissimilar, but related, approaches to learning economic and related behaviours, ranging from the combination of economics with

other meadows to the use of dissimilar, fundamental assumptions that challenge earlier economic assumptions:

- Political economy mainly commonly refers to interdisciplinary studies drawing upon economics, law, and political science in explaining how political organizations, the political environment, and the economic organization—capitalist, socialist, or mixed—power each other. The Journal of Economic Literature classification codes associate political economy with three subareas: the role of government and/or power relationships in resource allocation for each kind of economic organization, international political economy, which studies economic impacts of international relations, and economic models of political procedures. The last region, derived from public choice theory and dating from the 1960s, models voters, politicians, and bureaucrats as behaving in largely self-interested methods, in contrast to a view ascribed to earlier economists of government officials trying to maximize individual utilities from some type of social welfare function.
- Economists and political scientists often associate political economy with approaches by rational-choice assumptions, especially in game theory, and in examining phenomena beyond economics' average remit, such as government failure and intricate decision-creation in which context the term “positive political economy” is general. Other “traditional” topics contain analysis of such public-policy issues as economic regulation, monopoly, rent-seeking, market defence institutional

corruption, and distributional politics. Empirical analysis comprises the power of elections on the choice of economic policy, determinants and forecasting models of electoral outcomes, the political business cycles, central-bank independence, and the politics of excessive deficits.

- A recent focus has been on modeling economic policy and political organizations as to interactions flanked by mediators and economic and political organizations, including the seeming discrepancy of economic policy and economists' recommendations by the lens of transaction costs. From the mid-1990s, the field has expanded, in section aided through new cross-national data sets that allow tests of hypotheses on comparative economic systems and organizations. Topics have incorporated the breakup of nations, the origins and rate of transform of political organizations in relation to economic development, growth, backwardness, reform, and transition economies, the role of civilization, ethnicity, and gender in explaining economic outcomes, macroeconomic policy, and the relation of constitutions to economic policy, theoretical and empirical.
- New political economy may treat economic ideologies as the phenomenon to explain, per the traditions of Marxian political economy. Therefore, Charles S. Maier suggests that a political economy approach: "interrogates economic doctrines to disclose their sociological and political premises....in sum, [it] regards economic ideas and behaviour not as frameworks for analysis, but as beliefs and actions that necessity themselves be explained." This approach informs Andrew Gamble's *The Free Economy and*

*the Strong State*, and Colin Hay's *The Political Economy of New Labour*. It also informs much work published in *New Political Economy* an international journal founded through Sheffield University scholars in 1996.

- International political economy rising approaches to the actions of several actors. In the US, these approaches are associated with the journal *International Organization*, which, in the 1970s, became the leading journal of international political economy under the editorship of Robert Keohane, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Stephen Krasner. They are also associated with the journal *The Review of International Political Economy*. There also is a more critical school of IPE, inspired through Karl Polanyi's work; two biggest figures are Matthew Watson and Robert W. Cox.
- Anthropologists, sociologists, and geographers use *political economy* in referring to the regimes of politics or economic values that emerge primarily at the stage of states or local governance, but also within smaller social groups and social networks. Because these regimes power and are convinced through the organization of both social and economic capital, the analysis of dimensions lacking an average economic value of gender, of religions often attract on the concepts used in Marxian critiques of capital. Such approaches expand on neo-Marxian scholarship related to growth and underdevelopment postulated through André Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein.

- Historians have employed *political economy* to explore the methods in the past that persons and groups with general economic interests have used politics to effect changes beneficial to their interests.

## **Related Disciplines**

Because political economy is not a unified discipline, there are studies by the term that overlap in subject matter, but have radically dissimilar perspectives:

- Sociology studies the effects of persons' involvement in community as members of groups, and how that changes their skill to function. Several sociologists start from a perspective of manufacture-determining relation from Karl Marx. Marx's theories on the subject of political economy are contained in his book, *Das Kapital*.
- Political science focuses on the interaction flanked by organizations and human behaviour, the method in which the former forms choices and how the latter transform institutional frameworks. Beside with economics, it has made the best works in the field through authors like Shepsle, Ostrom, Ordeshook, in the middle of others.
- Anthropology studies political economy through investigating regimes of political and economic value that condition tacit characteristics of socio-cultural practices through means of broader historical, political, and sociological procedures; analyses of structural characteristics of transnational procedures focus on the interactions flanked by the world capitalist organization and regional cultures.

- Psychology is the fulcrum on which political economy exerts its force in learning decision-creation, but as the field of study whose assumptions model political economy.
- History documents transform, by it to argue political economy; historical works have political economy as the narrative's frame.
- Human geography is concerned with politico-economic procedures, emphasizing legroom and environment.
- Ecology deals with political economy, because human action has the greatest effect upon the environment, its central concern being the environment's suitability for human action. The ecological effects of economic action spur research upon changing market economy incentives.
- International relations often use political economy to study political and economic growth.
- Cultural studies studies social class, manufacture, labour, race, gender, and sex.
- Communications examines the institutional characteristics of media and telecommunication systems. Communication, the region of study which focuses on characteristics of human communication, pays scrupulous attention to the relationships flanked by owners, labour, consumers, advertisers, structures of manufacture, the state, and power relationships embedded in these relationships.

Dependency theory arose in the late fifties and the sixties as an extended critique of the modernization perspective. This school of idea is largely associated with the work of Andre Gunder Baran argued that the economic relationships that lived flanked by western Europe and the rest of the world were based on clash and use. 'The former took section in 'outright plunder or in plunder thinly veiled as trade, seizing and removing tremendous wealth from the lay of their penetration'. The result was transfer of wealth from the latter to the former.

He applied his critique to both modernization theory and orthodox Marxism, replacing their dualism through a theory that argued that the world has been capitalist since the sixteenth century, with all sectors drawn into the world organization based on manufacture for market. The ties of dominance and dependence, Frank argues, run in a chain-like fashion during the global capitalist organization, with metropolises appropriating surplus from satellites, their cities removing surplus from the hinterland and similarly.

Frank's central argument is that making of 'First' world and the 'Third' world is a result of the similar procedure. Just as to the dependency perspective the modern urbanized capitalist countries were never underdeveloped as the Third world, but were rather undeveloped.

Underdevelopment, instead of being caused through the peculiar socio-economic structures of the Third World countries, is the historical product of the relations which have obtained flanked by underdeveloped satellites and urbanized metropolises.



In short, growth and underdevelopment are two sides of the similar coin, two poles of the similar procedure metropolitan capitalist growth on a world level makes the 'growth of underdevelopment' in the Third world. Latin America's mainly backward regions were precisely those regions which had once been mainly strongly connected to the metropole.

Organizations such as plantations and haciendas, regardless of their internal appearance, have since the conquest been capitalist shapes of manufacture connected to the metropolitan market. Economic growth was experienced in Latin America only in those times when the metropolitan linkages were weakened - the Napoleonic Wars, the depression of the 1930s and the two World Wars of the twentieth century - and it came to an end precisely as the metropolises recovered from these disruptions and recovered their links to the Third world.

Dependency theory was indeed a powerful advance in excess of modernization theory, but it suffered from peculiar weaknesses of its own. First of all, it suffered from a sure historical character, viewing transform within the Third world countries as an outcome of its undifferentiated dependent status.

As Colin Leys put it, dependency theory "...concentrates on what happens to the underdeveloped countries at the hand of imperialism and colonialism, rather than on the total historical procedure involved, including the several shapes of thrash about against imperialism and colonialism which grow out of the circumstances of underdevelopment." Secondly, dependency theory tends to be economist. Social classes, states and politics seem as derivatives of economic forces and mechanisms and often receive extremely little attention.

Classes, class projects and class struggles seem neither as the prime movers of historical transform nor the prime foci of analytic attention.

Thirdly, critics have alleged that the concept of growth is obscure in dependency theory. Given that it is regularly argued that 'growth' occurs in the Third world when the metropolitan/satellite linkages are weakened, does 'growth' imply autarchy? Since 'growth' is an attribute of capitalist growth in the metropolises, is the debate in the ultimate analysis again in relation to the Third world's skill to replicate this path? Finally, the assumptions of the dependency theory, fail to give explanations for the several therefore-described 'economic miracles' of the Third world?

Therefore, while marking an advance beyond the myths of modernization, dependency theory did not fully escape its imprint. While modernization theory argued that 'diffusion' brought development, dependency theory would look to argue in a same vein that dependence brought stagnation.

### **World Organization Analysis**

World-systems theory the world-systems perspective is a multidisciplinary, macro-level approach to world history and social transform that stresses that the world-organization should be the primary unit of social analysis.

World-organization refers to the inter-local and transnational division of labour, which divides the world into core countries, semi-margin countries and the margin countries. Core countries focus on higher ability, capital-rigorous manufacture, and the rest of the world focuses on low-ability,

labour-rigorous manufacture and extraction of raw materials. This constantly reinforces the dominance of the core countries. Nonetheless, the organization is dynamic, in section as a result of revolutions in transport technology, and individual states can gain or lose the core status in excess of time. For a time, some countries become the world hegemon; during last few centuries throughout which time the world organization has extended geographically and intensified economically, this status has passed from the Netherlands, to the United Kingdom and mainly recently, to the United States.

Immanuel Wallerstein has urbanized the best-recognized adaptation of world-systems analysis, beginning in the 1970s. Wallerstein traces the rise of the world organization from the 15th century, when European feudal economy suffered a crisis and was transformed into a capitalist one. Europe utilized its advantages and gained manage in excess of mainly of the world economy, presiding in excess of the growth and spread of industrialization and capitalist economy, indirectly resulting in unequal growth.

Wallerstein's project is regularly misunderstood as world-systems "theory," a term that he uniformly rejects. For Wallerstein, world-systems analysis is above all a mode of analysis that aims to transcend the structures of knowledge inherited from the 19th century. This comprises, especially, the divisions within the social sciences, and flanked by the social sciences and history. For Wallerstein, then, world-systems analysis is a "knowledge movement" that seeks to discern the "totality of what has been paraded under the labels of the... human sciences and indeed well beyond." "We necessity invent a new language," Wallerstein insists, to

transcend the illusions of the “three supposedly distinctive arenas” of community/economy/politics. This trinitarian structure of knowledge is grounded in another, even grander, modernist architecture – the alienation of biophysical worlds from social ones. “One question, so, is whether as suggested, be able to justify something described social science in the twenty-first century as a separate sphere of knowledge.” Important work through several other scholars has been done since then.

### **Origins and Powers and Biggest Thinkers**

World-systems theory traces appeared in the 1970s. Its roots can be established in sociology, but it has urbanized into a highly interdisciplinary field. World-systems theory was aiming to replace modernization theory. Wallerstein criticized modernization theory due to:

- Its focus on the state as the only unit of analysis,
- Its assumption there is only a single path of evolutionary growth for all countries,
- Its disregard of transnational structures that constrain regional and national growth.

Three biggest precursors of world-systems theory are: the Annales school, Marxist, and dependence theory. The Annales School custom convinced Wallerstein in focusing on extensive-term procedures and geo-ecological areas as unit of analysis. Marxist theories added:

- A stress on social clash,

- A focus on the capital accumulation procedure and
- Competitive class struggles,
- A focus on a relevant totality,
- The transitory nature of social shapes, and
- A dialectical sense of motion by clash and contradiction.

World-systems theory was also significantly convinced through dependency theory - a neo-Marxist account of growth procedures. Other powers on the world-systems theory approach from scholars such as Karl Polanyi, Nikolai Kondratiev and Joseph Schumpeter.

Wallerstein sees the growth of the capitalist world-economy as detrimental to a big proportion of the world's population.

Wallerstein views the era since the 1970s as an "age of transition," one that will provide method to a future world-organization whose configuration cannot be determined in advance.

World-systems thinkers contain Samir Amin, Giovanni Arrighi, Andre Gunder Frank, and Immanuel Wallerstein with biggest contributions through Christopher Chase-Dunn, Beverly Silver, Volker Bornschier, Janet Abu Lughod, Thomas D. Hall, Kunibert Raffer, Theotonio dos Santos, Dale Tomich, Jason W. Moore, and others. In sociology, a primary alternative perspective is world polity theory as formulated through John W. Meyer.

## **Dependency Theory**

World-systems analysis builds upon, but also differs fundamentally from, the proposition of dependency theory. While accepting world inequality, the world market, and imperialism as fundamental characteristics of historical capitalism, Wallerstein broke with dependency theory's central proposition.

For Wallerstein, core countries do not use poor countries for two vital causes. First, core capitalists use workers in all zones of the capitalist world-economy, and so the crucial redistribution flanked by core and margin is surplus value, not "wealth" or "possessions" abstractly conceived. Second, core states do not use poor states—as dependency theory proposes—because capitalism is organized approximately an inter-local and transnational division of labour rather than an international division of labour.

Throughout the Industrial Revolution, for instance, English capitalists exploited slaves in the cotton zones of the American South, a peripheral area within a semi-peripheral state. Fernando Henrique Cardoso called the largest tenets of dependency theory as follows:

- There is a financial and technical penetration of the margin and semi-margin countries through the urbanized capitalist core countries
- This produces an unbalanced economic structure within the peripheral societies and in the middle of them and the centers

- This leads to limitations upon self-continued development in the margin
- This favors the appearance of specific patterns of class relations
- These need modifications in the role of the state to guarantee the functioning of the economy and the political articulation of a community, which contains, within itself, foci of inarticulateness and structural imbalance

Dependency and world organization theory propose that the poverty and backwardness of poor countries are caused through their peripheral location in the international division of labour. Since the capitalist world organization evolved, the distinction flanked by the central and the peripheral nations has grown and diverged. In recognizing a tripartite pattern in division of labour, world-systems analysis criticized dependency theory with its bimodal organization of only cores and peripheries.

## **Wallerstein**

The best recognized adaptation of the world-systems approach has been urbanized through Immanuel Wallerstein, who is seen as one of the founders of the intellectual school of world-systems theory.

Wallerstein notes that world-systems analysis calls for an unidisciplinary historical social science, and contends that the contemporary disciplines, products of the 19th century, are deeply flawed because they are not separate logics, as is

manifest for instance in the de facto overlap of analysis in the middle of scholars of the disciplines.

Wallerstein offers many definitions of a world-organization. He defined it, in 1974, briefly, as:

- An organization is defined as a unit with a single division of labour and multiple cultural systems.

He also offered a longer definition:

- ...a social organization, one that has boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimation, and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it jointly through tension and tear it separately as each group seeks eternally to remold it to its advantage. It has the aspects of an organism, in that it has a life-span in excess of which its aspects transform in some compliments and remain stable in others. One can describe its structures as being at dissimilar times strong or weak in conditions of the internal logic of its functioning.

In 1987, Wallerstein's, defines world-organization as:

- ...not the organization of the world, but an organization that is a world and which can be, mainly often has been, situated in a region less than the whole globe. World-systems analysis argues that the units of social reality within which we operate, whose rules constrain us, are for the mainly section such world-systems stems that once lived on the earth. World-systems analysis argues that there have been therefore distant only two



diversities of world-systems: world-economies and world empires. A world-empire is big bureaucratic structures with a single political center and an axial division of labour, but multiple cultures. A world-economy is a big axial division of labour with multiple political centers and multiple cultures. In English, the hyphen is essential to indicate these concepts. “World organization” without a hyphen suggests that there has been only one world-organization in the history of the world.

Wallerstein characterizes the world organization as a set of mechanisms which redistributes surplus value from the *margin* to the *core*. In his terminology, the *core* is the urbanized, industrialized section of the world, and the *margin* is the “underdeveloped”, typically raw materials-exporting, poor section of the world; the *market* being the means through which the *core* exploits the *margin*.

Separately from these, Wallerstein defines four temporal characteristics of the world organization. *Cyclical rhythms* symbolize the short-term fluctuation of economy, while *secular trends* mean deeper extensive run tendencies, such as common economic development or decline. The term *contradiction* means a common controversy in the organization, generally regarding some short term vs. extensive term trade-offs. For instance the problem of under consumption, wherein the drive-down of wages increases the profit for the capitalists on the short-run, but considering the extensive run, the decreasing of wages may have a crucially harmful effect through reducing the demand for the product. The last temporal characteristic is the *crisis*: a crisis occurs, if a constellation of conditions brings in relation to the end of the organization.

In Wallerstein's view, there have been three types of society's crossways human history: mini-systems or what anthropologists call bands, tribes, and small chiefdoms, and two kinds of world-systems - one that is politically unified and the other, not. World-systems are superior, and ethnically diverse. Contemporary community, described the "contemporary world-organization" is of the latter kind, but unique in being the first and only fully capitalist world-economy to have appeared, approximately 1450 - 1550 and to have geographically expanded crossways the whole planet, through in relation to the 1900. Capitalism is a organization based on competition flanked by free producers by free labour with free commodities, 'free' meaning it's accessible for sale and purchase on a market.

## **Aspects**

World-systems analysis argues that capitalism, as a historical social organization, has always integrated a diversity of labour shapes within a functioning division of labour. Countries do not have economies, but are section of the world-economy. Distant from being separate societies or worlds, the world-economy manifests a tripartite division of labour with core, semi-peripheral, and peripheral zones. In core zones businesses, with the support of states they operate within, monopolize the mainly profitable activities of the division of labour.

There are several methods to attribute a specific country to the core, semi-margin, or margin. By an empirically based sharp formal definition of "power" in a two-country connection, Piana in 2004 defined the "core" as made up of "free countries"

dominating others without being dominated, the “semi-margin” while at the similar time dominating others, and “margin” as the countries which are dominated. Based on 1998 data, the full list of countries in the three areas—jointly with a discussion of methodology—can be established.

The late 18th and early 19th centuries marked a great turning point in the growth of capitalism in that capitalists achieved state-societal power in the key states which furthered the industrial revolution marking the rise of capitalism. World-systems analysis contends that capitalism as a historical organization shaped earlier, that countries do not “develop” in levels, but rather the organization does, and these measures have a dissimilar meaning as a stage in the growth of historical capitalism; namely the emergence of the three ideologies of the national developmental mythology ugh levels if they pursue the right set of policies:

- Conservatism,
- Liberalism, and
- Radicalism.

Proponents of world-systems analysis see the world stratification organization the similar method Karl Marx viewed class and of productions and Max Weber viewed class d occupational ability stage in the manufacture procedure. The core nations primarily own and manage the biggest means of manufacture in the world and perform the higher-stage manufacture tasks.

The margin nations own extremely little of the world's means of manufacture and give less-skilled labour. Like a class organization with a nation, class positions in the world economy result in an unequal sharing of rewards or possessions.

The core nations receive the greatest share of surplus manufacture, and margin nations receive the least. Furthermore, core nations are generally able to purchase raw materials and other goods from non-core nations at low prices, while challenging higher prices for their exports to non-core nations. Chirot lists the five mainly significant benefits coming to core nations from their power of margin nations:

- Access to a big quantity of raw material
- Cheap labour
- Enormous profits from direct capital investments
- A market for exports
- Skilled professional labour by migration of these people from the non-core to the core.

The unique qualities of the contemporary world-organization contain its capitalistic nature, its truly global nature, and that it is a world-economy that has not become politically unified into a world-empire.

## **Core Nations**

- The mainly economically diversified, wealthy, and powerful
- Have strong central governments, controlling long bureaucracies and powerful militaries
- Have more intricate and stronger state organizations that help control economic affairs internally and externally
- Have a enough tax foundation therefore these state organizations can give infrastructure for a strong economy
- Highly industrialized; produce manufactured goods rather than raw materials for export
- Increasingly tend to specialize in information, fund and service industries
- More often in the forefront of new technologies and new industries. Examples today contain high-technology electronic and biotechnology industries. Another instance would be assembly-row auto manufacture in the early 20th century.
- Has strong bourgeois and working classes
- Have important means of power in excess of non-core nations
- Comparatively self-governing of outside manage

During the history of the contemporary world-organization there has been a group of core nations competing with one another for access to the world's possessions, economic dominance, and hegemony in excess of margin nations. Occasionally, there has been one core nation with clear dominance in excess of others.

A core nation is dominant in excess of all the others when it has a lead in three shapes of economic dominance in excess of an era of time:

- *Productivity dominance* allows a country to produce products of greater excellence at a cheaper price compared to other countries.
- Productivity dominance may lead to *trade dominance*. Now, there is a favorable balance of trade for the dominant nation since more countries are buying the products of the dominant country than it is buying from them.
- Trade dominance may lead to *financial dominance*. Now, more money is coming into the country than going out. Bankers of the dominant nation tend to receive more manage of the world's financial possessions.

Military dominance is also likely after a nation reaches these three rankings.

Though, it has been posited that during the contemporary world-organization, no nation has been able to use its military to gain economic dominance. Each of the past dominant nations became dominant with fairly small stages of military

spending, and began to lose economic dominance with military expansion later on. Historically, cores were established in the north-west Europe, although later in other sections of the world.

## **Margin Nations**

- Least economically diversified
- Have comparatively weak governments
- Have comparatively weak organizations with little tax foundation to support infrastructure growth
- Tend to depend on one kind of economic action, often on extracting and exporting raw materials to core nations
- Tend to be least industrialized
- Are often targets for investments from multinational corporations from core nations that approach into the country to use cheap unskilled labour for export back to core nations
- Has small bourgeois and big peasant classes
- Tend to have a high percentage of their people that are poor and uneducated.
- In excellence tends to be extremely high because of a small upper class that owns mainly of the land and has profitable ties to multinational corporations

- Tend to be extensively convinced through core nations and their multinational corporations. Several times they are forced to follow economic policies that favour core nations and harm the extensive-term economic prospects of margin nations.

Historically, peripheries were established outside Europe, for instance in Latin America and today in Sub-Saharan Africa.

### **Semi Periphery Nations**

Semi periphery nations are those that are midway flanked by the core and margin. They tend to be countries moving towards industrialization and a more diversified economy. Those areas often have comparatively urbanized and diversified economy, but are not dominant in international trade. They are not as subject to outside manipulation as peripheral societies; but just as to others they have “peripheral-like” relations to the core. While in the sphere of power of some cores semi peripheries also tend to exert their own manage in excess of some peripheries. Further, semi-peripheries act as buffers flanked by cores and peripheries, therefore “partially deflect the political pressures which groups primarily situated in peripheral regions might otherwise direct against core-states” and stabilize the world-organization.

Semi-peripheries can approach into subsistence both from developing peripheries, and from declining cores.

Historically, an instance of a semi-margin would be Spain and Portugal, who fell from their early core location, but still control to retain power in Latin America. Those countries imported silver and gold from its American colonies, but then



had to use it to pay for manufactured goods from core countries such as England and France. In the 20th, nations like the “settler colonies” of Australia, Canada and New Zealand had a semi-peripheral status. In the 21st century, nations like China, India, Brazil and South Africa are generally measured semi-margin.

## **Interpretation of the World History**

Before the 16th century, Europe was dominated through feudal economies. European economies grew from mid-12th to 14th century, but from 14th to mid 15th century, they suffered from a biggest crisis. Wallerstein explains this crisis as caused through:

- Stagnation or even decline of agricultural manufacture, rising the burden of peasants,
- Decreased agricultural productivity caused through changing climatological circumstances,
- An augment in epidemics,
- Optimum stage of the feudal economy has been reached in its economic cycle; the economy moved beyond it and entered a depression era.

As a response to the failure of the feudal organization, Europe embraced the capitalist organization. Europeans were motivated to develop technology to explore and trade approximately the world, by their larger military to take manage of the trade routes. Europeans exploited their initial

small advantages, which led to an accelerating procedure of accumulation of wealth and power in Europe.

Wallerstein notes that never before had an economic organization encompassed that much of the world, with trade links crossing therefore several political boundaries. In the past, geographically big economic systems lived, but were mostly limited to spheres of power of big empires; growth of the capitalism enabled the world economy to extend beyond individual states.

International division of labour was crucial in deciding what relationships exist flanked by dissimilar areas, their labour circumstances and political systems. For classification and comparison purposes, Wallerstein introduced the categories of core, semi-margin, margin, and external countries. Cores monopolized the capital-rigorous manufacture, and the rest of the world could only give labour and raw possessions. The resulting in excellence reinforced existing unequal growth.

There have only been three periods in which a core nation has dominated in the contemporary world-organization, with each lasting less than one hundred years. In the initial centuries of the rise of Europe, Northwest Europe constituted the core, Mediterranean Europe the semi periphery, and Eastern Europe and the Western hemisphere the margin. Approximately 1450, Spain and Portugal took the early lead when circumstances became right for a capitalist world-economy. They lead the method in establishing overseas colonies. Though, Portugal and Spain lost their lead primarily due to becoming overextended with empire structure. It became too expensive to control and protect several colonial territories approximately

the world. The first nation to gain clear dominance was the Netherlands in the 17th century, after their revolution led to a new financial organization several historians believe revolutionary. An impressive shipbuilding industry also contributed to their economic dominance by more exports to other countries. Eventually, other countries began to copy the financial ways and efficient manufacture created through the Dutch. After the Dutch gained its dominant status, the average of livelihood rose, pushing up manufacture costs.

Dutch bankers began to go outside of the country seeking profitable investments, and the flow of capital moved, especially to England. Through the end of the 17th century, clash in the middle of core nations increased as a result of the economic decline of the Dutch. Dutch financial investment helped England gain productivity and trade dominance, and Dutch military support helped England to defeat the French, the other country competing for dominance at the time.

In the 19th century, Britain replaced the Netherlands as the hegemon. As a result of the new British dominance, the world-organization became comparatively stable again throughout the 19th century. The British began to expand all in excess of, with several colonies in the New World, Africa, and Asia. The colonial organization began to lay a strain on the British military, and beside with other factors, led to an economic decline. Again, there was a great trade of core clash after the British lost their clear dominance. This time it was Germany, and later Italy and Japan providing the new threat.

Industrialization was another ongoing procedure at that time, resulting in the diminishing importance of the agricultural

sector. In the 18th century, England was Europe's leading industrial and agricultural producer; through 1900, only 10 per cent of England's population was working in the agricultural sector.

Through 1900, the contemporary world-organization was much dissimilar than it was 100 years earlier. Mainly of the margin societies had already been colonized through one of the older core nations. In 1800, the old European core claimed 35 per cent of the world's territory, but through 1914 it claimed 85 per cent of the world's territory. Now, if a core nation wanted margin regions to use as had done the Dutch and British, these margin regions would have to be taken from another core nation. This is what Germany, and then Japan and Italy, began to do early in the 20th century. The contemporary world-organization became geographically global at that time, and even the mainly remote areas of the world have all been integrated into the global economy.

While these countries were moving into core status, therefore was the United States. The American civil war led to more power for Northern industrial elites, who were now bigger able to pressure the government for policies favorable to industrial expansion. Like the Dutch bankers, British bankers were putting more investment towards the United States. Like the Dutch and British, the U.S. had a small military budget compared with other industrial nations at the time.

The U.S. began to take the lay of the British as the new dominant nation after World War I. With Japan and Europe in ruins after World War II, the U.S. was able to control the contemporary world-organization more than any other country

in the history of the world-organization. After World War II, the U.S. accounted for in excess of half of the world's industrial manufacture, owned two-thirds of the gold reserves in the world, and supplied one-third of the world's exports. Though, since the end of the Cold War, the future of the US hegemony has been questioned and just as to some scholars its hegemonic location has been in decline for a few decades. Through the end of the 20th century, the core of the wealthy industrialized countries was collected of Europe, but also some other countries, such as United States or Japan. The semi periphery comprised several states that have been extensive self-governing, but did not achieve Western stages of power, and poor, former colonies of the West shaped the margin.

## **Criticisms**

World-systems theory has attracted criticisms from its rivals; notably for being too focused on economy and not sufficient on civilization, and for being too core-centric and state-centric. Critique of the world-systems approach comes from four directions: from the positivists, the orthodox Marxists, the state autonomists, and the culturalists. The positivists criticize the approach as too prone to generalization, lacking quantitative data and failing to put forth a falsifiable proposition. Orthodox Marxists discover the world-systems approach deviating too distant from orthodox Marxist principles, such as not giving sufficient weight to the concept of social class. The state autonomists criticize the theory for blurring the boundaries flanked by state and businesses. Further, the positivists, the orthodox Marxists and the state autonomists argue that state should be the central unit of analysis. Finally, the culturalists argue that world-systems

theory puts too much importance on the economy and not sufficient on the civilization. In Wallerstein's own languages:

- “In short, mainly of the criticisms of world-systems analysis criticizes it for what it explicitly proclaims as its perspective. World-systems analysis views these other manners of analysis as defective and/or limiting in scope and calls for unthinking them.”

One of the fundamental conceptual troubles of the world organization theory is that the assumptions which describe its actual conceptual units are social systems. The assumptions which describe these require to be examined as well as how they are related to each other and how one change into another. The essential argument of the world organization theory is that in the sixteenth century a capitalist world economy urbanized which could be called as a world organization.

The following is a theoretical critique concerned with the vital claims of world organization theory: “There are today no socialist systems in the world-economy any more than there are feudal systems because there is only one world organization. It is a world-economy and it is through definition capitalist in form.”

Robert Brenner has pointed out that the prioritization of the world market means the neglect of regional class structures and class struggles: “They fail to take into explanation either the method in which these class structures themselves emerge as the outcome of class struggles whose results are incomprehensible in conditions merely of market forces.” Robert Brenner: Director of the Center for Social Theory and

Comparative History at UCLA Another criticism is that of reductionism made through Theda Skocpol. She believes the interstate organization is distant from being an easy superstructure of the capitalist world economy: "The international states organization as a transnational structure of military competition was not originally created through capitalism. During contemporary world history, it symbolizes an analytically autonomous stage of transnational reality-interdependent in its structure and dynamics with world capitalism, but not reducible to it." Theda Skocpol: American Sociologist and Political Scientist at Harvard University

## **New Growths**

New growths in world-systems research contain studies on the cyclical procedures, the consequences of the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the roles of gender and the civilization, studies of slavery and incorporation of new areas into the world-organization, and the precapitalist world-systems. Arguably the greatest source of renewal in world-systems analysis since 2000 has been the synthesis of world-organization and environmental approaches. Key figures in the "greening" of world-systems analysis contain Andrew K. Jorgenson, Stephen Bunker, Richard York, and Jason W. Moore.

## **Time Era**

Wallerstein traces the origin of today's world-organization to the "extensive 16th century". Janet Abu Lughod argues that a pre-contemporary world organization long crossways Eurasia lived in the 13th Century prior to the formation of the contemporary world-organization recognized through

Wallerstein. Janet Abu Lughod contends that the Mongol Empire played a significant role in stitching jointly the Chinese, Indian, Muslim and European areas in the 13th century, before the rise of the contemporary world organization. In debates, Wallerstein contends that her organization was not a “world-organization” because it did not entail integrated manufacture networks, but was instead a huge trading network.

Andre Gunder Frank goes further and claims that a global-level world organization that comprises Asia, Europe and Africa has lived since the 4th millennium BCE. The center of this organization was in Asia, specifically China. Andrey Korotayev goes even further than Frank and dates the beginning of the World Organization formation to the 10th millennium BCE, connecting it with the start of the Neo-lithic Revolution in the Transitional East. The center of this organization was originally in West Asia.

## **Current Research**

Wallerstein’s theories are widely established during the world. In the United States, one of the hubs of world-systems research is at the Fernand Braudel Center for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems and Civilizations, at Binghamton University. In the middle of the mainly significant related periodicals are the *Journal of World-Systems Research*, published through the American Sociological Association’s Part on the Political Economy of the World Organization; and the *Review*, published the Braudel Center.



## **Articulation of Manners of Manufacture**

In any specific community or country, *dissimilar* manners of manufacture might emerge and exist alongside each other, connected jointly economically by trade and mutual obligations. Therefore, for instance, urban capitalist industry might co-exist with rural peasant manufacture for existence and easy swap and tribal hunting and gathering. Old and new manners of manufacture might combine to form a hybrid economy.

Though, Marx's view was that the expansion of capitalist markets tended to dissolve and displace older methods of producing in excess of time. A capitalist community was a community in which the capitalist mode of manufacture had become the dominant one. The civilization, laws and customs of that community might though preserve several traditions of the preceding manners of manufacture. Therefore, although two countries might both be capitalist, being economically based largely on private enterprise for profit and wage labour, these capitalisms might be extremely dissimilar in social character and functioning, reflecting extremely dissimilar cultures, religions, social rules and histories.

Elaborating on this thought, Leon Trotsky famously called the economic growth of the world as a procedure of *uneven and combined growth* of dissimilar co-existing societies and manners of manufacture which all power each other. This means that historical changes which took centuries to happen in one country might be truncated, abbreviated or telescoped in another. Therefore, for instance, Trotsky observes in the opening chapter of his history of the Russian Revolution of

1917 that “Savages throw absent their bows and arrows for rifles all at once, without traveling the road which place flanked by these two weapons in the past. The European colonists in America did not begin history all in excess of again from the beginning”, etc. Therefore, old and new techniques and cultures might combine in novel and unique admixtures, which cannot be understood other than through tracing out the history of their emergence.

### **Class Analysis**

Class analysis is research in sociology, politics and economics from the point of view of the stratification of the community into dynamic classes. It implies that there is no universal or uniform social outlook, rather that there are fundamental conflicts that exist inherent in community. Mainly recognized examples are the theory of Karl Marx and Max Weber’s three-component theory of stratification.

### **Barrington Moore and Political Growth**

In a non-Marxist sense, class analysis is a theory of political growth, in which political regimes and systems are said to be formed through the social class structure of the country. The largest advocate for this theory is political scientist Barrington Moore, Jr.. In Moore’s theory, Great Britain slowly attained stable democratic governance, compared to neighbouring countries such as France and Germany, is due to the rapid displacement of peasantry throughout the enclosure movement which fully transformed Britain into an advanced, industrial community with a strong bourgeois class, which Moore sees as indispensable for a lasting liberal democracy. In contrast,

France had a big peasantry that is stationary on land yet politically volatile, leading to the alternating flanked by violent revolutions and monarchical reactions.

## **Globalization and Neo-Liberal Approach**

### **The Problematic Character of Neo-liberalism**

Neo-liberalism seems to be problematic as a dominant theory for modern capitalism. The continuity and survival of the capitalist organization depends on its skill to bring vigorous capital accumulation, where the latter procedure is understood to contain not presently economic expansion but also technical progress.

Vigorous capital accumulation permits growing profits to coexist with growing livelihood standards for a substantial section of the population in excess of the extensive-run. Though, it does not seem that neo-liberalism promotes vigorous capital accumulation in modern capitalism. There are a number of causes why one would not anticipate the neo-liberal model to promote rapid accumulation. First, it provides rise to a problem of insufficient aggregate demand in excess of the extensive run, stemming from the powerful tendency of the neo-liberal regime to lower both real wages and public spending.

Second, the neo-liberal model makes instability on the macroeconomic stage through renouncing state counter-cyclical spending and taxation policies, through reducing the effectiveness of “automatic stabilizers” by shrinking social welfare programmes, and through loosening public regulation

of the financial sector. This renders the organization more vulnerable to biggest financial crises and depressions. Third, the neo-liberal model tends to intensify class clash, which can potentially discourage capitalist investment. The historical proof confirms doubts in relation to the skill of the neo-liberal model to promote rapid capital accumulation. As suggested, seem at development rates of gross domestic product development rate gives at least a rough approximation of the rate of capital accumulation, while the labour productivity development rate tells us something in relation to the extent to which capitalism is developing the forces of manufacture via growing ratios of means of manufacture to direct labour, technical advance, and improved labour skills. Standard annual real GDP development rates for six leading urbanized capitalist countries in excess of two periods, 1950-73 and 1973-99. The first era was the heyday of state-regulated capitalism, both within those six countries and in the capitalist world-organization as an entire. The second era covers the period of rising neo-liberal dominance. All six countries had significantly faster GDP development in the earlier era than in the later one.

While Japan and the biggest Western European economies have been comparatively depressed in the 1990s, the US is often portrayed as rebounding to great prosperity in excess of the past decade. Neo-liberals often claim that US adherence to neo-liberal policies finally paid off in the 1990s, while the more timid moves absent from state-interventionist policies in Europe and Japan kept them mired in stagnation. While GDP development improved slightly in 1990-99, it remained well below that of the period of state-regulated capitalism. Some analysts cite the information that GDP development

accelerated after 1995, averaging 4.1 per cent per year throughout 1995-99. Though, it is not meaningful to compare a short fragment of the 1990s business cycle expansion to the long run performance of the economy throughout 1948-73. While there was important improvement in productivity development in the 1990s, it remained well below the 1948-73 rates, despite the rapid spread of what should be productivity-enhancing communication and information-management technologies throughout the past decade.

The proof from GDP and labour productivity development rates supports the claim that the neo-liberal model is inferior to the state regulationist model for key dimensions of capitalist economic performance. There is ample proof that the neo-liberal model has shifted income and wealth in the direction of the already wealthy. Though, the skill to shift income upward has limits in an economy that is not rising rapidly. Neo-liberalism does not seem to be delivering the goods in the methods that matter the mainly for capitalism's extensive-run continuity and survival.

### **The Structure of Competition and Economic Policy**

The procedures by which the dominant economic ideology and policies are selected in a capitalist organization are intricate and several-sided. No common rule operates to assure that those economic policies which would be mainly favorable for capitalism are automatically adopted.

History suggests that one significant determinant of the dominant economic ideology and policy stance is the competitive structure of capitalism in a given period.

Specifically, this level argues that periods of comparatively unconstrained competition tend to produce the intellectual and public policy dominance of liberalism, while periods of comparatively constrained, oligopolistic market relations tend to promote interventionist ideas and policies.

A relation in the opposite direction also exists, one which is often commented upon. That is, one can argue that interventionist policies promote monopoly power in markets, while liberal policies promote greater competition. This latter relation is not being denied here. Rather, it will be argued that there is a normally-overlooked direction of power, having important historical explanatory power, which runs from competitive structure to public policy. In the era when capitalism first became well recognized in the US, throughout 1800-1860, the government played a comparatively interventionist role.

The federal government placed high tariffs on competing manufactured goods from Europe, and federal, state, and regional stages of government all actively financed, and in some cases built and operated, the new canal and rail organization that created a big internal market. There was no serious debate in excess of the propriety of public financing of transportation improvements in that period — the only debate was in excess of which areas would get the key subsidized routes.

Once capitalism had become well recognized in the US after the Civil War, it entered an era of cutthroat competition and wild accumulation recognized as the Robber Baron period. In this era a coherent anti-interventionist liberal location appeared

and became politically dominant. Despite the enormous inequalities, the severe business cycle, and the outrageous and often unlawful behaviour of the Goulds and Rockefellers, the thought that government should not intervene in the economy held sway by the end of the 19 century.

From roughly 1890 to 1903 a vast merger wave transformed the competitive structure of US capitalism. Out of that merger wave appeared giant corporations possessing important monopoly power in the manufacturing, mining, transportation, and communication sectors. US industry settled down to a more restrained form of oligopolistic rivalry. At the similar time, several of the new monopoly capitalists began to criticize the old Laissez Faire ideas and support a more interventionist role for the state.

The combination of large business support for state regulation of business, jointly with same demands arising from a popular anti-monopoly movement based in the middle of small farmers and transitional class professionals, ushered in what is described the Progressive Period, from 1900-16. The structure of a regulationist state that was begun in the Progressive Period was completed throughout the New Trade period a few decades later, when once again both large business leaders and a vigorous popular movement supported an interventionist state.

Both in the Progressive Period and the New Trade, large business and the popular movement differed in relation to the what kinds of state intervention were needed. Large business favored events to augment the continuity of the organization and to improve circumstances for profit-creation, while the

popular movement sought to use the state to restrain the power and privileges of large business and give greater security for ordinary people. The outcome in both cases was a political compromise, one weighted towards the interests of large business, reflecting the comparative power of the latter in American capitalism.

Small business has remained adamantly opposed to the large, interventionist state, from the Progressive Period by the New Trade down to the present. This division flanked by large and small business is chronicled for the Progressive Period in Weinstein. In the decade's immediately following World War II one can observe this division in the divergent views of the Business Roundtable, a large business organization which often supported interventionist programmes, and the US Chambers of Commerce, the premier small business organization, which hewed to an antigovernment stance.

What explains this political variation flanked by big and small business? When big corporations achieve important market power and become freed from fear regarding their immediate survival, they tend to develop an extensive time horizon and pay attention to the necessities for assuring rising profits in excess of time. They approach to see the state as a potential ally. Having high and stable monopoly profits, they tend to view the cost of government programmes as something they can afford, given their potential benefits. Through contrast, the typical small business faces a daily battle for survival, which prevents attention to extensive-run thoughts and which spaces a premium on avoiding the short-run costs of taxation and state regulation. This explains the radically dissimilar positions that large business and small business held



concerning the proper state role in the economy for the first two-thirds of the twentieth century.

This extensive-standing division flanked by large business and small business emerged to vanish in the US starting in the 1970s. Big corporations and banks which had formerly supported foundations that advocated an active government role in the economy, such as the Brookings Institution, became large donors to neo-liberal foundations such as the American Enterprise Institute and the Heritage Basis. As a result, such right-wing foundations, which previously had to rely largely on contributions from small business, became extremely wealthy and influential. It was large business's desertion of the political coalition supporting state intervention and its shift to neo-liberalism that rebuilt support for neo-liberal theories and policies in the US, starting in the 1970s. With business now unified on economic policy, the shift was dramatic. Large grants became accessible for economics research having a neo-liberal slant. The biggest media shifted their spin on political growths, and the phrase "government programmes" now could not be printed except for with the word "bloated" before it.

This switch in the dominant economic model first showed up in the mid 1970s in academic economics, as the previously marginalized Chicago School spread its power distant beyond the University of Chicago. This was soon followed through a radical shift in the public policy arena. In 1978- 79 the previously interventionist Carter Administration began sounding the extremely neo-liberal themes B deregulation of business, cutbacks in social programmes, and common fiscal and monetary austerity B that were to become the centerpiece of Reagan Administration policies in 1981. What caused the

radical transform in the political posture of large business concerning state intervention in the economy? This level argues that a biggest section of the account lies in the effects of the globalization of the world capitalist economy in the post-World War II era.

## **Chapter 3**

# **Globalization and Competition in Comparative Politics**

## **Other Factors Promoting Neo-liberalism**

Globalization is generally defined as an augment in the volume of cross-border economic interactions and resource flows, producing a qualitative shift in the relations flanked by national economies and flanked by nation-states and Rowthorn. Three types of economic interactions have increased considerably in past decades: merchandise trade flows, foreign direct investment, and cross-border financial investments. As suggested, briefly analyze each, with an eye on their effects on the competitive structure of modern capitalism.

The ratio of merchandise exports to gross domestic product for selected years from 1820 to 1992, for the world and also for Western Europe, the US, and Japan. Capitalism brought a five-fold rise in world exports comparative to output from 1820-70, followed through another augment of almost three-fourths through 1913.

After declining in the interwar era, world exports reached a new peak of 11.2 per cent of world output in 1973, growing further to 13.5 per cent in 1992. The 1992 figure was in excess of fifty per cent higher than the pre-World War I peak. Merchandise exports contain physical goods only, while GDP comprises services, several of which are not tradable, as well

as goods. In the twentieth century the proportion of services in GDP has risen significantly. This ratio almost tripled throughout 1950-92, with merchandise exports growing to almost one-third of total goods output in the latter year. The 1992 figure was 2.6 times as high as that of 1913.

Western Europe, the US, and Japan all experienced important increases in exports comparative to GDP throughout 1950-92. All of them achieved ratios of exports to GDP distant in excess of the 1913 stage. Several analysts view foreign direct investment as the mainly significant form of cross-border economic interchange. It is associated with the movement of technology and organizational ways, not presently goods. This measure has more than doubled since 1975, although it is not much greater today than it was in 1913. Though, it is still comparatively low in absolute conditions, with foreign direct investment accounting for only 5.2 per cent of gross fixed capital formation in 1995.

Not all, or even mainly, international capital flows take the form of direct investment. Financial flows ties and deposits in foreign bank accounts are normally superior. One measure that takes explanation of financial as well as direct investment is the total net movement of capital into or out of a country. That measure designates the extent to which capital from one country finances growth in other countries. Since net capital inflow or outflow is almost equal to the current explanation deficit or surplus, this designates the size of net cross-border capital flows. The ratio almost doubled from 1970-74 to 1990-96, although it remained well below the figure for 1910-14.

Cross-border gross capital movements have grown much more rapidly than cross-border net capital movements. In recent times an extremely big and rapidly rising volume of capital has moved back and forth crossways national boundaries. Much of this capital flow is speculative in nature, reflecting rising amounts of short-term capital that are moved approximately the world in search of the best temporary return. No data on such flows are accessible for the early section of this century, but the data for recent decades are impressive. Throughout 1980-95 cross-border transactions in bonds and equities as a percentage of GDP rose from 9 per cent to 136 per cent for the US, from 8 per cent to 168 per cent for Germany, and from 8 per cent to 66 per cent for Japan.

The total volume of foreign swap transactions in the world rose from in relation to the \$15 billion per day in 1973 to \$80 billion per day in 1980 and \$1260 billion per day in 1995. Trade in goods and services accounted for 15 per cent of foreign swap transactions in 1973 but for less than 2 per cent of foreign swap transactions in 1995.

While cross-border flows of goods and capital are generally measured to be the best indicators of possible globalization of capitalism, changes that have occurred in excess of time within capitalist enterprises are also relevant. That is, the much-discussed rise of the transnational corporation corporation which has a substantial proportion of its sales, assets, and employees outside its house country. TNCs lived in the pre-World War I period, primarily in the extractive sector. In the post-World War II era several big manufacturing corporations in the US, Western Europe, and Japan became TNCs.

The main TNCs are extremely international considered through the site of their activities. One study establish that the 100 main TNCs in the world had 40.4 per cent of their assets abroad, 50.0 per cent of output abroad, and 47.9 per cent of employment abroad in 1996. While this shows that the main TNCs are significantly international in their activities, all but a handful have retained a single national foundation for top officials and biggest stockholders. The top 200 TNCs ranked through output were estimated to produce only in relation to the 10 per cent of world GDP in 1995.

Through the secure of the twentieth century, capitalism had become significantly more globalized than it had been fifty years ago, and through some events it is much more globalized than it had been at the previous peak of this procedure in 1913. The mainly significant characteristics of globalization today are greatly increased international trade, increased flows of capital crossways national boundaries tall, and a biggest role for big TNCs in manufacturing, extractive activities, and fund, operating worldwide yet retaining in almost all cases a clear foundation in a single nation-state.

While the earlier wave of globalization before World War I did produce a capitalism that was significantly international, two characteristics of that earlier international organization differed from the current global capitalism in methods that are relevant here.

First, the pre-world War I globalization took lay within a world carved up into a few great colonial empires, which meant that much of the therefore-described “cross-border” trade and investment of that earlier period actually occurred within a

legroom controlled through a single state. Second, the high stage of world trade reached before World War I occurred within an organization based much more on specialization and division of labour. That is, manufactured goods were exported through the advanced capitalist countries in swap for primary products, unlike today when mainly trade is in manufactured goods. In 1913 62.5 per cent of world trade was in primary products. Through contrast, in 1970 60.9 per cent of world exports were manufactured goods, growing to 74.7 per cent in 1994.

Some analysts argue that globalization has produced a world of such economic interdependence that individual nation-states no longer have the power to regulate capital. Though, while global interdependence does make difficulties for state regulation, this effect has been greatly exaggerated. Nation-states still retain a good trade of potential power vis-à-vis capitalist firms, provided that the political will is present to exercise such power. For instance, even such a small country as Malaysia proved able to successfully impose capital controls following the Asian financial crisis of 1997, despite the opposition of the IMF and the US government.

A state that has the political will to exercise some manages in excess of movements of goods and capital crossways its borders still retains important power to regulate business. The more significant effect of globalization has been on the political will to undertake state regulation, rather than on the technological feasibility of doing therefore.

Globalization has had this effect through changing the competitive structure of capitalism. It seems that globalization

in this era has made capitalism significantly more competitive, in many methods. First, the rapid development of trade has changed the situation faced through big corporations. In the US the rate of import penetration of domestic manufacturing markets was only 2 per cent in 1950; it rose to 8 per cent in 1971 and 16 per cent through 1993, an 8-fold augment since 1950.

Second, the rapid augment in foreign direct investment has in several cases placed TNCs' manufacture facilities in the house markets of their foreign rivals. Common Motors not only faces import competition from Toyota and Honda but has to compete with US-produced Toyota and Honda vehicles. Third, the increasingly integrated and open world financial organization has thrown the biggest banks and other financial organizations of the leading capitalist nations increasingly into competition with one another.

Globalization seems to be one factor that has transformed large business from a supporter to an opponent of the interventionist state. It has done therefore partly through producing TNCs whose tie to the domestic markets for goods and labour is limited. More importantly, globalization tends to turn large business into small business. The procedure of globalization has increased the competitive pressure faced through big corporations and banks, as competition has become a world-wide connection. Even if those who run big corporations and financial organizations recognize require for a strong nation-state in their house foundation, the new competitive pressure they face shortens their time horizon.



It pushes them towards support for any means to reduce their tax burden and lift their regulatory constraints, to free them to compete more effectively with their global rivals. While a regulationist state may look to be in the interests of large business, in that it can more effectively promote capital accumulation in the extensive run, in a highly competitive environment large business is drawn absent from supporting a regulationist state. Globalization has produced a world capitalism that bears some resemblance to the Robber Baron Period in the US. Giant corporations battle one another in an organization lacking well defined rules.

Mergers and acquisitions abound, including some that cross national boundaries, but therefore distant few world industries have evolved the type of tight oligopolistic structure that would place the foundation for a more controlled form of market relations. Like the late 19 century US Robber Barons, today's big corporations and banks above all want freedom from political burdens and restraints as they confront one another in world markets.

The above interpretation of the rise and persistence of neo-liberalism attributes it, at least in section, to the changed competitive structure of world capitalism resulting from the procedure of globalization. As neo-liberalism gained power starting in the 1970s, it became a force propelling the globalization procedure further. One cause for stressing the row of causation running from globalization to neo-liberalism is the time sequence of the growths.

The procedure of globalization, which had been reversed to some extent through political and economic measures in the

interwar era, resumed right after World War II, producing a significantly more globalized world economy and eroding the monopoly power of big corporations well before neo-liberalism began its second coming in the mid 1970s. The rapid rise in merchandise exports began throughout the Bretton Woods era. Therefore too did the rising role for TNC's. These two characteristics of the current globalization had their roots in the postwar period of state-regulated capitalism. This suggests that, to some extent, globalization reflects an extensive-run tendency in the capital accumulation procedure rather than presently being a result of the growing power of neo-liberal policies. On the other hand, once neo-liberalism became dominant, it accelerated the procedure of globalization. This can be seen mainly clearly in the data on cross-border flows of both real and financial capital, which began to grow rapidly only after the 1960s.

The changed competitive structure of capitalism gives section of the account for the rise from the ashes of classical liberalism and its persistence in the face of widespread proof of its failure to deliver the goods. Though, three additional factors have played a role in promoting neo-liberal dominance. These are the weakening of socialist movements in the industrialized capitalist countries, the demise of state socialism, and the extensive era that has elapsed since the last biggest capitalist economic crisis. There is legroom here for only some brief comments in relation to the additional factors.

The socialist movements in the industrialized capitalist countries have declined in strength significantly in excess of the past few decades. While Social Democratic parties have approach to office in many European countries recently, they

no longer symbolize a threat of even important modification of capitalism, much less the specter of replacing capitalism with an alternative socialist organization.

The regulationist state was always partly a response to the fear of socialism, a point illustrated through the emergence of the first biggest regulationist state of the period of mature capitalism in Germany in the late 19 century, in response to the world's first biggest socialist movement. As the threat coming from socialist movements in the industrialized capitalist countries has receded, therefore too has to stimulus to retain the regulationist state. The subsistence of a powerful bloc of Communist-run states with an alternative "state socialist" socioeconomic organization tended to push capitalism towards a state regulationist form. It reinforced the fear in the middle of capitalists that their own working classes might turn against capitalism. It also had an impact on relations in the middle of the leading capitalist states, promoting inter-state unity behind US leadership, which facilitated the making and operation of a world-organization of state-regulated capitalism. The demise of state socialism throughout 1989-91 removed one more factor that had reinforced the regulationist state.

The occurrence of a biggest economic crisis tends to promote an interventionist state, since active state intervention is required to overcome a biggest crisis. The memory of a recent biggest crisis tends to stay up support for a regulationist state, which is correctly seen as a stabilizing force tending to head off biggest crises. As the Great Depression of the 1930s has receded into the far past, the belief has taken hold that biggest

economic crises have been banished forever. This reduces the perceived require to retain the regulationist state.

## **Modernization Theory: Growth As Modernization**

Modernization theory is a theory used to explain the procedure of modernization within societies. The theory seems at the internal factors of a country while assuming that, with assistance, “traditional” countries can be brought to growth in the similar manner more urbanized countries have. Modernization theory attempts to identify the social variables which contribute to social progress and growth of societies, and seeks to explain the procedure of social development. Modernization theory is subject to criticism originating in the middle of socialist and free-market ideologies, world-systems theorists, globalization theory and dependency theory in the middle of others. Modernization theory not only stresses the procedure of transform but also the responses to that transform. It also seems at internal dynamics while referring to social and cultural structures and the version of new technologies.

## **Earliest Expressions of the Theory**

Historically, the thought of modernization is comparatively new. Its vital principles can be derived from the Thought of Progress, which appeared in the 18th century Age of Enlightenment with the thought that people themselves could develop and transform their community. French philosopher Marquis de Condorcet was involved in the origins of the theory with the concept that technical advancements and economical changes can enable changes in moral and cultural values.

Condorcet was the first to create the economic-social growth relationship and that there can be continuous progress and improvement in human affairs. With that said, new advancements and improvements would require to stay pace with a constantly changing world. Furthermore, he encouraged technical procedures to help provide people further manage in excess of their environments, arguing that technical progress would eventually spur social progress. In addition to social structure and the development of societies, the French sociologist Émile Durkheim urbanized the concept of functionalism which stresses the interdependence of the organizations of a community and their interaction in maintaining cultural and social unity.

His mainly well-known work is *The Division of Labour in Community*, which called how social order was to be maintained in a community and how primitive societies might create the transition to more economically advanced industrial societies. Durkheim suggested that in a capitalist community, with an intricate division of labour, economic regulation would be needed to uphold order.

He stressed that the biggest transition from a primitive social order to a more advanced industrial community could otherwise bring crisis and disorder. Durkheim furthermore urbanized the thought of social development, which designates how societies and cultures develop in excess of time—much like a livelihood organism—essentially saying that social development is like biological development with reference to the growth of its components. Like organisms, societies progress by many levels usually starting at a simplistic stage and then developing into a more intricate stage. Societies

adapt to their nearby environments, but they interact with other societies which further contribute to their progress and growth. Contemporary sociology evolved in section as a reaction to the troubles associated with modernity, such as industrialization and the procedure of 'rationalization'.

## **State Theory**

Internal situations in societies immediately affect the procedures of modernization. A state in which favorites are rewarded and governmental corruption is prevalent reasons the state to suffer in conditions of modernization. This can repress the state's economic growth and productivity and lead money and possessions to flow out to other countries with more favorable investment environments. Such mechanisms slow the procedure of modernization and lead to require sorting out internal conflicts therefore as to aid the procedure of modernization.

State theory is said to be mixed with internal politics, and that each country will have its own unique pathway to growth. For a country to become more urbanized it is said that continuity both inside and outside the country is essential.

The State theory essentially implies that in order for modernization to grow and for societies to become more urbanized the state necessity be tamed and power to arbitrarily seize private property curtailed. From the taming of the state, a capitalist economy can bigger arise, resulting in increased productivity supporting the internal modernization of community.

## **Globalization and Modernization**

Globalization can be defined as the integration of economic, political and social cultures and is related to the spreading of modernization crossways borders. It theorizes the growth of a global economy in the sense that the world is moving in the direction of more efficient use of possessions and the means of manufacture.

Mass tourism could not have urbanized without air travel. Annual trans border tourist arrivals rose to 456 million through 1990 and are expected to double again, to 937 million per annum, through 2010. Communication is another biggest region that has grown due to modernization. Communication industries have enabled capitalism to spread during the world. Telephony, television broadcasts, news services and online service providers have played a crucial section in globalization.

With the several evident positive attributes to globalization there are also negative consequences. Economic growth can often initially highlight the disparities flanked by a community's rich and it's poor. In biggest municipalities of developing countries there exist pockets where technologies of the modernized world—computers, cell phones and satellite television—exist right alongside stark poverty. This often begets an acute awareness of those in community initially or chronically left behind through economic progress.

Globalization has several advocates some of which are globalists, transformationalists and traditionalists. Globalists are globalization modernization theorists therefore are so extremely positive in relation to the concept. They argue that

globalization is good for everyone as there are benefits for all including vulnerable groups such as women and children. This is done because globalization is typically western and it's the western values which are transmitted so allowing women to rights they wouldn't have had before, such as reproduction rights.

## **Technology**

New technology is a biggest source of social transform. Since modernization deals with social transform from agrarian societies to industrial ones, it is significant to seem at the technical viewpoint. New technologies do not transform societies through it. Rather, it is the response to technology that reasons transform. Regularly, technology will be established but not put to use for an extremely extensive time. Take for instance the skill to extract metal from rock. It was not presently a new technology at one time, but one that had profound implications for the course of societies. It was always there, but went unused for a great era of time. As Neil Postman has said, "technical transform is not additive; it is ecological. A new technology does not merely add something; it changes everything". People in community are always coming up with new ideas and bigger methods of creation life easier and more enjoyable. Technology creates it possible for a more innovated community and broad social transform. What becomes of this is a dramatic transform by the centuries that has evolved socially, industrially, and economically, summed up through the term modernization. Cell phones, for instance, have changed lives of millions during the world. This is especially true in Africa and other sections of the Transitional East where there is a low cost communication infrastructure. So, widely



dispersed populations are linked, it facilitates other business's communication in the middle of each other, and it gives internet access, which also provides greater value in literacy. In addition to technology being a great social and economic advancement, it also grants these more dependent societies to become more modernized despite internal conflicts or repressive governments, allowing them to reap the benefits of such technical advancements.

During the world new technology has also helped people recover after the impact of natural disasters. In Sri Lanka after the 2004 tsunami several people lost their livelihoods. A new technology in the coir industry has helped them get back on their feet. This new technology has brought the indigenous industry into the contemporary age. Coir products are made from fibrous husks of the coconut. By a decorticator, workers can extract coir fibre in a single day. In the past they had to soak the coconut husks in salt water for 6–8 months until they are soft sufficient to be separated through hand. This project is being funded through USAID.

## **Contributors**

In the middle of the scientists who contributed much to this theory are Walt Rostow, who in his *The Levels of Economic Development: A Non-Communist Manifesto* concentrates on the economic organization face of the modernization, trying to illustrate factors needed for a country to reach the path to modernization in his Rostovian take-off model. David Apter concentrated on the political organization and history of democracy, researching the relationship flanked by democracy, good governance and efficiency and modernization.

Seymour Martin Lipset in “Some Social Requisites of Democracy” argued that economic growth sets off a series of profound social changes that jointly tend to produce democracy. David McClelland approached this subject from the psychological perspective, with his motivations theory, arguing that modernization cannot happen until a given community values innovation, striving for improvement and entrepreneurship. Alex Inkeles likewise makes a model of contemporary personality, which requires being self-governing, active, interested in public policies and cultural matters, open for new experiences, rational and being able to make extensive-term plans for the future. Edward Said’s “Orientalism” interprets modernization from the point of view of societies that are quickly and radically transformed.

### **Modernization and Traditional Community**

Modernization theorists often saw traditions as obstacles to economic development. Furthermore, while modernization might deliver violent, radical transform for traditional societies it was idea worth the price. Critics insist that traditional societies were often destroyed without ever gaining promised advantages if, in the middle of other things, the economic gap flanked by advanced societies and such societies actually increased. The net effect of modernization for some societies was so the replacement of traditional poverty through a more contemporary form of misery, just as to these critics. Others point to improvements in livelihood standards, physical infrastructure, education and economic opportunity to refute such criticisms.

## **Chapter 4**

# **Constitution and Government's Governing Structures**

## **Constitution of India**

The Constitution of India is the supreme law of the land, which is fundamental in the governance of India. The Constitution of India was enacted on 26th November, 1949 and was adopted on 26th January, 1950. The Draftsmen of the Indian Constitution took inspiration from Constitutions all over the world and incorporated their attributes into the Indian Constitution. For example Part III on Fundamental Rights is partly derived from the American Constitution and Part IV on Directive Principles of State Policy from the Irish Constitution.

## **The Importance of the Constitution**

The Constitution lays down the basic structure of government under which the people are to be governed. It establishes the main organs of government-the executive, the legislature and the judiciary. The Constitution not only defines the powers of each organ, but also demarcates their responsibilities. It regulates the relationship between the different organs and between the government and the people. The Constitution is superior to all other laws of the country. Every law enacted by the government has to be in conformity with the Constitution. The Constitution lays down the national goals of India- Democracy, Socialism, Secularism and National Integration. It

also spells out the rights and duties of citizens. The Constitution applies to the State of Jammu and Kashmir with certain exceptions and modifications as provided in article 370 and the Constitution (Application to Jammu and Kashmir) Order, 1954

## **Preamble**

*We, the people of India having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a sovereign socialist secular democratic republic and to secure to all its citizens:*

- Justice, social, economic and political;
- Liberty of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;
- Equality of status and of opportunity;
- And to promote among them all
- Fraternity assuring the dignity of the individual and the unity and integrity of the Nation;
- In our constituent assembly this twenty-sixth day of November, 1949, do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this constitution

The original drafting used the words “sovereign democratic republic”. The two additional words “socialist” and “secular” were introduced by the controversial 42nd amendment.

## **The Importance of the Preamble**

The preamble is not a part of the Constitution of India as it is not enforceable in a court of law. However, the Supreme Court has, in the case of 'Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala', recognized that the Preamble is a part of the Constitution and may be used to interpret ambiguous areas of the Constitution where differing interpretations present themselves.

However, the Preamble is useful as an interpretive tool only if there is an ambiguity in the article itself and should not be treated as a rights bestowing part of the Constitution. The first words of the Preamble—"We, the people"—signify that power is ultimately vested in the hands of the people of India. The Preamble lays down the most important national goals which every citizen and the government must try to achieve, such as socialism, secularism and national integration

## **Sovereign**

- The word sovereign means supreme or independent. India is internally and externally sovereign-externally free from the control of any foreign power and internally, it has a free government which is directly elected by the people and makes laws that govern the people.

## **cSocialist**

The word socialist was added to the Preamble by the 42nd amendment act of 1976. It implies social and economic equality. Social equality in this context means the absence of discrimination on the grounds of caste, colour, creed, sex,

religion, language, etc. Under social equality, everyone has equal status and opportunities. Economic equality in this context means that the government will endeavour to make the distribution of wealth more equal and provide a decent standard of living for all. This is in effect emphasizing a commitment towards the formation of a Welfare state. India has adopted a mixed economy and the government has framed many laws to achieve the aim of social equality, such as the Abolition of Untouchability and Zamindari, the Equal Wages Act, Bonded Labour Abolition Act and the Child Labour Prohibition Act.

## **Secular**

The word secular was inserted into the Preamble by the 42nd amendment act of 1976. It implies equality of all religions and religious tolerance. India therefore does not have an official state religion. Every person has the right to preach, practice and propagate any religion they choose. The government must not favour or discriminate against any religion. It must treat all religions with equal respect. All citizens, irrespective of their religious beliefs are equal in the eyes of law. No religious instruction is imparted in government or government-aided schools. The Supreme Court in *S.R Bommai v. Union of India* held that secularism was an integral part of the basic structure of the constitution.

## **Democratic**

- *India is a democracy:* The people of India elect their governments at all levels (Union, State and local) by a system of universal adult franchise. Every citizen of India, who is 18

years of age and above and not otherwise debarred by law, is entitled to vote. Every citizen enjoys this right without any discrimination on the basis of caste, creed, colour, sex, religion or education.

## **Republic**

As opposed to a monarchy, in which the head of state is appointed on hereditary basis for a lifetime or until he abdicates from the throne, a democratic republic is an entity in which the head of state is elected, directly or indirectly, for a fixed tenure. The President of India is elected by an electoral college for a term of five years.

## **Schedules**

Schedules can be added to the constitution by amendment. The twelve schedules in force cover the designations of the States and Union Territories; emoluments for high-level officials; forms of oaths; allocation of the number of seats in the Rajya Sabha (Council of States-the upper house of Parliament) per State or Union Territory; provisions for the administration and control of Scheduled Areas and Scheduled Tribes (areas and tribes needing special protection due to disadvantageous conditions); provisions for the administration of tribal areas in Assam; the Union (central government), State, and Concurrent (dual) lists of responsibilities; the official languages; land and tenure reforms; the association of Sikkim with India; anti-defection provisions for Members of Parliament and Members of the State Legislatures; rural development; and urban planning.

## **The Legislature**

The legislature's main function is making laws of the state. A law gets the authority of the state when it is adopted by the state. Other organisations in society also have their laws, rules and procedures, but they are followed only by its members; laws of the state are binding on the society.

Legislature provides the legitimacy and support to the state. The legislature has an important role in the amendment of the constitution. A flexible constitution can be amended by the legislature following the ordinary process of legislature, as is the case in U.K. The rigid constitutions that are found in federation like U.S.A., the amendment procedure that are followed are difficult.

The Constitution of India follows a middle course where some of its provisions can be amended by simple majority in the legislature (*e.g.*, creation of new states in the federation and abolition of Legislative Council in a state), and for amending others, two-thirds majority is required (*e.g.*, Fundamental Rights and Directive Principles of State Policy). The provisions regarding federal issues are in the third category, where a constitutional amendment is to be ratified by atleast onehalf of the state legislatures.

In all these cases, the final assent of the President of India is essential. The legislature is the representative institution that reflects the final choice of the society. The legislature gets its authority to make laws for it on the basis of the fact that it represents the society. In a federal system, where the state is constituted of smaller units (states or provinces)



representation is given to the federal units also. The legislature is a deliberative body where matters of social and political concerns are debated and discussed. Since the legislature represents the country, the deliberations are expression of national concern and consensus. The state has to keep in view these concerns while formulating its policies. The actions of the executive are under constant scrutiny of the legislature. This control is direct in the case of the parliamentary system of government, because the members of the executive are members of the legislature. The executive, hence, emanates from the legislature. Parliamentary discussions and questions asked in the legislature are effective checks on the actions of the executive.

The executive has to explain and justify its actions in the legislature. The legislature acts as an effective check on the activities of the state and makes suggestions about the policies to be followed. The legislature is the custodian of national finances. The budget of the country is passed by the legislature that makes available to the state the finances for different activities. Finances are available to the governments for its activities only after the legislature's authorisation. The government also has to report back to the legislature about the state expenditure. This is a very effective control on the state activity by the legislature.

The expansion of the state activities has resulted in the increase of the powers of the executive. On many occasions the executive has to act through delegated legislation. With the increase in the state activities, the legislature is under constant pressure. Many writers have complained about the decline of legislature in modern times. While the legislature

performs many functions, its representative role is the most important function in modern democracies. Through periodical elections to the legislature, the country expresses itself and keeps a check on the activities of the government.

## **Unicameral and Bicameral Legislature**

Unicameral and Bicameral legislatures are two systems of the organisation of the legislature. When there is a single house of the legislature, it is called a unicameral system. In most of the cases, there are two houses of the legislature popularly known as bicameral system. They are called the Upper House and the Lower House. The Lok Sabha in India, the British House of Commons and the House of Representative in U.S.A. are the lower houses.

The Upper Houses in the respective countries are Rajya Sabha, the House of Lords and the Senate. The two houses are constituted on the basis of different principles of representation. While the lower house is based on the principle of direct election, for the upper house different principles are followed.

Thus, the members of the Lok Sabha are elected directly every five years, the Rajya Sabha members are elected indirectly by the legislators in the states. Some members are also nominated on the basis of special qualifications. As a directly elected house, the lower house is more important in a democracy.

It has more powers in matters, such as financial matters of the state. But the upper house also performs important functions.

Discussions and deliberations on matters of importance in the second chambers provide occasions for a second look on these matters, where the directly elected lower houses may be swayed by the changing public opinion or matters of momentary concerns. In matters requiring cooler and fuller consideration, the second chambers provide more time for their consideration and discussion. The second chambers are supposed to be a house of more experienced and mature persons. The second house also provides representation to the special interests of some sections of the society.

In federal states there is an added significance to the two houses of legislature. While the lower house represents the country as a whole, the upper house represents the states (units).

In the first case the members are elected directly from the constituencies demarcated for this purpose. The states send their representatives to the upper house. The Rajya Sabha in India is constituted of members elected indirectly by the members of the State Assemblies. The Union Territories similarly send their representatives. The Rajya Sabha also includes 12 nominated members. The Senate in U.S.A. consists of members elected by the states. Every state elects two members to the Senate. Thus the U.S. Senate has 100 members from its 50 States.

### **The President of India**

The Office of the President is the highest position in the Indian constitutional system. The President is the Chief Executive of the Indian Republic endowed with vast powers and functions.

These powers and functions are, however, more formal than they are substantive and are exercised with the aid and advice of the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister. Thus, his position is nominal and ceremonial. Articles 58 and 59 of the Indian Constitution lay down the qualifications. A candidate for the office of the President should be a citizen of India, must have completed 35 years of age and possess other qualifications which are necessary to become a member of the Lok Sabha. He should not hold any office of profit under the Union, State or Local Governments at the time of his election, nor should be a Member of either House of the Parliament or State Legislature. Even if he happens to be a Member, he ceases to be a Member after his election as President. Besides, he should also possess such other qualifications as may be prescribed by the Parliament from time to time. Further, the nomination should be supported by 40 members belonging to the Union Parliament or elected members of the State Legislatures.

### **Method of Election**

Articles 54 and 55 of the Indian Constitution describe the method of election of President. The Constitution prescribes an indirect election through an electoral college on the basis of proportional representation and by means of single transferable vote.

*The Electoral College consists of two types of members:*

- Elected members of both the Houses of Parliament,
- Elected members of the Legislative Assemblies of the States.

The nominated members are not included in the Electoral College. The framers of Indian Constitution wanted to involve only the elected members of the Parliament and State Legislative Assemblies. This was intended to make the President Election broad based and to achieve political balance between the Centre and the States. Consequently, the President represents not only the Union, but also the States. This is in keeping with the federal character of Indian Policy. Each elector casts a different number of votes.

The general principle is that the total votes cast by Members of Parliament equals the total votes cast by Legislators. Also, legislators from larger states cast more votes than those from smaller states. Finally, the number of legislators in a state matters; if a state has a few legislators, then each legislator has relatively more votes; if a state has many legislators, then each legislator has fewer votes. The actual calculation for votes cast by a particular state is calculated by dividing the state's population by 1000, which is divided again by the number of legislators from the State voting in the electoral college. This number is the number of votes per legislator in a given state. For votes cast by those in Parliament, the total number of votes cast by all state legislators is divided by the number of members of both Houses of Parliament. This is the number of votes per member of either house of Parliament. The President is elected for a five year term. He can seek re-election for another term.

### **Procedure for the Removal of President**

Article 56 and 61 deal with the procedure for removing or impeaching the President of India. In this regard, the

constitution lays down that violation of Constitution is the ground for removal. The process of impeachment can be initiated by either Rajya Sabha or Lok Sabha. At least 14 days notice in writing must be given by not less than one-fourth of the total members of the House before such a resolution containing charges against the President is moved. After the resolution is moved and debated it must be passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the total membership of the House in which it has been moved. Later the impeachment resolution shall be sent to other House. At this stage, the other House itself or through a committee investigate into the charges leveled against the President.

After the investigation, the resolution is passed by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the total membership of the House and then the resolution takes effect. Thus, the procedure for the removal of the President is difficult and has been made so to prevent misuse of this power by the parliament. Till now no President has been impeached.

### **Privileges of the President**

*The President enjoys a number of privileges:*

- He is not answerable to any court for the exercise of his power and the performance of the duties of his office, except through impeachment proceedings.
- No criminal proceedings can be instituted against him in any court during his term of office.
- He cannot be arrested or imprisoned during his term of office.

- No civil proceedings can be instituted against him in any court in respect of any act done by him in his personal capacity, during his term of office.

## **Powers and Functions of the President**

The powers and functions of the President can be broadly categorized under the following heads:

- *Executive Powers of President:* The executive powers of the Union are vested in the President. Article 53,74,75,77 and other articles deal with his executive powers. Article 53 vests all executive powers in him and empowers him to exercise powers directly by himself or through officers subordinate to him. Article 74 stipulates that the President shall act as per aid and advice of the Union Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister in respect of matters concerning the Union Government. Article 75 requires the Prime Minister to communicate to the President all decision of the Union 'Council of Ministers. Article 77 holds that all executive powers of the Union Government shall be exercised in the name of the President. The executive powers of the president include both Administrative and Military Powers. The President has the power of appointment and removal of high dignitaries of the State. The President appoints the Prime Minister and his council of Ministers, Chief Justice and Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts, Chairman and Members of Union Public Service Commission, Attorney General, State Governors and other high dignitaries of the State. President of India is also the Supreme Commander of all the Defence Forces in India.

He appoints the Chiefs of the Army Staff, the Navy and the Air Force. He has the powers to declare war and conclude peace. But all these powers have to be exercised by him subject to ratification of the Parliament. The President exercises all the executive powers only on the advice of the Union Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister.

- *Legislative powers of the President:* Even though he is not a Member of either House of the Parliament, Article 79 states that the President is an integral part of the Union Parliament. He has the power to summon both the Houses of Parliament and also to prorogue them. He can dissolve Lok Sabha before the expiry of its term and order elections to it on the advice of the Prime Minister. He summons the Parliament at least twice in a year. Besides this, the President has the right to address either House or their joint sessions at any time. The President can also send messages to either House of Parliament on any matter which must be considered by the Parliament. The President has power to summon a joint-session of both Houses of Parliament in the case of a deadlock between the two Houses. In May 1978, the President summoned a joint session of both Houses to pass the Banking Service Bill. No bill passed by the Parliament can become an Act unless it is assented to by the President. When a bill is passed by both the Houses of Parliament, the President can
  - Give his assessment
  - Withhold his assent or



- Return the bill for the reconsideration of the parliament. In case, a bill is returned to the House for reconsideration and if the same is passed by both the Houses with or without modification and sent to the President for a second time, the President is bound to give his assent.
- However, a money bill cannot be either withheld or returned for reconsideration of the Houses. The President's power to withhold his assent is known as the power of veto and is applicable to non-money bills only. When the Parliament is not in session, the President promulgates ordinances in public interest. The ordinances have the same force and effect as the laws passed by the Parliament. They have to be placed before the Parliament within a period of six weeks from the day of re-assembling of Parliament. If there is a failure to bring the ordinance before Parliament for this approval or if it is disapproved, then the ordinance will be invalid. An ordinance, however, can be in force as long as Parliament does not meet. Article 240 empowers the President to make regulations for the peace, progress and good Government of the Union Territories. Article 254 empowers him to remove the inconsistencies between the Laws passed by the Parliament and State Legislature and the subjects included in the Concurrent List. Further, it is laid down that a money bill can be introduced in the Parliament only with the prior recommendation of the President. Such prior recommendation is also necessary for introducing bills in regard to the formation of new States, alteration of areas, boundaries, names of existing States, etc. Certain bills passed by the State Legislature such as

those dealing with compulsory acquisition of private property or those which are derogatory to the powers of the High Courts or those seeking imposition of a tax on a commodity declared "Essential" by the Parliament, or likely to be inconsistent with the Union Legislation already in force, or those so considered essential by the Governor, etc., require the assent of the President. Such bills are reserved by the Governor for the consideration of the president. When President's rule is imposed in a State, the President approves all such bills sent to him by the Parliament with regard to the matters included in the State List. The President nominates 12 members to the Rajya Sabha and two members belonging to the Anglo-Indian community to the Lok Sabha. The annual reports of the Comptroller and Auditor General, Finance Commission, Union Public Service Commission, etc., are placed before the Parliament at the instance of the President.

- *Financial Powers of the President:* Article 112 of the Indian Constitution deals with the financial powers of the President. The President accords approval for introducing financial bills in the Parliament. No money bill can be introduced in the Parliament without his consent. The President should in respect of every financial year cause to be laid before the Parliament the annual financial statement of the Government of India for that year. The Contingency Fund of India is also placed under his disposal. Further, he appoints the Chairman and Members of the Finance Commission to advise him on financial matters. It may be noted that the President shall not refuse to give his assent on the money bills due to the

fact that he himself has recommended such bills for consideration and approval of the Parliament.

- *Judicial Powers of the President:* The President enjoys vast powers in judicial matter. He appoints the Chief Justice and Judges of the Supreme Court and Chief Justice and Judges of State High Courts. The President has the power to grant pardon, reprieve, suspension, remission or commutation of punishment or sentences of court martial. The powers of pardon of the President pertain to such offences which are related to violation of Acts on subject under the Union List. These powers of granting pardon are given to the President for revoking extreme rigidity in criminal laws and for protecting the persons on humanitarian considerations. Lastly the President has the right to seek the advice of the Supreme Court on some constitutional, legal and diplomatic matters. Article 143 the President may refer any question of public importance involving a question of law as well as of fact to the Supreme Court for seeking its opinion. In 1972, President Sanjeeva Reddy sought the advice of the Supreme Court for creating special courts to try the emergency excesses. He may or may not accept that opinion.
- *Emergency Powers of the President:* Part VXIII of the Indian Constitution deals with the Emergency powers of the President. The intention behind the Emergency provisions is to safeguard the sovereignty, independence and integrity of the Indian Union.

*For this purpose, the President is constitutionally empowered to declare three types of emergencies namely:*

- National Emergency arising out of war, external aggression or armed rebellion;
  - Emergency arising due to the breakdown of the constitutional machinery which would ultimately result in President's rule in the State;
  - Financial Emergency.
- If the President is satisfied that the security of India is threatened by foreign attack or by armed rebellion he can make a proclamation of emergency in respect of the whole of India or any part of the Country. It is noteworthy that the President can make such a proclamation even when he feels that there is imminent danger to the security of India. Such an emergency was declared in India in 1962 (Indo-China war), 1965 (Indo-Pakistan war), 1971 and 1975 (declared by Indira Gandhi to let her government remain in power). The President can declare such an emergency only on the basis of a written request by the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister. Such a proclamation must be approved by the Parliament within one month. Such an emergency can be imposed for six months. It can be extended by six months by repeated parliamentary approval. During the proclamation of emergency, the President can modify the distribution of powers between the Union and the States and suspend the enforcement of the Fundamental Rights. If the President, on receipt of report from the Governor or otherwise, is satisfied that the Government of a State

cannot be carried on in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution, he can make a proclamation of emergency. Such an emergency must be approved by the Parliament within a period of six months. It is imposed for six months and can last for a maximum period of three years with repeated parliamentary approval every six months. If the emergency needs to be extended for more than three years, it can be done by a constitutional amendment, as has happened in Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. During such emergency the President can assume to himself all or any of the functions of the State Government. The administration of the State is carried out by the Governor on behalf of the President. Finally, the President can declare a financial emergency under Act 350, if he is satisfied that a situation has arisen whereby the financial stability or credit of India or of any part of the territory thereof is threatened. Such an emergency must be approved by the Parliament within two months. It has never been declared. Such a situation had arisen but was avoided by selling off of the gold assets of India. It remains enforced till the President revokes it. During such an emergency he can direct the Union as well as the State Government to observe canons of financial propriety as he may deem desirable. He can also ask them to rescue the salaries and allowances of all or any of State servants. He can direct the States to reserve their money bills for his consideration. He can even order the reduction of judges of the Supreme Court and High Courts.

## **Position of the President and Important Presidential Interventions**

The President of India is the constitutional head performing a nominal and ceremonial role. However, it does not mean that President did not have difference of opinion with the Prime Minister on the politics of the Government on certain occasions. But such difference did not assume serious proportions culminating in any constitutional crisis. Whenever such differences arose they were attempted to be resolved informally or through party functionaries. The first President of India, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, though a close associate of Nehru, did not agree with the Prime Minister on certain issues. Although Dr. Prasad was not in full agreement with the Hindu Code Bill, he concurred with the Policy of Government. Similarly, in 1959, he first declined to give his assent to the proclamation of State Emergency in Kerala.

Later he signed the emergency declaration in Kerala at the insistence of Nehru. On November 28, 1960, Dr. Rajendra Prasad, in his address to the Indian Law Institute, New Delhi, remarked "there is no provision in the Constitution which in so many words lays down that the President shall be bound to act in accordance with the advice of his Council of Ministers. By way of reply Prime Minister Nehru stated in December 1960 at a Press Conference that the President has always acted as constitutional head. We have modeled our Constitution on the Parliamentary system and not on the Presidential System, although we have copied or rather adopted many provisions of the US Constitution, because our Constitution is a federal one.

Essentially, our Constitution is based on the U.K. Parliamentary model. That is the basic thing. In fact, it is stated that whenever it does not expressly say anything we should follow the practice of the House of Commons in UK. K.M. Munshi argues for an independent Presidency and says that there is no provision in the Constitution of India which expressly lays down that the President is bound by the advice of Council of Ministers.

Further the President is elected by the Parliament as well as State Legislatures. As such he is also expected to protect the interests of the States. He also takes oath to defend, protect and preserve the Constitution from violation and encroachments from any quarters including the Government. These arguments generated a debate on the eve of the Fourth General Election.

Thus the doctrine of independent President attracted favourable response from the opposition parties in the later sixties. In order to prevent the idea gaining momentum in 1976, the 42nd Constitution Amendment Act was passed which stipulated that the President shall be bound by the advice of the Council of Ministers. The amendment ended all misgivings about independent presidency. However, the 44th Constitution Amendment of the Janata Government restored the earlier position.

Further, it also stated that the President is empowered to ask the Council of Ministers to reconsider its advice on any matter. In mid 1980 decade, President Zail Singh had withheld assent to a legislation passed by Parliament that gave sweeping powers to the State to intercept mail. This was considered by

the President to be an encroachment on citizens' freedom of speech and liberty as guaranteed by the Constitution. In the early 1990, President Venkatraman withheld assent to a legislation passed by outgoing parliament that gave pension benefits to themselves.

This was interpreted by the President to be in the nature of self-aggrandisement. In 1979, the then Prime Minister Charan Singh did not enjoy Parliamentary majority. He also did not convene parliament. Since then, Presidents have been more diligent in directing incoming Prime Ministers to convene Parliament and prove their majority within a reasonable deadline dates (2-3 weeks). In the interim period, the Prime Ministers are generally restrained from taking policy decisions.

Since the nineties, Parliamentary elections have generally not resulted in a single party or group of parties having a distinct majority. In such cases, Presidents have used their discretion and directed Prime Ministerial aspirants to establish their credentials before being invited to form the government. Typically, the aspirants have produced letters from various party leaders pledging support to their candidature. This is in addition to proving majority within weeks of being sworn in.

In late nineties, President Narayanan introduced the important practice of explaining to the nation (by means of Rashtrapati Bhavan communiqués) the thinking that led to the various decisions he took while exercising his discretionary powers; this has led to openness and transparency in the functioning of the President.



## **President's Rule in Goa**

Due to serious political instability, President's rule was imposed in the State of Goa on March 4, 2005, keeping the State Legislative Assembly under suspended animation. Bye elections to fill 5 vacancies in the Goa Legislative Assembly were held on June 2, 2005. The President's rule was revoked on June 7, 2005 and the Government, headed by Shri Pratapsingh Raoji Rane of the Indian National Congress, was installed.

## **President's Rule in Bihar**

After elections to constitute a new Legislative Assembly of Bihar held in the month of February, 2005, no party or combination of parties was able to secure a majority in the Legislative Assembly so as to form a Government, resulting in the imposition of the President's rule in the State and keeping the Legislative Assembly under suspended animation. In his communication dated May 21, 2005, the Governor of Bihar recommended dissolution of the Legislative Assembly. On May 23, 2005, the President was pleased to issue Presidential Order, dissolving the Legislative Assembly of Bihar.

The Rajya Sabha and Lok Sabha approved the extension of President's Rule beyond September 6, 2005 for a period of another six months on August 1, 2005 and August 2, 2005, respectively. In the elections to constitute the new Legislative Assembly held in the month of October–November, 2005, the National Democratic Alliance comprising Janata Dal (United) and Bhartiya Janata Party got an absolute majority. On November 24, 2005, President's rule was revoked. The

Governor administered the oath of office of the Chief Minister to Shri Nitish Kumar, along with 25 other Ministers. The Constitution of India provides for a Parliamentary form of Government in India. In such a form of Government, there is a President with nominal powers and acting as the constitutional ruler, while the Prime Minister is vested with real powers and acts as a real head of Union Government. The President exercises his powers on the advice of the Council of Ministers headed by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister is appointed by the President. However, the President has to appoint only such person as Prime Minister who commands a majority in the Lok Sabha. If there is no single party available with a majority in the Lok Sabha or there is no recognized leader of the majority party, the President can use some discretion in the appointment of Prime Minister. Even in this case the President has to ensure that only such a person is appointed as Prime Minister who shall be able to muster majority support in the Parliament.

### **Tenure of the Prime Minister**

The Prime Minister holds office for a term of five years. Usually the term of Prime Minister is co-terminus with that of the Lok Sabha. Theoretically the Prime Minister holds office during the pleasure of the President, but actually he remains in office as long as he enjoys the confidence of the Lok Sabha. If he loses the confidence of the Lok Sabha, the Prime Minister must either tender his resignation or the President can dismiss him. The Prime Minister of India plays a very pivotal role in Indian polity and administration. Broadly speaking, as the chief executive, he performs two types of functions: Political and

Administrative. These are explained below: The political role of the Prime Minister can be studied under the following heads:

- *In relation to the Council of Ministers:* The Prime Minister occupies a key position in the Council of Ministers. All members of the Council of Ministers are appointed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister. However, the Prime Minister has to keep several practical considerations in mind while forming the Council. After the Council of Ministers is constituted, it is the prerogative of the Prime Minister to allocate various portfolios among the Ministers. He can also reshuffle these portfolios subsequently in the interest of administrative efficiency. In case of any difference of opinion between the Prime Minister and the other ministers, the Prime Minister can either advise the Minister to tender his resignation or recommend his dismissal to the President. As the Chairman of the Council of Ministers, the Prime Minister determines its agenda and its proceedings and he influences the decisions of the Council of Ministers in a decisive manner. All the Prime Minister coordinates the working of the various Ministers and ensures that their policies and programmes do not conflict. In case of any conflict, the job of conflict resolution lies with the Prime Minister.
- *In relation to the President:* The Prime Minister is the chief channel of communication between the Council of Ministers and the President. He communicates all the decisions of the Council of Ministers to the President and submits these matters for the reconsideration of the Council of Ministers whenever the President wants the Council to reconsider them. The Prime Minister has also to

furnish such information relating to the administration of affairs of the Union and proposals for legislation as the President may call for. The President acts on the advice of the Prime Minister with regard to appointment of important officials like the Chief Justice of India, the judges of the Supreme Court, the Judges and Chief Justice of the High Courts. Comptroller and Auditor General, Chairman and members of Union Public Service Commission, Finance Commissioner, Election Commissioner, etc.

- *In relation to the Indian Parliament:* The Prime Minister is intimately connected with the Parliament. In fact he is appointed as Prime Minister only because he is the leader of the majority party in Lok Sabha. After his appointment, the Prime Minister and his Council of Ministers is collectively responsible to the Parliament and stays in the office as long as it enjoys the confidence of a majority of members of the Lok Sabha. The Prime Minister has to justify the policy and programmes of his Government on the floor of the Parliament. In fact all important policy announcements are made by the Prime Minister on the floor of the Parliament. The Prime Minister also exercise control over the time table of the House. Its sessions are convened and prorogued by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister. The President dissolves the Lok Sabha also on the advice of the Prime Minister.
- *In relation to the political party, that he represents:* The relationship between Prime Minister and Party is also very strong. As a leading member of the party, he greatly influences its working. The Prime Minister is aware that

the continued existence of his Government depends on Party support and solidarity. Therefore, he tries to maintain the best of relations and control over other leaders in his Party. Quite often the Prime Minister acts as the President of the Operational Wing of the Party.

### **The Cabinet Secretariat**

One of the most important institutions in a Cabinet form of Government is the Cabinet Secretariat. As the name implies this organization provides the secretariat assistance to the Cabinet. But, it has acquired many other functions, most important of which is the coordination of the various departments of the Government. The origin of the Cabinet Secretariat can be traced back from the time of the British period.

When the work of the Government of India expanded, the Governor-General distributed the work of different departments among the various members of the Executive Council and retained only some important functions with himself. He was assisted by a Private Secretary in these functions.

In the beginning, the Private Secretary did not accompany the Governor-General to the Executive Council, but during the regime of Lord Wellington, the Private Secretary, for the first time, was asked to accompany the Governor-General to the meetings of the Executive Council. Later on, in 1935, the Private Secretary was designated as the Secretary to the Executive Council. He performed twofold functions, Private Secretary to the Governor-General as well as Secretary to the Executive Council.

A little later the two functions were separated and were assigned to two different persons holding two different posts. Thus, the post of the Secretary of the Executive Council came into being. This post, later on, when India became independent, began to be called the Cabinet Secretary. The office attached Cabinet Secretary began to be called Cabinet Secretariat.

The efficiency of the Cabinet depends, to a large extent, on the Cabinet Secretariat whose functions are to prepare the agenda of the Cabinet meeting, to provide information and material necessary for its deliberations and to draft records of the discussions and decisions, both of the Cabinet and its committees. It keeps the President, the Vice-President and all the Ministries informed of the major activities of the Government.

It has three wings, *viz.* the civil wing, the military wing and the intelligence wing. The civil wing provides secretarial machinery for the Cabinet and the various Committees of the Cabinet.

The military wing is responsible for all secretarial work connected with meetings of the Defence Committee, National Defence Council, Military Affairs Committee and a number of other Committees concerned with defence matters. The intelligence wing concerns itself with matters relating to the Joint Intelligence Committee of the Cabinet.

The head of the Cabinet Secretariat is the Cabinet Secretary. The Cabinet Secretary is usually the senior most civil servant of the country and the official precedence gives him the first place among the civil servants.

## **Functions of the Cabinet Secretariat**

*The Cabinet Secretariat has three wings namely:*

- Civil wing;
- Military wing, and
- Intelligence wing.

The main civil wing provides secretariat for the cabinet. It also provides secretariat services for the various standing committees and adhoc committees of Secretaries which function under the Chairmanship of the Cabinet Secretary. It also deals with framing of rules of business of the Union Government.

The Military Wing is responsible for the secretarial work concerned with the meetings of the Defence Committee, National Defence Council, Military Affairs Committee and a number of other committees concerned with Defence matters. The Intelligence wing concerns itself with matters relating to the Joint Intelligence Committee of the cabinet.

*The functions of the Department of Cabinet Affairs can be studied under the following heads:*

- *The role as the Secretariat of the Cabinet:* The foremost function of the Cabinet Secretariat is to perform the necessary secretariat work relating to the meetings of the Cabinet and the committees. This includes the circulation of agenda notes for the consideration of the Cabinet. After the meetings of the Cabinet and Cabinet

Committees, the Secretariat prepares the proceedings and circulates them to the members. Whenever necessary the secretariat also procures the implementation report and presents them to the Cabinet or the Cabinet Committee as the case may be. In addition, it has to circulate a number of other papers to the President, Vice President, Members of the Cabinet/Cabinet Committees, Council of Ministers for information. A list of such papers is given in the IVth Schedule to the transaction of Business Rules, 1961. Some of the important papers so circulated are economic review, fortnightly political reports from the State Governments, and the Union Territories, monthly summaries from Ministries/Departments giving an account of their activities and decisions, monthly notes from missions abroad; quarterly reports on the Five Year Plans, reports on agricultural production, reports on public sector undertakings, reports on administrative reforms, reports of the UPSC, reports on the working of the industrial/commercial Undertakings of the Central Government; brief notes on important matters from ministries, trade agreements, arrangements in pursuance of the general directions and decisions of the Cabinet and any other papers which the Prime Minister may wish to circulate to the members.

- *The role as originating Department:* The Department has rather a limited original function which can be divided into the following parts:
  - *Important Appointments:* The Appointments of the Minister is done by the President on the advice of



the Prime Minister. Once the appointment is approved by the President, the Department is to look after the matters like swearing in ceremony, assumption of office, etc. Similarly, the work relating to resignation, relinquishment of charge, change in portfolio, and so on are also looked after by this department. The necessary gazette notifications are also issued by them.

- *Rules and Allocation of Business:* Article 77(3) of the Constitution authorizes the President to make rules for the more convenient transactions of business of the Government and for its proper allocations among ministers. Work relating to the drafting of such Rules is handled in the Cabinet Office. The allocation of work among the ministers is also handled in this office. The re-organization of the Departments and the Ministries requires some amount of thinking. This input is provided by the Cabinet Secretariat. Since the activities of the Government are expanding, it often becomes necessary to create new departments resulting in need for re-organization of the Ministries. Therefore, such allocation or reallocation of business is also a continuous process.
  
- *General Coordination and follow-up:* General coordination and follow up of the Cabinet decisions is also the responsibility of this department. In this matter the department does not supersede or cross over other ministries or departments nor does it take over any of their

functions or responsibilities, it is the duty of the department to:

- i. Assist in resolving difficulties, delays, which may arise in any field of activities between the Ministries and Departments;
  - ii. Watch progress on important administrative measures of the Government of India which affect more than one ministry;
  - iii. Assist in coordinating the major administrative activities and policy of the Government of India;
  - iv. Watch the implementation of the decisions in the Cabinet as a whole.
- For the performance of these duties the Department has to issue circular and instructions for the guidance of the ministry. It also conveys the directions of the Cabinet or the Prime Minister on administrative and allied matters.
  - *Role as a Coordinating Department:* In every administrative system a number of specialized departments have to be set up to undertake different kinds of activities. To enable the Government to function as a whole it is necessary to coordinate their activities so that coherent policies and actions emerge out of the system. Various mechanisms have been evolved to achieve such coordination. The department of Cabinet Affairs is one of the agencies charged with the duties of securing effective coordination. As early as in October,

1945, a Coordination Committee of the Executive Council of the Viceroy was established. The Committee was intended for dealing with the coordination work on behalf of the council in respect of civil and military affairs. In his capacity as Secretary to the Coordination Committees of the Council, the Council Secretary performed the following duties without any particular executive authority.

- To assist in coordinating the major administrative activities of the Government;
  - To assist in resolving the difficulties or delay on account of inter-ministerial conflict;
  - To watch the progress of the administrative measures affecting more than one ministry;
  - To submit to the Coordination Committee of the Council such matters as required for its decisions or instructions.
- The Secretary to the Coordination Committee has no executive authority and had to perform his function on behalf of the Council. He served all the ministers and was at the disposal of the ministries for consultations in any matter for which his assistance was required. His duty was to assist the smooth and speedy progress of business with the cooperation and confidence of all ministries. The work of Coordination previously done by the Coordination Committee of the Council is now undertaken by the whole Cabinet and a number of its committees. At the higher level the essential function of

the coordination is performed by the Cabinet. However, the Cabinet cannot undertake this task on a continuous basis. Therefore, the device of the Cabinet Committees has been put into operation to achieve the necessary coordination at a level lower than that of the full cabinet. Such Committees are set up by the Cabinet or Prime Minister under Rule 6 of the Government of India (Transaction of Business) Rules, 1961.

- *There are a number of Cabinet Committees such as:*
  - Appointments Committee
  - Economic Coordination Committee
  - Committee on Parliamentary and Legal Affairs
  - Political Affairs Committee
  - Food and Agriculture Committee, etc.
- At the official level a number of standing committees of the Secretaries with the Cabinet Secretary as Chairman have been set up.
- *Specific functions have been assigned to these committees. Some of the important committees are:*
  - Committee on Economic Secretaries;
  - Secretaries Committee on Foreign Affairs;
  - Scientific Advisory Committee to the Cabinet.

- These Committees assist the Cabinet and Cabinet committees on matters which fall within the scope of their functions. Since the Cabinet Committees are not expert bodies, the Secretaries' Committees have been formed to provide the necessary expertise and to consider the matters in details before they are considered by the Cabinet Committees or the Cabinet. Whenever there is a difference of opinion among different ministries/departments, the Cabinet Secretary as senior colleague tries to get the matter sorted out in coordination meetings of the Committees of Secretaries. For this purpose, apart from the meetings of the regular committees, the Cabinet Secretary may also discuss the matter informally with a number of Secretaries and try to achieve consensus. Rule 4 of the Transactions of Business Rules lays down that when matter concerns more than one ministry a decision can be taken only when all the ministries concur with it. Their differences of opinion are also supposed to be resolved by such formal or informal consultations between the Secretaries and the Ministers. The formal consultations take place in the Secretaries' Committees and the Cabinet Committees. Informal discussions are organized by either the Secretaries themselves or by the Cabinet Secretary. This is a very important role. Achieving coordination in different departments having varied experiences and different points of view is a difficult and painstaking process. If this function is not well performed the output of the Government will not be commensurate with the efforts put in by the different ministries/departments.

- *Role in implementing the Decisions of the Cabinet:* The Cabinet Secretariat conveys to the concerned departments and the ministries the decisions of the cabinet and Cabinet Committees. Naturally, in the subsequent meetings of the Cabinet or the Cabinet Committees the question of implementation of these decisions often arises. The Cabinet Secretariat has, therefore, to keep a watch on the progress of implementation of the decisions of the Cabinet and its Committees. For the purpose the Cabinet Secretariat has issued instructions that a monthly statement showing the progress of the cases relating to each ministry be sent to the Cabinet Secretariat. These statements are scrutinized with reference to the decisions of the Cabinet communicated to the Ministries by the Cabinet Secretariat. In case of any delays in the implementation, the Cabinet Secretariat brings the facts to the notice of the ministries at the highest level and get the action expedited.

## **Rules of Procedure**

The work relating to the cabinet and its committees is governed by the rules of procedures in regard to the proceedings of the Cabinet which were approved in 1947.

*There are three methods of disposal of cases by the Cabinet:*

- Discussion in Cabinet
- Circulation for expression of opinion
- By discussion in a committee of the Cabinet.

For the cabinet meetings, the notice of the meetings is sent to all the cabinet ministers along with agenda notes. The Ministers of State in independent charge of any particular department are sent a special invitation to attend the meeting, whenever a question relating to their department is considered by the Cabinet. They are also invited when an opinion expressed by them on any other Ministry's case is being considered by the Cabinet. All arrangements for the meetings are made by the Cabinet Secretary and other officials of the Cabinet Secretariat.

Secretaries and senior officers of the other ministries remain in attendance at the meeting when an opinion expressed by them on any other Ministry is being considered. However, they are called inside only when desired by their Minister or the Prime Minister. The minutes of the meetings are drawn up by the officials of the Cabinet Secretariat present in the Cabinet meeting. They are submitted to the Prime Minister for approval within 24 hours.

After the approval of the Prime Minister the Minutes are circulated to the Cabinet Ministers. Ministers of State in dependent charge of the Ministry and the Secretaries concerned. In case any minister suggests any changes in the proceedings, it is submitted to the Prime Minister for the orders. If the Prime Minister accepts the amendments, the revised minutes are circulated. At the end of each Cabinet meeting the Cabinet Secretary briefs the Press on those important decisions taken that can be disclosed to the Press. Similar briefing is given whenever necessary in case of meetings of the Cabinet Committees

## **Cabinet Secretary**

The Head of the Cabinet Secretariat in India is the Cabinet Secretary. This office was created in 1950 and its first occupant was Mr. N.R. Pillai. Usually one of the senior-most civil servants is appointed as Cabinet Secretary. This has resulted in very short tenures for the Cabinet Secretaries in India. For example, there had been 9 Cabinet Secretaries in the first 25 years of the creation of the office. It means that the average tenure of the Cabinet Secretary is less than three years inspite of the extensions given to some of the Cabinet Secretaries. However, in England the post of the Cabinet Secretary is a selection post and comparatively younger persons are appointed as Cabinet Secretary.

The importance of the role of the Cabinet Secretary has often been affected by the size and importance of the Prime Minister's Secretariat. In Britain the Cabinet Secretary also functions as Secretary to the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister's office there is a very small one rendering assistance only in routine functions. Almost the same situation prevailed in India during the period of Pt. Jawahar Lal Nehru.

At that time the Cabinet Secretary was playing a very important role in the overall coordination of the Government work as well as in tendering mature advice to the Prime Minister and the Cabinet. However, during the time of Lal Bhadur Shastri and later Indira Gandhi, the Prime Ministers' Office (PMO) was considerably strengthened. The obvious result has been that the importance of the Cabinet Secretariat has reduced and the PMO has emerged as the rival centre of power at official level which enjoys more proximity to the Prime



Minister. To compare the position of the Cabinet Secretariat with the Prime Ministers Office (PMO), we must look at how the PMO has evolved.

Only then we would be able to decide whether there has been any encroachment by the PMO over the role and functions of the Cabinet Secretariat. The PMO was brought into existence not as a policy making institution, nor for monitoring the performance of the Government, nor was it supposed to supervise the ministries. It was only to assist the Prime Minister in the discharge of his political and parliamentary role.

It was to keep a record of his political engagements and assist in public relations work. It was to prepare answers to the questions which the Prime Minister was expected to reply in Parliament. It was also to place before the Prime Minister any proposal of any Ministry. It was thus an assisting agency, at most, both staff and auxiliary agency. Prime Minister Nehru assigned importance to the PMO only to the extent its initial purpose was concerned.

He gave more importance to Cabinet Secretariat in view of the prevailing cabinet system of governance. He did not concentrate power in the PMO. However, since the Prime Ministership of Shri Lal Bhadur Shastri, the role of the PMO, its status itself was changed from that of an "office" to that of a "Secretariat". This implied that from now on it had to play a policy making as well as monitoring role. Although Prime Minister Shastri did not intentionally try to give extra importance to the PMO, the kind of persons who were appointed to the PMO gave it an enhanced prestige and status.

Mr. L.K. Jha was appointed to this office as Secretary in this office and he emerged as a very important person in running the affairs of the government.

After Mr. Jha, Mr. P.N. Haskar and Mr. P.C. Alaxander also remained equally powerful. This was the period when the Cabinet Secretariat was undoubtedly overshadowed by the Prime Minister's Secretariat. During emergency, all decisions were taken by the PMO. All proposals were placed before the PMO and all files were routed through it. No references were made to the Cabinet Secretariat. The PMO thus became the real cabinet. The position of the Prime Ministers Secretariat was sought to be changed by the Janata Party in 1977. The nomenclature was again changed from Prime Ministers Secretariat to Primer Ministers office.

Thus it was in line with Janata Party's Commitment to the principle of collective leadership instead of the concentration of all power in the Prime Minister. However, with the return of Smt. Indira Gandhi as Prime Minister, the importance of the PMO once again increased. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi tried to initially give equal importance to both the Cabinet Secretariat and the PMO. However, in spite of this, the importance of the Cabinet Secretary went down because the Prime Minister was more keen to appoint and consult "experts" in the cabinet secretariat rather than the Cabinet Secretary. Moreover, towards the later period of his regime, he started giving more importance to the PMO and tried to concentrate more powers in the PMO. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao too instead of depending on the Cabinet Secretariat, concentrated more powers in the PMO. He was never very sure about the loyalty of his cabinet colleagues and thus decided to rely more on the

PMO. However, with the emergence of coalition governments, the position of the Prime Minister has certainly weakened. The Constituents of these coalitions have always objected to the concentration of more and more powers in the Prime Minister or the PMO. They have again and again advocated and emphasized collective leadership. Since the Cabinet of coalition governments comprises of leaders from different parties, more emphasis is now being given on the cabinet secretariat and the powers of the PMO are being curtailed. Thus we can observe that both the Prime Minister's Office (PMO) and the Cabinet Secretariat have seen a chequered history.

The role and status of either of them has not remained the same and has been varying across time. At times, the PMO has dominated while at times the Cabinet Secretariat has dominated. The role and status of either of them has depended on the position and status of the incumbent Prime Minister, the political climate of the country, the type of government at the centre and also on the personality of the incumbent officials in these institutions.

## **The Judiciary**

The judiciary is the third branch of government along with the legislature and the executive. It is concerned with some of the basic concerns of the state for settling dispute, application of laws to maintain law and order in society and to ensure justice to the people, among various means to achieve this. The judicial process is the foremost to settle disputes just as to the laws of the State, the society is likely to move towards the 'state of nature' as described by Hobbes. The laws are the basis for bringing order in society by means of the judiciary.

The judicial process helps the process of legitimacy of the state. A belief that the state has a 'right to rule', that the rule is beneficial to the society and serves the interests of the people go a long way to ensure their voluntary obedience. The rule and ruler is just and the people will get justice in the hands of the rulers which make them accept the state.

People resent unjust rule and unjust rulers. Justice has a moral connotation while it emphasises on 'what is right' and 'what is wrong' from the point of view of the well being of the society. In this sense, it defines the rights and obligations of the individuals. Justice in a narrower sense refers to the laws of the state which the individuals must obey. Thus, a distinction is made between 'just' and 'legal'. The judiciary is mainly concerned with the letter, though broader considerations of justice are ever present.

The law courts have to keep in view standards of 'fairness' and 'reasonableness' while applying the laws to individual cases. The state is the source of laws that regulate the working of society. The legislature makes those laws. There are other kinds of laws also, *e.g.*, customary laws, that have to be kept in view. Laws also circumscribe the working of the state. They prescribe the limits to the sovereign power in terms of the objectives of the state. Valmiki's Ramayana, 'Shanti Parva' of Mahabharata and Kautilya's Arthashastra talk of the conduct of the king just as to Dharma. Defining the powers and functions of the government and of its different organs is the main concern of a constitution in modern states. By doing so the constitution puts limits on the governmental powers.

The laws govern the functioning of the state. Protecting the individuals from the excesses and arbitrary interference and oppression of the state is also ensured by justice. It is in this sense that the constitution is called the fundamental law of the land. The judiciary is the guardian of the constitution. Judiciary performs many functions in the state.

It settles disputes between individuals, between the individuals and groups, between the individuals and the state. While doing so it selects the law that is appropriate to the individual case. The Supreme Court of India has two types of jurisdictions—original and appellate. Cases that can be heard by the Supreme Court directly are under its original jurisdiction, *e.g.*, disputes between the states and enforcement of Fundamental Rights.

The appellate jurisdiction refers to the case on which High Court has given a judgement, but the affected party wants to appeal against that judgement. The appellate jurisdiction applies to three types of cases—constitutional, civil and criminal. It becomes necessary also to interpret the laws and advise the state. The Supreme Court of India performs advisory function under Article 143 of the Constitution. Under this provision the President can refer a matter of public importance to the Supreme Court of India for the opinion. Interpretation of the constitution is an important function of the judiciary. Such interpretations are important for the constitution and political process.

The decision of the Supreme Court on India regarding powers of the Parliament to amend the constitution pointed out that this power is limited: the basic structure of the Constitution

cannot be changed by the Parliament. The judgements in the Keshavanand Bharati case (1973) and Minerva Mills case (1980) stressed this limitation. The meaning of the basic structure of the Constitution has been elaborated by the Supreme Court since then in several cases that came before it. In the functioning of judiciary the judicial process is as important as the substantive issues of law. It is often said the 'justice should not only be done but it should also be seen to be done'.

There is elaborate procedure that is followed by the judiciary—the law courts, the judges, the lawyers through the arguments. The judiciary has a place of importance in a federation. The constitution in a federal form of government is in the form of a contract document between the central government and the federal units. The constitution therefore has supremacy over the governmental units. The judiciary is the guardian of the Constitution with reference to the powers of the federal units. In this process the judiciary settles the disputes between the union and the states as well as between the states.

The constitution guarantees rights to its citizens. Bill of Rights in the American Constitution and the Fundamental Rights in the Constitution of India are such rights to the citizens of the two countries.

The judiciary ensures that these rights are available to the citizens. If an Indian citizen feels aggrieved on account of any infringement of the Fundamental Rights he/she can approach the Supreme Court of India directly. The Fundamental Rights fall within the original jurisdiction of the Supreme Court. We have noted above that the judiciary in a federal form has an

important position. The US Constitution provides for judicial review of the actions of the legislature and the executive. Since the Constitution is supreme these actions can be reviewed to see if the constitutional provisions have been followed. In case of any violation, the legislative and executive actions can be declared null and void. In India the scope of judicial review mainly covers three areas: the distribution of powers between the union and states, powers of the executive and the legislature and the Fundamental Rights guaranteed under Part III of the Constitution.

There is another difference between the US and Indian Judicial review. In the former, judicial review is on the basis of the “due process of law’ while the Indian Constitution uses the phrase “just as to the process established by law”. By this clause, the powers of the judicial review of the court are restricted. Independence of the judiciary from the other organs of the state goes a long way to preserve its status.

This is done by keeping the appointments of judges, their tenure, emoluments and the working conditions independent of the control of the other two branches of the government, *i.e.*, the legislature and the executive. In India, the President as the head of the State appoints the judges in consultation with the Chief Justice. Specific qualifications are prescribed for the appointment of the judges. The tenure of the judges is also ensured. Both the constitutional provisions and the process of government must maintain the independence of judiciary. In a unitary form of government, there is a single organisation of judiciary while in a federation the union and the states have their own judicial units. Thus, in India we find Supreme Court at the top and the High Courts in the States. The High Courts,

the Subordinate Courts function under the supervision of the High Courts. At the District level, the civil cases are heard by the District Court and the Court of Session Judge looks after the criminal cases. The Courts of First Class Magistrates and of other Magistrates function under the District Court and the Sessions Court.

In the cities of Delhi, Kolkata, Mumbai and Chennai, the Metropolitan Magistrates' Courts look after the judicial functions. The judicial function of the government is managed by the hierarchy of these judicial institutions. In the traditional concept of judiciary, the judge is depicted by an image, where the eyes of the judge are covered by dark cloth with hands holding the balance. This obviously means that the judges are supposed to have a very open mind on every issue without having any personal opinions at all. Further, this also implies that the judges would not allow themselves to be influenced by the events happening around them. Rightly or wrongly, Indian judiciary has now come to play a very vital role in influencing the various aspects of the administration and governance of the country.

At one time, it was thought that the role of judiciary is only to interpret the laws and regulations and provide judgements exclusively from the legal point of view. This perspective regarding the judiciary has undergone sea change in recent times. Unlike in the past, judiciary is now entertaining a number of subjects which do not merely involve legal issues but also the issues relating to administration, governance and personal life style of individuals.



There are many judgements given in recent times, which have no legal bearing but largely constitute the views and opinions of the individual judges. Perhaps, this is the reason as to why a number of judgements are reversed and re reversed in the higher courts. Further, in recent times, one also comes across a number of observations of the judges, particularly during the hearing stages, which are not judgements but severe indictments of one party or the other by way of opinions and views. Pronouncements have also been made by the judges during the hearing stage which are not based on the arguments made during the hearings but based on the information available to the judges from press and media or other sources.

Many wonder as to whether observations can be made by judges during the hearing which may amount to 'pre judging' the case. In other words, judiciary is now going through a phase of revolution in the country and judges are having a larger than life image. The responsibility vested with the judiciary has also gone up by leaps and bounds, as judiciary appears to have the ultimate say in all matters. While the judges now command considerable prestige and respect in society, one cannot deny the fact that several of the judges have been caught in corruption charges in recent times.

Many vague allegations have been made against several of the judges, which could create a bad image in the course of time, which should be avoided, particularly in view of the vital role expected of the judiciary. The quality of the judges has to be maintained and protected at the highest level and they should be made to observe several restraints, which are called upon because of the nature of the duties that they discharge. The protection of the quality of the judges is now the most vital

need of the day. The Supreme Court of India has original, appellate and advisory jurisdiction. Its exclusive original jurisdiction extends to any dispute between the Government of India and one or more states, or between the Government of India and any state or states on one side and one or more states on the other, or between two or more states, if and insofar as the dispute involves any question (whether of law or of fact) on which the existence or extent of a legal right depends.

In addition, Article 32 of the Indian Constitution gives an extensive original jurisdiction to the Supreme Court in regard to enforcement of Fundamental Rights. It is empowered to issue directions, orders or writs, including writs in the nature of habeas corpus, mandamus, prohibition, quo warranto and certiorari to enforce them. The Supreme Court has been conferred with power to direct transfer of any civil or criminal case from one State High Court to another State High Court, or from a court subordinate to another State High Court.

### **Public Interest Litigation**

Although the proceedings in the Supreme Court arise out of the judgements or orders made by the Subordinate Courts, of late the Supreme Court has started entertaining matters in which interest of the public at large is involved, and the Court may be moved by any individual or group of persons either by filing a Writ Petition at the Filing Counter of the Court, or by addressing a letter to Hon'ble The Chief Justice of India highlighting the question of public importance for invoking this jurisdiction.

Such a concept is known as Public Interest Litigation, or PIL and several matters of public importance have become landmark cases. This concept is unique to the Supreme Court of India, and perhaps no other Court in the world has been exercising this extraordinary jurisdiction.

## **High Courts of India**

The High Court stands at the head of a State's judicial administration. There are 21 High Courts in the country, three having jurisdiction over more than one state. The Union Territories come under the jurisdiction of different State High Courts. Each High Court comprises a Chief Justice and such other Judges as the President may, from time to time, appoint.

Each High Court has powers of jurisprudence over all subordinate courts within its jurisdiction, namely the District and Sessions courts and other lower courts. It can call for returns from such Courts, make and issue general rules and prescribe forms to regulate their practice and proceedings and determine the manner and form in which book entries and accounts shall be kept.

The District and Session Courts comprise the lowest level of courts, and are trial courts of original jurisdiction, applying both federal and state laws. States are divided into districts and within each, a District and Sessions Judge is head of the judiciary.

A District Judge presides over civil cases, while a Sessions Judge over criminal cases.

These judges are appointed by the Governor of the state in consultation with the state's High Court. There is a hierarchy of judicial officials below the district level, many selected through competitive examination by the state's public service commissions.

Civil cases at the sub district level are filed in sub district or munsif courts. Lesser criminal cases are entrusted to courts of magistrates functioning under the Sessions Judge. At the village level, disputes are frequently resolved by Panchayats or Lok Adalats (People's Courts), appealable to the District and Sessions Court.

## **Government**

Government refers to the legislators, administrators, and arbitrators in the administrative bureaucracy who control a state at a given time, and to the system of government by which they are organized. Government is the means by which state policy is enforced, as well as the mechanism for determining the policy of the state.

The word government is derived from the Latin verb *gubernare*, an infinitive meaning "to govern" or "to manage".

States are served by a continuous succession of different governments. Each successive government is composed of a body of individuals who control and decide for the state. Their function is to enforce laws, legislate new ones, and arbitrate conflicts. In some societies, this group is often a self-perpetuating or hereditary class. In other societies, such as democracies, the political roles remain, but there is frequent turnover of the people actually filling the positions. In most

Western societies, there is a clear distinction between a government and the state. Public disapproval of a particular government does not necessarily represent disapproval of the state itself. However, in some totalitarian regimes, there is not a clear distinction between the regime and the state. In fact, leaders in such regimes often attempt to deliberately blur the lines between the two, in order to conflate their interests with those of the polity.

### **Types of governments**

- *Authoritarian:* Authoritarian governments are characterized by an emphasis on the authority of the state in a republic or union. It is a political system controlled by unelected rulers who usually permit some degree of individual freedom.
- *Constitutional monarchy:* A government that has a monarch, but one whose powers are limited by law or by a formal constitution, such as the United Kingdom
- *Constitutional republic:* A government whose powers are limited by law or a formal constitution, and chosen by a vote amongst at least some sections of the populace. Republics which exclude sections of the populace from participation will typically claim to represent all citizens.
- *Democracy:* Rule by a government chosen by election where most of the populace are enfranchised. The key distinction between a democracy and other forms of constitutional government is usually taken to be that the right to vote is not limited by a person's wealth or race. A Democratic government is, therefore, one supported by a

majority of the populace. A “majority” may be defined in different ways. There are many “power-sharing” or “electoral-college” or “constit-uency” systems where the government is not chosen by a simple one-vote-per-person headcount.

- *Dictatorship*: Rule by an individual who has full power over the country. The term may refer to a system where the dictator came to power, and holds it, purely by force - but it also includes systems where the dictator first came to power legitimately but then was able to amend the constitution so as to, in effect, gather all power for themselves.
- *Emirate*: Similar to a monarchy or sultanate, but a government in which the supreme power is in the hands of an emir; the emir may be an absolute overlord or a sovereign with constitutionally limited authority.
- *Monarchy*: Rule by an individual who has inherited the role and expects to bequeath it to their heir.
- *Oligarchy*: Rule by a small group of people who share similar interests or family relations.
- *Plutocracy*: A government composed of the wealthy class. Any of the forms of government listed here can be plutocracy. For instance, if all of the voted representatives in a republic are wealthy, then it is a republic and a plutocracy.
- *Theocracy*: Rule by a religious elite.

- *Totalitarian:* Totalitarian governments regulate nearly every aspect of public and private life.

## **Internal security**

Internal security, or IS, is the act of keeping peace within the borders of a sovereign state or other self-governing territories. generally by upholding the national law and defending against internal security threats.

Responsibility for internal security may range from police to paramilitary forces, and in exceptional circumstances, the military itself.

## **Threats to Internal Security**

Threats to the general peace may range from low-level civil disorder, large scale violence, or even an armed insurgency. Threats to internal security may be directed at either the state's citizens, or the organs and infrastructure of the state itself, and may range from petty crime, serious organised crime, political or industrial unrest, or even domestic terrorism. Foreign powers may also act as a threat to internal security, by either committing or sponsoring terrorism or rebellion, without actually declaring war.

## **Forces and Agencies**

Governmental responsibility for internal security will generally rest with an interior ministry, as opposed to a defence ministry. Depending on the state, a state's internal security will be maintained by either the ordinary police or law

enforcement agencies or more militarised police forces. Other specialised internal security agencies may exist to augment these main forces, such as border guards, special police units, or aspects of the state's List of intelligence agencies. In some states, internal security may be the primary responsibility of a secret police force.

The level of authorised force used by agencies and forces responsible for maintaining internal security might range from unarmed police to fully armed paramilitary organisations, or employ some level of less-lethal weaponry in between. For violent situations, internal security forces may contain some element of military type equipment such as non-military armored vehicles.

### **Justice Aspects**

Depending on the organisation of the state, internal security forces may have jurisdiction on national or federal levels. As the concept of internal security refers to the entity of the state and its citizens, persons who are threats to internal security may be designated as an enemy of the state or enemy of the people.

Persons detained by internal security forces may either be dealt with by the normal criminal justice system, or for more serious crimes against internal security such as treason, they may face special measures such as secret trials. In times of extreme unrest, internal security actions may include measures such as internment. Depending on the nature of the specific state's form of government, enforcing internal security will generally not be carried out by a country's military forces,



whose primary role is external defence, except in times of extreme unrest or other state of emergency, short of civil war.

Often, military involvement in internal security is explicitly prohibited, or is restricted to authorised military aid to the civil power as part of the principle of civilian control of the military. Military special forces units may in some cases be put under the temporary command of civilian powers, for special internal security situations such as counter terrorism operations.

### **Administrative centre**

An administrative centre is a term often used in several countries to refer to a county town, or other seat of regional or local government, or the place where the central administration of a commune is located.

In Russia, the term is applied to the inhabited localities which serve as a seat of government of entities of various levels. The only exception to this rule is the republics, for which the term “capital” is used to refer to the seat of government. The capital of Russia is also an entity to which the term “administrative centre” does not apply.

In the United Kingdom the term is commonly used to denote the centre of a local authority which is distinct from a historic county with a county town.

### **Board of Control (municipal government)**

In municipal government a Board of Control is an executive body that usually deals with financial and administrative

matters. The idea is that a small body of four or five people is better able to make certain decisions than a large, unwieldy city council. Boards of Control were introduced in many North American municipalities in the early 20th century as a product of the municipal reform movement. They proved unpopular with many as they tended to centralize power in a small body while disempowering city councils.

Boards of Control typically consist of the mayor and several Controllers who are elected on a city-wide basis as opposed to aldermen who were elected on a ward basis. As a result, Boards of Control tended to be less representative of the diverse opinions and communities with majority views among the population being overrepresented. As well, since they were elected by a larger electorate running for a seat on the Board of Control would be prohibitively expensive for many municipal politicians resulting in wealthier politicians being more likely to run for the body. Lastly, Boards of Control tended to meet *in camera* rather than in open session in the manner of city councils making them less accountable to the public.

Because of these problems, many municipalities abolished Boards of Control in the years following World War II. They were maintained in several municipalities in suburban Toronto, Canada, into the late 1980s, including North York, Scarborough and Etobicoke.

The City of London, Ontario was one of the few remaining municipalities in North America to retain a Board of Control. It was abolished after the 2010 municipal elections.

## **Governors of states of India**

The Governors and Lieutenant-Governors of the states and territories of India have similar powers and functions at the state level as that of the President of India at Union level. Governors exist in the states while Lieutenant-Governors exist in union territories and in the National Capital Territory of Delhi. The Governor acts as the nominal head whereas the real power lies in the hand of the Chief Ministers of the states and the Chief Minister's Council of Ministers. In India, a Lieutenant governor is in charge of a Union Territory. However the rank is present only in the union territories of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, Delhi and Pondicherry (the other territories have an administrator appointed, who is an IAS officer). Lieutenant-Governors hold the same rank as a Governor of a state in the list of precedence. The Governors and Lieutenant-Governors are appointed by the President for a term of 5 years.

## **Powers and Functions**

The Governor enjoys many different types of powers:

- Executive powers related to administration, appointments and removals,
- Legislative powers related to lawmaking and the state legislature, that is Vidhan Sabha or Vidhan Parishad,
- Discretionary powers to be carried out according to the discretion of the Governor.

## **Executive Powers**

The Constitution vests in the Governor all the executive powers of the State Government. The Governor appoints the Chief Minister who enjoys the support of the majority in the Vidhan Sabha. The Governor also appoints the other members of the Council of Ministers and distributes portfolios to them on the advice of the Chief Minister. The Council of Ministers remain in power during the 'pleasure' of the Governor, but in the real sense it means the pleasure of the Vidhan Sabha. As long as the majority in the Vidhan Sabha supports the government, the Council of Ministers cannot be dismissed. The Governor appoints the Chief Minister of a state. He also appoints the Advocate General and the chairman and members of the State Public Service Commission. The President consults the Governor in the appointment of judges of the High Courts and the Governor appoints the judges of the District Courts.

## **Legislative Powers**

The Governor summons the sessions of both houses of the state legislature and prorogues them. The Governor can even dissolve the Vidhan Sabha. These powers are formal and the Governor while using these powers must act according to the advice of the Council of Ministers headed by the Chief Minister. The Governor inaugurates the state legislature by addressing it after the assembly elections and also at the beginning of the first session every year. The Governor's address on these occasions generally outlines new policies of the state government. A bill that the state legislature has passed, can become a law only after the Governor gives assent. The Governor can return a bill to the state legislature, if it is

not a money bill, for reconsideration. However, if the state legislature sends it back to the Governor for the second time, the Governor must assent to it. The Governor has the power to reserve certain bills for the President. When the state legislature is not in session and the Governor considers it necessary to have a law, then the Governor can promulgate ordinances. These ordinances are submitted to the state legislature at its next session. They remain valid for no more than six weeks from the date the state legislature is reconvened unless approved by it earlier. Money bills can be introduced in the State Legislative Assembly only on the prior recommendation of the Governor. He also causes to be laid before the State Legislature the annual financial statement which is the State Budget. Further no demand for grant shall be made except on his recommendation. He can also make advances out of the Contingency Fund of the State to meet any unforeseen expenditure. Moreover, he constitutes the State Finance Commission.

### **Discretionary Powers**

Normally, the Governor has to act on the aid and advice of the Council of ministers headed by the Chief Minister. However, there are situations when the Governor has to act as per his own judgement and take decisions on his own. These are called the discretionary powers of the Governor. The Governor exercises them in the following cases:

*In the Appointment of the Chief Minister of a State* When no party gets a majority in the Vidhan Sabha, the Governor can either ask the leader of the single largest party or the consensus leader of two or more parties (that is, a coalition

party) to form the government. The Governor then appoints the leader of the largest party to Chief Minister.

*In informing the President of the Failure of Constitutional Machinery in a State* The Governor can send a report to the President informing him or her that the State's constitutional functioning has been compromised and recommending the President impose "President's rule" upon the state.

The term of Governor's office is normally 5 years but it can be terminated earlier by:

- Dismissal by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister of the country, at whose pleasure the Governor holds office.
- Resignation by the governor.

## Chapter 5

# Comparative Analysis in Political Science

## Changing Meaning of Political Science

Usually the comparative approach to politics and society is defined both by its substance and by its method. Such a description, however, undermines the necessary link between theory and method as well as the distinctiveness of the comparative approach in terms of what, when and to compare. Theory here equals the propositions concerning the explanation of a relationship between politics in social reality and the societal developments that are affected by it. Method is then the most appropriate way to investigate the proposed relationships empirically. As we have stated before, comparing as such is one of the common tenets underlying much if not all research in the social sciences. Yet, one needs to realise all the time that this refers to the 'logic' of systematically finding answers to questions about the complexities of reality.

This logic has already been used for a long time and has been described by John Stuart Mill as the *methods of Agreement and Difference*. Comparison is then an instrument to verify or falsify relationships between two phenomena. Yet, here in this book we consider the logic as an integral part of the comparative approach by stressing the crucial importance of the link between the Research Question, on the one hand, and the Research Design, on the other. For this we need to reduce

the complexity of reality and thus to control for variation—this is what the comparative method allows for.

As Sartori stresses, we need to compare in order to control the observed units of variation or the variables that make up the theoretical relationship. In fact, what the researcher is attempting, is to identify the necessary and sufficient conditions under which the relationship occurs in reality. In fact this would entail that it may be assumed by the researcher that all other things are equal except for the relationship under empirical review.

This is what we call the *Ceteris Paribus* clause. The more ‘truly’ the comparison, *i.e.* the more explicit the relationship between the Research Question and Research Design is of a comparative nature, the more positive the analytical results will be. If we look, for instance, at the relationship between ‘class society’ and the emergence of ‘welfare states’ the relationship is positive if we examine the developments in the UK and Sweden and Australia.

Yet, if we focus instead on the Netherlands, Germany and Italy where the role of religion used to be the central focus of political behaviour, the answer could be negative to this Research Question. Hence, only when we take into account as many relevant and concurrent cases it is possible to reach a viable and plausible conclusion concerning socioeconomic divisions in society and related consequences in terms of welfare regulation. Similarly, the question whether or not economic developments are also dependent on types of democratic governance and interest intermediation cannot be fully answered by studying one country, or — like Olson did —



by comparing only the states within the USA. The basic message is thus the degree of control of the environment or contextual features necessary to reach sound conclusions is in need of selecting the proper number of cases, be it cross-sectionally or cross-time. From this point of view, it appears reasonable to conclude — as Dalton does — that it is almost impossible to conceive of serious explanatory work in political and social science that is not at least implicitly comparative.

Janoski and Hicks, for instance, point correctly to the distinction between *internal* and *external* analysis in the social sciences. Both types are considered as important for comparative research. Internal analysis refers to the knowledge necessary to understand the cases under review *per se* whereas external analysis is the analysis of the agreement or differences *between* cases.

*As we shall later on, both types of analysis are useful for:*

- Selecting the proper research design;
- Evaluating the reliability and validity of the data gathered.

Hence, from the perspective that the comparative approach is a crucial one in political and social science, depending on the definition of the core subject and research question asked one must also take into account that knowledge of the cases as such, which make up the universe of discourse, is a vital prerequisite for accomplishing good comparative types of analysis. Hence, internal types of comparisons can be useful to execute external analysis of the same phenomenon.

The comparative approach to political science is thus not by itself exclusive, but if we follow the idea that concepts derived from theories about the real world need to be investigated by means of controlling variation as observed in the real world, we cannot abstain from this approach. Actually, we could go even further by saying, that the comparative approach is the fundamental point of departure for most theories that figure in political and social science. In addition, the comparative method then is not only preferred, but required in those situations in which there is no possible recourse to experimental techniques or when the number of observations do not allow for the use of statistical techniques that are based on sampling.

However, these limitations are rather the exception than the rule. An important and crucial step in the use and application of the comparative approach is the issue of *concept formation*, which can travel across time, situations, or societies. In other words, how to define crucial concepts and subsequently develop a systematic classification of variables that represent the theoretical relationship proposed and which are derived from the core subject of the discipline, that is: the 'political' in a society.

The 'political' in a society can be described on the basis of three dimensions: *politics, polity and policy*. Politics is then what we would like to call the political process. On this level actors interact with each other if and when they have conflicting interests or views regarding societal issues that cannot be solved by them. The process of solving those problems, which make actors clash, is more often than not visible through the political and social *institutions* that have

emerged in order to facilitate conflict resolution. Institutions — or the ‘rules of political governance’ — help to develop coalescence and to achieve a consensus among conflicting actors through compromising alternative preferences. These institutions manifest themselves in the *rules of the game* in a society.

This is what is meant with the ‘polity’. To put it more formally, rules are humanly devised constraints that shape political interaction. Institutions are then considered to be both formal, like for instance in a constitution, which can be enforced, and informal, *i.e.* they evolve over time and are respected as a code of conduct by most actors involved. Hence, the rules — be it formal or informal — define the relationship between the ‘political and society’. In short, a theory of the political process must assume that there exists a mutual and interdependent relation between politics and society, but that its organization is to a large extent independent from society. The issue at hand is then to investigate to what extent and in what way this process can be observed and affects social and economic developments of societies by means of comparison.

It should be kept in mind, that the triad of ‘politics-polity-policy’ in itself is *not* a theory of the political process. It is instead a *heuristic* device to delineate the ‘political’ from the ‘non-political’. This description of the ‘political’, however, makes it possible to elaborate on the core subject of the comparative approach.

That is to say that all those processes that can be defined by means of these three dimensions are in need of a comparative analysis in order to explain the process. Theories and

hypotheses in comparative political science usually refer to units of variation, *i.e.* political variables, policy variables and polity-variables at the macroscopic level. The theories and hypotheses often apply to many units of observation and many time periods. The term unit of variation can have two meanings therefore: on the one hand it signifies an elaboration of the theoretical argument and the related Research Question into meaningful concepts, on the other hand it concerns the translation of the theory into a Research Design where variables are developed that can be observed empirically and are the units of analysis.

A number of comparative researchers have drawn attention to this confusing way of using the terms 'unit of variation' and 'unit of observation', which easily leads to equating description with explanation. Yet, it is quite important to know exactly what is under discussion, if we wish to validate theoretical statements by means of empirical knowledge.

Przeworski and Teune propose a distinction between 'levels of observation' and 'levels of analysis', whereas Ragin introduces the terms 'observational unit' and 'explanatory unit'. Both these distinctions between respectively empirical knowledge and theoretical statements appear useful, but may still be confusing to the practitioner. In summary: a comparative analysis of the 'political' in society begins with the formulation of the unit of variation by referring to relations at a macroscopic level. By elaborating these units, one must always keep in mind that the units of observation that are employed are not identical, but are considered to be similar. Finally, the unit of measurement is not by definition equal to the analytical properties as defined in social theory and related research

questions. To give an example: the study of the development of the welfare state is not, by definition, a topic of comparative political research. In our view, it becomes a comparative topic only if an attempt is made to explain this development by means of macro-political properties such as conflicting interests between socio-economic classes.

These conflicts are, depending on the existing institutions of the liberal democratic state, fought out in parliament and other decision-making bodies and subsequently may result in a patterned variation of public policy-formation at the system-level of the state. Hence the core subject is not the welfare state, but instead the extent to which politics, polity and policy can be identified as properties of the political process that shapes the welfare state in a country. This being the case, the extent to which elements of this process are relevant, is explaining the political development of the welfare state.

To conclude our discussion of the study of the relationship between politics and society: the *theory-guided* question within any type of comparative analysis is to what extent the 'political', in terms of explanatory units of *variation* can indeed account for, and is shaped by the political actions in one social system compared to another. Conversely, the theory guided question, or Research Question needs to be refined as to define the units of *measurement* and thus the units of *observation* in social reality.

It is this process and the attempts to explain it by systematic comparison that distinguishes the comparative approach from other approaches in political and social science. This conclusion brings us to the next issue we seek to answer: what

steps must be taken to properly relate the Research Question to an adequate Research Design, *i.e.* a design that is conducive to plausible conclusions. Political Science is that part of social science which deals with the foundations of the *state* and the principles of the *government*. According to J W Garner, “Politics begins and ends with the state.”

Similarly, R G Gettel wrote that Politics is the “study of the state in the past, present and future”. Harold J Laski stated in the same vein that the study of Politics concerns itself with the life of men and women in relation to organized state. Thus as a social science, Political Science deals with those aspects of individuals in society which relate to their activities and organizations devoted to seeking of power, resolution of conflicts and all these, within an overall framework of the rule and law as laid down by the state.

### **Changing Meaning of Political Science**

The term Politics is derived from the Greek word *polis* which means city-state. That is why many commentators, as you saw, rightly define Politics in terms of the state or government. However, this definition does not exhaust the meaning of Politics. Politics also deals with *power*. Harold D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan define Political Science as “the study of shaping and sharing of power”. In a word, *Politics deals with both state and power*.

However, the power that Political Science deals with is, more often than not, the legitimate power. Since science is the systematic study of any phenomenon through observation and experiment, it follows that Political Science studies the state

and power in all their aspects. You will learn more about the state and power later in this lesson. Political Science deals with both empirical facts and normative issues. Facts are in the domain of “what is” and value preferences are in the domain of “what should be.” For example, if somebody says India is a parliamentary democracy, he or she is making a statement of empirical fact.

This is what India today actually is. But if she or he were to make a statement like the one that India should switch over to presidential form of democracy, the statement would be a normative one.

Political Science is not satisfied with describing the state of affairs, it wants to change or improve upon them. Empirical statements are true or false by virtue of what observation shows to be the case. Evaluative statements are ethical/moral imperatives, which are often said not to be true or false in any sense at all. Formal statements are true or false by virtue of the meanings of their constituent terms alone. Political Philosophy deals with formal statements. Political Science deals with empirical statements and also evaluates the existing political institutions, practices and focuses on how to improve them.

## **Growth of the Discipline of Political Science**

Systematic study of Politics started with the Greeks in the fourth century BC. Philosophers like Plato and Aristotle used it in the most comprehensive sense. Aristotle called Politics a “master science”. For him, it comprised of not only the institutions of state or government but also family, property

and other social institutions. Politics, for the Greeks, was an all-encompassing activity. The ancient Greek view about Political Science was mainly *ethical*. In contrast, the ancient Romans considered the *legal* aspect of Politics more important for their governance. During the Middle Ages, Political Science became a branch of religious order of the Church. Political authority was, then, subordinated to the authority of the Church. As the state grew in size and became more complex, Political Science acquired a realistic and secular approach. After the Industrial Revolution, the role of the State, which was limited to maintenance of law and order and providing defence against external aggression, underwent considerable changes with the emergence of the new economic system called capitalism. In the twentieth century, after the Second World War, the 'behavioural approach' offered a new dimension of Political Science.

The behavioural movement in American Political Science in the 1950s and the 1960s placed a lot of emphasis on the 'science' part of Politics. It wanted to model Politics after the methods followed by natural sciences like Physics, Botany, etc. The behaviouralists built theory inductively from empirical propositions.

Those who follow inductive method would come to the conclusion after study, observation and experiment. For example, when some behaviouralists saw African-Americans of the southern United States of America voted for the Democratic Party of the United States, they came to the conclusion that the African-Americans do vote for the Democrats. This behavioural approach shifted the focus of its study from political institutions and structures to their functions.



It placed stress on political activity and the behaviour of men and women who control these institutions. It replaced the study of ideas by the study of facts, evidence and behaviour. It considered political activity manifested in behaviour as the true subject of Political Science. A political activity may be in the form of an individual contesting an election.

It may be the activity of a group seeking the adoption of a particular policy in its favour by the government. As different people pursue different interests, such activities tend to generate disagreement, competition and conflict. But the distinctive quality of Politics is that it includes *physical coercion* or *force* by the government. It may and usually does involve the persuasive influence and effort of the government to resolve conflicts through its balanced policy decisions. Politics is also viewed as a process whereby individuals, groups or communities seek to achieve their specific but conflicting goals. Politics, as the process, seeks to allocate resources authoritatively. Politics, as the study of structures, institutions, processes and activities, recognizes the possibility of the use of power. The Marxist approach, which is derived from the writings of the nineteenth century German philosopher Karl Marx, views Politics as a study of irreconcilable conflicts between the two classes 'haves' and the 'have-nots'; in other words, the exploiters and the exploited.

The emancipation of the have-nots will come only through a revolution which would put an end to the institution of private property, thus changing the class society to the classless society. But Politics, as against the Marxist view, has another view also, the liberal view, according to which Politics is considered as an as effort for conciliation and accommodation

to bring about rule of order and Justice. Incidentally, the Marxist view of politics comes as a reaction to the liberal view of politics.

## **History of Political Science**

Political science as a separate field is a relatively late arrival in terms of social sciences. However, the term “political science” was not always distinguished from political philosophy, and the modern discipline has a clear set of antecedents including also moral philosophy, political economy, political theology, history, and other fields concerned with normative determinations of what ought to be and with deducing the characteristics and functions of the ideal state.

The antecedents of Western politics can be traced back to the Socratic political philosophers, Plato (427–347 BC), Xenophon (c. 430–354 BC), and Aristotle (“The Father of Political Science”) (384–322 BC). These authors, in such works as *The Republic* and *Laws* by Plato, and *The Politics* and *Nicomachean Ethics* by Aristotle, analyzed political systems philosophically, going beyond earlier Greek poetic and historical reflections which can be found in the works of epic poets like Homer and Hesiod, historians like Herodotus and Thucydides, and dramatists such as Sophocles, Aristophanes, and Euripides.

## **The rise and fall of the Roman Empire**

During the height of the Roman Empire, famous historians such as Polybius, Livy and Plutarch documented the rise of the Roman Republic, and the organization and histories of other nations, while statesmen like Julius Caesar, Cicero and others

provided us with examples of the politics of the republic and Rome's empire and wars. The study of politics during this age was oriented towards understanding history, understanding methods of governing, and describing the operation of governments. Nearly a thousand years elapsed, from the foundation of the city of Rome in 753 BC to the fall of the Roman Empire or the beginning of the Middle Ages.

In the interim, there is a manifest translation of Hellenic culture into the Roman sphere. The Greek gods become Romans and Greek philosophy in one way or another turns into Roman law, *e.g.* Stoicism. The Stoic was committed to preserving proper hierarchical roles and duties in the state so that the state as a whole would remain stable. Among the best known Roman Stoics were philosopher Seneca and the emperor Marcus Aurelius. Seneca, a wealthy Roman patrician, is often criticized by some modern commentators for failing to adequately live by his own precepts. The Meditations of Marcus Aurelius, on the other hand, can be best thought of as the philosophical reflections of an emperor divided between his philosophical aspirations and the duty he felt to defend the Roman Empire from its external enemies through his various military campaigns. According to Polybius, Roman institutions were the backbone of the empire but Roman law is the medulla.

## **The Middle Ages**

With the fall of the Western Roman Empire, there arose a more diffuse arena for political studies. The rise of monotheism and, particularly for the Western tradition, Christianity, brought to light a new space for politics and political action. Works such

as Augustine of Hippo's *The City of God* synthesized current philosophies and political traditions with those of Christianity, redefining the borders between what was religious and what was political. During the Middle Ages, the study of politics was widespread in the churches and courts. Most of the political questions surrounding the relationship between church and state were clarified and contested in this period. The Arabs lost sight of Aristotle's political science but continued to study Plato's *Republic* which became the basic text of Judeo-Islamic political philosophy as in the works of Alfarabi and Averroes; this did not happen in the Christian world, where Aristotle's *Politics* was translated in the 13th century and became the basic text as in the works of Saint Thomas Aquinas.

## **Indian Sub-Continent**

In ancient India, the antecedents of politics can be traced back to the *Rig-Veda*, *Samhitas*, *Brahmanas*, the Mahabharata and Buddhist *Pali Canon*. Chanakya (c. 350–275 BC) was a political thinker in Takshashila. Chanakya wrote the *Arthashastra*, a treatise on political thought, economics and social order. It discusses monetary and fiscal policies, welfare, international relations, and war strategies in detail, among other topics. The Manusmriti, dated to about two centuries after the time of Chanakya is another important Indian political treatise.

## **East Asia**

Ancient China was home to several competing schools of political thought, most of which arose in the Spring and Autumn Period. These included Mohism (a utilitarian philosophy), Taoism, Legalism (a school of thought based on

the supremacy of the state), and Confucianism. Eventually, a modified form of Confucianism (heavily infused with elements of Legalism) became the dominant political philosophy in China during the Imperial Period. This form of Confucianism also deeply influenced and were expounded upon by scholars in Korea and Japan.

## **West Asia**

In Persia, works such as the *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam and *Epic of Kings* by Ferdowsi provided evidence of political analysis, while the Middle Eastern Aristotelians such as Avicenna and later Maimonides and Averroes, continued Aristotle's tradition of analysis and empiricism, writing commentaries on Aristotle's works. Averroes did not have at hand a text of Aristotle's *Politics*, so he wrote a commentary on Plato's *Republic* instead.

## **The Renaissance**

During the Italian Renaissance, Niccolò Machiavelli established the emphasis of modern political science on direct empirical observation of political institutions and actors. Machiavelli was also a realist, arguing that even evil means should be considered if they help to create and preserve a glorious regime. Machiavelli therefore also argues against the use of idealistic models in politics, and has been described as the father of the "politics model" of political science. Later, the expansion of the scientific paradigm during the Enlightenment further pushed the study of politics beyond normative determinations.

## **The Enlightenment**

Like Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, well known for his theory of the social contract, believed that a strong central power, such as a monarchy, was necessary to rule the innate selfishness of the individual but neither of them believed in the divine right of kings. John Locke, on the other hand, who gave us *Two Treatises of Government* and who did not believe in the divine right of kings either, sided with Aquinas and stood against both Machiavelli and Hobbes by accepting Aristotle's dictum that man seeks to be happy in a state of social harmony as a social animal. Unlike Aquinas' preponderant view on the salvation of the soul from original sin, Locke believed man comes into this world with a mind that is basically a *tabula rasa*. According to Locke, an absolute ruler as proposed by Hobbes is unnecessary, for natural law is based on reason and equality, seeking peace and survival for man.

Religion would no longer play a dominant role in politics. There would be separation of church and state. Principles similar to those that dominated the material sciences could be applied to society as a whole, originating the social sciences. Politics could be studied in a laboratory as it were, the social milieu. In 1787, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "...The science of politics like most other sciences has received great improvement." (*The Federalist Papers* Number 9 and 51). Both the marquis d'Argenson and the abbé de Saint-Pierre described politics as a science; d'Argenson was a philosopher and de Saint-Pierre an allied reformer of the enlightenment.

Other important figures in American politics who participated in the Enlightenment were Benjamin Franklin and Thomas Jefferson.

### **Modern political science**

Because political science is essentially a study of human behaviour, in all aspects of politics, observations in controlled environments are often challenging to reproduce or duplicate, though experimental methods are increasingly common. Citing this difficulty, former American Political Science Association President Lawrence Lowell once said “We are limited by the impossibility of experiment. Politics is an observational, not an experimental science.” Because of this, political scientists have historically observed political elites, institutions, and individual or group behaviour in order to identify patterns, draw generalizations, and build theories of politics.

Like all social sciences, political science faces the difficulty of observing human actors that can only be partially observed and who have the capacity for making conscious choices unlike other subjects such as non-human organisms in biology or inanimate objects as in physics. Despite the complexities, contemporary political science has progressed by adopting a variety of methods and theoretical approaches to understanding politics and methodological pluralism is a defining feature of contemporary political science.

The advent of political science as a university discipline was marked by the creation of university departments and chairs with the title of political science arising in the late 19th century. In fact, the designation “political scientist” is typically

reserved for those with a doctorate in the field. Integrating political studies of the past into a unified discipline is ongoing, and the history of political science has provided a rich field for the growth of both normative and positive political science, with each part of the discipline sharing some historical predecessors. The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903 and the American Political Science Review was founded in 1906 in an effort to distinguish the study of politics from economics and other social phenomena.

### **Behavioural Revolution and New Institutionalism**

In the 1950s and the 1960s, a behavioural revolution stressing the systematic and rigorously scientific study of individual and group behaviour swept the discipline. A focus on studying political behaviour, rather than institutions or interpretation of legal texts, characterized early behavioural political science, including work by Robert Dahl, Philip Converse, and in the collaboration between sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld and public opinion scholar Bernard Berelson. The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed a takeoff in the use of deductive, game theoretic formal modeling techniques aimed at generating a more analytical corpus of knowledge in the discipline. This period saw a surge of research that borrowed theory and methods from economics to study political institutions, such as the United States Congress, as well as political behaviour, such as voting. William H. Riker and his colleagues and students at the University of Rochester were the main proponents of this shift. Criticisms of the use of this rational choice theorizing has been widespread, even among political scientists who adopt quantitative methods.



This trend towards formalization has continued and accelerated, even as the behaviouralist revolution has subsided. At the same time, because of the interdependence of all social life, political science also moved towards a closer working relationship with other disciplines, especially sociology, economics, history, anthropology, psychology, public administration, law, and statistics without losing its own identity.

Increasingly, political scientists have used the scientific method to create an intellectual discipline involving quantitative research methods, as well as the generation of formal economics-style models of politics to derive testable hypotheses followed by empirical verification. Over the past generations, the discipline placed an increasing emphasis on relevance and the use of new approaches to increase scientific knowledge in the field and provide explanations for empirical outcomes.

Kenneth R. Mladenka, a political scientist at Texas AandM University, was among the academics that proceeded to bring acceptance of the newer urban studies component of the discipline. In the 1970s and 1980s, he found that urban scholars were not as prominent on the editorial boards of the major political science journals, and that traditional scholars, called empiricists, regard most urban research, dependent on case studies, paradigms, qualitative analysis, and theoretical perspectives, as less reliable than the traditional emphasis of the discipline. The urban scholars such as Mladenka stress “local settings where global, national, and voting behaviour outcomes happen at street level and where day-to-day lives are affected.”

## **Recent Developments**

In 2000, the Perestroika Movement in political science was introduced as a reaction against what supporters of the movement called the mathematicization of political science. Those who identified with the movement argued for a plurality of methodologies and approaches in political science and for more relevance of the discipline to those outside of it.

## **Distinction between Political Science and Politics**

The terms 'Political Science' and 'Politics' are often used interchangeably. However, the distinction between the two needs to be understood. Some scholars define Politics to be "the science and art of government." But this is only a part of the total explanation of the subject of Political Science. Now-a-days the term Politics is used to mean the problems of the citizens interacting with the instrument of political power in one form or the other. Sometimes, Politics was and still is used as the technique of compromise or the method to capture power and retain it.

According to many political scientists, the study of Political Science comprises theory of the state, concept of sovereign power, forms and functions of government, making and execution of laws, elections, political parties, rights and duties of citizens, policy functions and study of welfare activities of the State and government. There is another aspect of Politics that needs to be emphasised. Politics, many a time, implies practical politics.

Practising politics is different from studying it. Practical politics includes actual formation of government, the working of government, administration, laws and legislation. It also includes international politics including matters such as peace and war, international trade and economic order, protection of rights, etc. All these also comprise the subject matter of the study of Politics. While the knowledge of Political Science as a discipline is acquired through study, the skill of practical politics is acquired through politicking or manipulations and craftiness or by exploiting caste and regional loyalties and religious sentiments. Practical politics is often described as the 'dirty game' and a 'corrupting' process in the common people's mind.

But we find that there are hardly any human groupings or societies, which are free from 'politics' and hardly any individual who does not know the implications of the "game of politics". Practical Politics also has many positive aspects. In this era of welfare state many positive programmes such as removal of untouchability, land reforms, release of bonded labourers, prohibition of trafficking in human beings and *begar*, introduction of minimum wages, employment generation programmes, empowerment of the other backward classes are all examples of positive aspects of practical politics. 'Politics' refers to the process of actual happenings in society and in institutions, which Political Science refers to its understand in a systematic manner.

### **Public administration**

Public administration is a "field of enquiry with a diverse scope", of which the "fundamental goal...is to advance

management and policies so that government can function.” Some of the various definitions which have been offered for the term are: “the management of public programmes”; the “translation of politics into the reality that citizens see every day”; and “the study of government decision making, the analysis of the policies themselves, the various inputs that have produced them, and the inputs necessary to produce alternative policies.”

Public administration is “centrally concerned with the organization of government policies and programmes as well as the behaviour of officials formally responsible for their conduct”. Many unelected public servants can be considered to be public administrators, including police officers, municipal budget analysts, HR benefits administrators, city managers, Census analysts, and cabinet secretaries. Public administrators are public servants working in public departments and agencies, at all levels of government. In the US, civil servants and academics such as Woodrow Wilson promoted American civil service reform in the 1880s, moving public administration into academia.

However, “until the mid-20th century and the dissemination of the German sociologist Max Weber’s theory of bureaucracy” there was not “much interest in a theory of public administration.” The field is multi-disciplinary in character; one of the various proposals for public administration’s sub-fields sets out five pillars, including human resources, organizational theory, policy analysis and statistics, budgeting, and ethics.

## **Local government**

Local government refers collectively to administrative authorities over areas that are smaller than a state. The term is used to contrast with offices at nation-state level, which are referred to as the central government, national government, or federal government. 'Local government' only acts within powers delegated to it by legislation or directives of the higher level of government and each country has some kind of local government which will differ from those of other countries. In primitive societies the lowest level of local government is the village headman or tribal chief. Federal states such as the United States have two levels of government above the local level: the governments of the fifty states and the federal national government whose relations are governed by the constitution of the United States. Local government in the United States originated in the colonial period and has been modified since then: the highest level of local government is at county level.

In modern nations, local governments usually have some of the same kind of powers as national governments do. They usually have some power to raise taxes, though these may be limited by central legislation. The question of Municipal Autonomy—which powers the local government has, or should have, and why—is a key question of public administration and governance. The institutions of local government vary greatly between countries, and even where similar arrangements exist, the terminology often varies. Common names for local government entities include state, province, region, department, county, prefecture, district, city, township, town, borough, parish, municipality, shire and village. However all

these names are often used informally in different countries and local government is the legal part of central government.

## **Local Government in India**

In India the local government is the third level of government apart from the State and Central governments. There are two types of Local Government in operation: Panchayats in rural areas and Municipalities in urban areas. The Panchayats are a linked-system of local bodies with Village Panchayats, Panchayat Samities at the intermediate level, and district panchayats.

The rural panchayats created in around 1959 were based on the soviet model of tiering with hierarchical control to undertake mainly agency tasks of the states through earmarked funding, with limited civic tasks financed from assigned land revenue and local surcharge thereon. This resulted in overlapping functional jurisdiction and a mismatch of functions and taxes among the three tiers. The urban municipalities, created during the colonial days of mid-19th century, survived the 'socialist' experiment and retained their separate character as their English counterparts.

In 1991, through two identical constitutional amendments, one for the Panchayats and the other for the Municipalities, a number of changes were introduced to strengthen local governments in India ensure regularity of their election every five years and limiting their period of super session or dissolution to six months, three sets of local local governments for the Panchayats and the Municipalities, reservation of seats and chairpersons for women and scheduled castes and tribes,

creation of independent state selection commission, state finance commission linked with the central finance commission, and planning committees at the districts and metropolitan areas. In addition, these amendments have indicated guidelines for the states to empower the local governments through increased devolution of functions and taxes to them—these are not been followed-up by the states. However, the CFCs have been allocating discretionary grants for local governments passed through the states. One lacuna in the existing arrangement is that the Panchayats do not have a statutorily delegated list of functions on which its revenues could be spent; this has created problems of financing their own activities from their own revenues or through general grants from the CFC-SFC arrangements. Panchayats act mostly as agencies for implementing their erstwhile soviet plan schemes and projects on cost reimbursement that do not have any maintenance component for transferred completed works. The major national parties are committed to improve the effectiveness of the Panchayats through further central action to remedy the situation.

## **Scope Of Political Science**

Here we shall learn about the scope of Political Science in terms of role of the State, functions of government and its relationship with citizens.

## **Role of the State**

The term 'State' in its modern sense was first used by Machiavelli, the Italian statesman. The study of the State has

since remained the focal point for the political scientists. The State consists of four elements. These are:

- The people;
- The territory on which they live;
- The government to rule and regulate the lives of the people and
- Sovereignty, which implies unrestricted authority to take decisions and manage its own affairs.

You will read in detail about these four elements in the second lesson. The role and nature of the State have been interpreted differently. Modern western liberal thinking, about which you will study more in the fourth lesson, arose with the commercial Revolution in Western Europe in the sixteenth century and became prominent with the Industrial Revolution in the eighteenth century. These Revolutions brought into focus a new economic system called capitalism.

The social group consisting of traders, merchants and businessmen and later the industrialists was the major beneficiary of this system. The liberals emphasized that the consent of the people is the true basis of the state. Early liberal thinkers also considered the state as a 'necessary evil'- an evil but necessary for the purpose of protecting the individual from the external and internal enemies. According to this view, that government is the best which governs the least. In other words, the state should be a 'police state' and hence a limited one. It should also be limited in a different sense: as John Locke, the famous English liberal philosopher of the



seventeenth century, said it is there to protect the individual's natural right to life, liberty and property. By contrast, the Marxist view, about which you will study more in the fourth lesson, does not consider the State as an impartial institution.

It asserts that, throughout the centuries, the state has been a tool in the hands of the "haves" for exploiting and dominating the "have-nots." In the future classless society like the communist society, the state would "wither away,". In Gandhian view, the State would justify its existence, by acting as a "trustee" of the people. It should help the poorest and the weakest one.

It should restore to him or her, a control over his or her own life and destiny. The Welfare State, which slowly emerged during the 1930s, tries to promote the well being of its citizens, especially the poor, the needy, the unemployed and the aged. It is now generally agreed that the Welfare State exists to promote common good. So the functions of the state have increased manifold. Power refers to the ability of one person affecting the attitudes or action of another. I have power over you if I can make you do what you would not have done otherwise. But power is not always exercised openly. It can be exercised in unseen way, as in controlling the agenda. However, power can be best exercised when I can convince you about what is good/bad for you.

To that extent, my power over you would be complete. And this dominance would always go unchallenged. By power of the government, we think of the different aspects of government. We think of ministers who have departments under them for the exercise of power over the area of their domains. There is

the bureaucracy and the enormous structure of governmental administration, which has power over us. It can control our lives in various ways by making, administering and implementing laws. Here, one thing is to be noted. Power does not lie only in the highly publicized areas of social life, like government, administration, elections, etc.

It also exists in small institutions like family etc. Many feminists are of the opinion that inside the private world of family man exercises power or dominance over woman. Hence, it is very aptly said, "even the personal is political." Another thing to be noticed is that there is a distinction between legitimate and illegitimate power. There can be power, which is considered right or proper, while another may be improper. A dacoit's power over me is very real, because if I do not comply with his wishes, I might lose my life or limb. But it is not proper power as is generally understood. Contrary to it the power that the government's representatives, policemen or judges exercise over me is proper power. The dacoit's power is illegitimate power while the government's is legitimate. And the power of constitutional authorities over me is called authority. Authority contains the two ideas of power and legitimacy. Authority is that form of power which is legitimate. It is power plus legitimacy.

## **Citizens and Government**

The government is the most important instrument of the State through which the latter realizes its objectives. Through its three organs i.e; the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary, it makes laws and rules, implements them, maintains peace and order in the Individual and the State

country and resolves clashes of interests. It also tries to ensure territorial integrity or unity of the country. Modern democratic governments perform many other functions for the development and welfare of citizens and the society, as a whole.

This is especially so in a developing country like ours. The relationship between citizens and the government is reciprocal. The citizens are members of the State. The state recognizes certain rights of the citizens and in turn expects certain duties from them. So far as the rights of the citizens are concerned, they can be divided into three: civil, political and social. CIVIL RIGHTS are those rights which are necessary for the freedom/liberty of the individual. They include the right to life and personal liberty, right to freedom of speech, expression and thought, right to own property, right to enter into contract, right to equality before law and equal protection by law. Equality before law means absence of special privileges; equal protection of laws implies equals should be treated equally.

POLITICAL RIGHTS include the right to vote and the right to contest election. SOCIAL RIGHTS include the right to some degrees of economic welfare and security and the right to live the life of a civilized being according to standards prevailing in the society. It is the primary duty of the citizens to pay taxes to the government. They should cooperate with the government and abide by the laws and rules; should help in preventing diseases by immunization and by keeping neighbourhood clean.

They should have small families to help the government check the population growth. They should preserve public property,

help in catching and punishing anti-social and anti-national elements. Further, the citizens of different castes, religions, languages and regions should solve their problems by understanding and agreement and not by violent means. In this way, a lot of resources, energy and time of the government can be saved for constructive purposes.

## **Liberty**

The term liberty is derived from the Latin word *liber* meaning free. Thus liberty means freedom. Freedom is of paramount importance for the development of an individual's personality. Historically speaking, the term liberty was initially defined as absence of all restraints on an individual. This is known as the negative concept of liberty. Early liberalism championed negative liberty. John Stuart Mill, the nineteenth century English political philosopher, described, "Restraint as an evil". Mill was especially worried about the restraints coming from the state and society. However, since individuals live together in a society, complete absence of restraints would be neither possible nor desirable. Further, differentiating between the self-regarding and other-regarding action is not always possible. It has been very aptly said that your liberty to swing your arm ends there where my nose begins. For liberty to be enjoyed by everyone, it should have reasonable restraints. This is the concept of positive liberty. This concept further means freedom to be a master of one's own self. Harold J Laski supported this concept. Freedoms are opportunities which history has shown to be essential to the development of personality. The freedom of many requires restraint of law on the freedom of some. Later liberals supported the positive liberty.