CHAPTER-I

THE RESEARCH PROBLEM : A THEORETICAL STATEMENT

Crisis of the Development of Political Participation

The crisis of political development in the modern democratic politics is mainly the crisis of development of political participation. The political participation occupies such a prominent place and plays such a pivotal role in the modern democratic politics that without its development there can be no real democratic progress. The crisis of development of political participation, therefore, is the most important problem of modern democratic development. If democratic development depends ultimately upon the development of participation, then serious attempts should be made to develop participation by solving this problem. But before making a practical attempt to solve this problem, what is necessary is to grasp correctly the nature of this crisis as well as its causes and cures. With this view in mind, an attempt is made in this chapter to explain the nature of the crisis of political participation, its causes and cures, on the theoretical plane which are explored empirically in this thesis. This chapter deals with the following points:

Explanation of the concept of political participation, its ideal and real contents, dimensions of participation, exploration of crisis, causes of crisis and solutions to the problem.

Explanation of the Concept of Political Participation:

1 I belong to the school of thought which defines political development as progress towards political democracy.
The concept of political participation occupies a prominent place in the body of modern democratic political theory. It is the most important structural ingredient of a modern body politic. It is sine qua non of a democracy, and a civic duty. Modernism in political theory has two important dimensions, one methodological and another theoretical or conceptual. Methodological modernism deals with tool innovation, tool sophistication, scientism and empiricism. Theoretical modernism mainly deals with new concepts of analysis. In short, modern political theory deals with the new empirical concepts. These new concepts explain and theorize the practical aspect of the political life. Political participation is one such theoretical concept that explains the actual reality of democratic development.

The purpose of the democratic politics is to enable people to control their own destinies. The crux of the democratic process, therefore, lies in the process of the diffusion of powers i.e. giving powers in the hands of the people to enable them to control governmental actions. Controlling governmental actions means influencing rule-making, rule-implementing, and rule-adjudicating process at all the levels of the system. This whole process has two aspects, one, constitutional i.e. guaranteeing democratic rights of the citizens and another, practical

3 Ibid., p. 289.
i.e. actually making use of the given democratic rights. The concept of political participation deals with this practical aspect of the democratic development. It is, therefore, nothing but the process of actualisation of the democratic rights.

Though the concept of political participation is an empirical category, it is not a value-free one. It is a value-loaded concept as it deals with the democratic development which has its own democratic value premises. The understanding of the nature of political participation remains incomplete without the consideration of its value contents and the understanding of empirical actuality of political development is meaningless unless it is understood in terms of its ultimate ideal goals.

Thus, the concept of political participation is an empirical theoretical category which explains the empirical real nature of the process of democratisation in the light of the ultimate objective of democratic development. Any empirical concept that deals with development or modernisation has both the normative - ideal and the empirical-real contents. The understanding of the nature of the crisis of the participation development depends on the basic understanding of the ideal and real views regarding the nature of the political participation in terms of the political development. It is, therefore, necessary to understand the normative-ideal and the empirical-real nature of the concept of political participation.
Ideal Content

Political participation, as an explanatory concept of the democratic development, has two important democratic value premises, the principle of majority participation and the principle of equality. The ultimate goal of the democratic development in its political sense is the maximum (or nearly total) participation and equal influence on the governmental actions. In the process of democratic development, therefore, from the ideal point of view, the trend should be one of the maximisation and the equalisation of participation. Democratic development in this sense means the development of mass participation. Two schools of thought, liberal and revolutionary democrats, believe in these value premises of the maximum and equal participation.

Liberal Democrats:

Liberal democrats like Rousseau, Mill, G.D.H. Cole and Lord Bryce have supported the view that democratization is a process of the maximisation and equalisation of participation. Lord Bryce defined democracy as "government in which the will of the majority of political citizens values."\(^5\) Rousseau in his "Social Contract" clearly stressed the role of individual participation in decision-making.\(^6\) The equality principle which was

---

a core concept of democratic liberalism was expressed in terms of adult franchise and one man one vote system. Political equality, according to the liberal democrats, includes three specific points: (1) equal universal suffrage, (2) social equality, and (3) equality of opportunity. Rousseau, while stressing the importance of the principle of equality, said, "The only policy that will be acceptable to all is the one where any benefits and burdens are equally shared; the participatory process ensures that political equality is made effective in the decision-making assembly."

Revolutionary Democrats:

Lenin has clearly stated, "democracy means equality." Further, while talking on transition to socialist democracy, he said, "But it is important to realize how infinitely mendacious is the ordinary bourgeoisie conception of socialism as something lifeless, petrified, fixed once for all, whereas in reality only under socialism will a rapid, genuine, really mass forward..."

---


8 According to G.D.H. Cole theoretical democrats ignored the fact that vast inequalities of wealth and status, resulting in vast inequalities of education, power and control of environment are necessarily fatal to any real democracy whether in politics or any other sphere.

9 Rousseau, op.cit.

movement, embracing first majority and then the whole of the population commence in all spheres of public and personal life."\textsuperscript{11} MaoTse Tung has also stressed to firmly believe in the majority of the people.\textsuperscript{12}

In a nutshell, maximum and equal participation i.e., mass participation (a mass developmental approach) is the normative ideal content of the democratic development.

\textbf{Empirical - Real Content}

The Western (including American) behavioralists do not consider the issue of democratic development from the mass developmental approach. According to them, empirical scienticism has nothing to do with ideal value premises but it deals only with value-free actuality and reality. According to them, if viewed from value-free empirical angle, the democratic development is not a process of maximisation and equalisation of participation and not a mass developmental one. Political participation, as they empirically observe, is minimum and differential. Very few people participate and those who participate exert unequal influence. The concept of political development, therefore, is a concept of elite development. There are

\textsuperscript{11} Ibid., p. 171.

\textsuperscript{12} MaoTse Tung/"Firmly believe in the majority of the people", (Oct. 13, 1957) - Speech at the 13th Session of the Supreme State Conferences.
two important schools of thought that agree to the acceptance of the historico-empirical reality of democratic development as a differential and minimum participation. First is the school of elitists and another is of polyarchists.

Elitists:

Elitism of Mosca,13 Robert Michels14 and others15 does not believe in the concept of rule by many but in the concept of rule by few. They pretend that their advocacy of elitism is not based on the grounds of meritocracy or technocracy but of historicity. If it is a fact that people are ruled by elite, one must believe in rule by elite.

Polyarchists:

The polyarchists like Robert Dahl, Joseph Schumpeter, Berelson and Gavain Sartori believe in polyarchism i.e. rule by both elite and masses. According to Robert Dahl, it is "a mixture of elite rule and democracy."16 In Schumpeter's theory

---

of democracy, participation has no special or central role. All that is entailed is that enough citizens participate to keep the electoral machinery - the institutional arrangements - working satisfactorily. The focus of the theory is on the minority of leaders. "The electoral mass", says Schumpeter "is incapable of action other than a stampede." According to Berelson, limited participation and apathy have a positive function for the whole system by cushioning the shock of disagreement, adjustment and change. According to Sartori, people must 'react', they do not 'act', to the initiatives and policies of the competing elites.

In short, according to the polyarchists, political equality refers to universal suffrage and equality of opportunity, of access to channels of influence over leaders. Participation, so far as the majority is concerned, is participation in the choice of decision-makers.

Thus, empiricism of the western behavioralists, based on elitism and polyarchism does not believe in the mass developmental goals of maximisation and equalization of participation. According to them, it has been proved empirically that

people's participation in decision-making is minimum; the majority never decides; the trend is not of maximisation, people never equally influence; in short, participation is minimum and differential. This is clearly an elite developmental approach which believes in more participation and more influence of very few privileged people of the society.

Now, theoretically, the crisis of the development of participation is clear. It has emerged out of the above discussed ideal-real contents of the political participation. Ideally participation should be maximum and equal but really it is minimum and differential. And, therefore, crisis of the development of participation is a crisis of low and differential participation.

Let me further explain and extend this dichotomy of development of participation on participation dimensions.

Dimensions of Participation:

The in-depth understanding of the nature of the crisis of participation development requires some explanation of the dimensional scope of the political participation. The political participation has the following three important dimensions:

1. Involvement,
2. Information,
3. Institution.
Involvement

Involvement is an acting aspect of the political participation. It includes the extent of involvement on different activity dimensions. There are different participatory activities in which people take part. These participatory activities are generally divided into two groups, one uni-activity and another multi-activity group. Usually it is called uni-dimensional and multi-dimensional participation.

Now, we shall discuss in brief, the meaning of and the differences between the uni- and the multi-activity participation and their decision-making influencing capabilities.

Uni-activity Participation:

The Uni-activists' proposition is that the electoral activity or the ballot box politics is the only real means through which people can effectively participate in and directly influence decision-making. It is through electioneering


(Continued on next page)
(voting) that voters elect their decision-makers (rulers) and control their own fate. Electoral activity includes voting and voting-supporting activities. George Dupex's 'Participation Index' based on A. Campbell's model, includes only four activities: (1) Voting, (2) Attendance at public meetings, (3) Reading of electoral posters, (4) Efforts at persuasion. But this does not mean that they totally neglect non-electoral activities. What they do is that they attach all importance to the ballot box activity and consider voting as a real and final deciding device of political participation. Even Biplab Dasgupta and W.H. Morris Jones, while accepting the importance of non-electoral behaviour, finally say, "Particularly in the newly independent countries, system stability, strength and legitimate credibility, all depend on enlarged mass electoral activity." 

20 (Continued from the previous page)


See also the work done by V.M. Shirsiyar, S.D. Sharma, A100 Dastur, Kini and others on Voting Behaviour in India.


Multi-activity Participation:

For the clear-cut understanding, the multi-activity participation should be sub-divided into two groups, one covering the electoral and few non-electoral or between the election activities but not many or all; and another covering many or nearly all legitimate activities. The former is called the middle-recourse approach and the latter is called the broad approach.

Middle Recourse Approach:

N.H. Nie and Sidney Verba cover all electoral and those few non-electoral activities which "more or less directly aim at influencing the section of governmental personnel and/or the actions they take." Nie and Verba exclude from their 'more or less directly efficacious activity syndrome' the following three activity types: (1) 'Ceremonial' or a 'support' activities, that is "expressing support for the government by marching in the parades, working hard in developmental projects, participating in youth groups organised by the government or voting in ceremonial elections." (2) Attitude behaviour activities i.e. sense of efficacy or one's civic norms, and (3) Semi- or non-political activities.

---


24 Ibid., See p.1.
types of eco-cultural activities. Explaining their views on non-indexing of these activities, Nie and Verba argue that "the distinction is important, especially in an area when so much attention is focussed on the political mobilisation of citizens in 'support' sense. This is what is meant by participation in many of the developing countries of the world and often in the developed as well. In contrast, the kind of participation, in which we are interested, - perhaps it should be labelled as democratic participation - works the other way: it emphasizes a flow of influence upward from the masses and, above all, it does not involve support for a pre-existing unified national interest but is a part of a process by which the national interest or national interests are created." It is true that normally and usually, democratic acts should be people-initiated, having upward influence flow, but this does not mean that all government initiated 'support' activities are undemocratic. If government-initiated activities are support activities to the democratically pre-decided policies and programmes, then such activities should be called the democratic activities. True, there may be undemocratic, authoritarian activities initiated by the government, but then such activities help to develop the democratic consciousness and the practice of learning the lessons and rectifying the process.

25 Ibid., p. 2.
Broad Approach:

A very broadly conceptualised proposition is that political participation is a multi-activity phenomenon which covers all those legal activities and types which more or less directly or indirectly influence decision-making and the governmental affairs. According to Herbert MacClosky, the term 'political participation' refers to "those voluntary activities by which members of a society share in the selection of rulers and directly or indirectly in the formation of public policy." According to John Stuart Mill, "the only government which can fully satisfy all the exigencies of the social state is one in which the whole people participate; any participation, even in the smallest public function, is useful; the participation should everywhere be as great as the general degree improvement of the community will allow; and nothing less can be ultimately desirable than the admission of all to a share in the sovereign power of the state." Mathews and Prothro have defined political participation as "all behaviour through which people directly


27 Herbert MacClosky, op cit., p. 252.

express their political opinions.\textsuperscript{29} L.W. Milbrath included fifteen activities under three-fold hierarchical classification (Gladiator-Transitional - Spectator) on an active-passive continuum, but excluded political demonstration from his paradigm.\textsuperscript{30} Robert, E. Lane deals only with the ways the people take part in and not with the political preferences.\textsuperscript{31}

It is clear from the above discussion that uni-activity is an electoral activity and multi-activity is an electoral-plus-non-electoral activity. Of these two activity types, the multi-activity type appears to be more capable of influencing and controlling the governmental affairs than the uni-activity type. The following are the reasons of the high capability of the multi-activity type:

1) It includes all legitimate 'direct actions' (including street demonstrations) and 'institutionally organised' activities.

2) It is through these activities that people can control and influence governmental actions in the inter-election period. Elections do not occur frequently, they occur periodically, and hence the problem remains to control and influence governmental efforts of framing and


\textsuperscript{30} L.W. Milbrath, op. cit., p. 18.

\textsuperscript{31} Robert E. Lane, op. cit., p. 15.
implementing the policies and programmes during this period. It is here where the multi-activity approach is of the utmost importance.

3) In the democratic process, people cannot and should not wait to control, to influence and to change the governmental policies and programmes till the next elections. People should constantly and consciously control and influence the governmental actions. The multi-activity approach is thus a constant and conscious participation approach.

To conclude, the multi-activity type possesses more amount of the controlling and influencing capability than the uni-activity type.

Information

Information is a thinking or knowing aspect of the political participation. Political participation, in fact, is a process of both acting and thinking. Lasswell and Kaplan's view of considering politicization, "not a matter of individual's thought but rather of his behaviour" appears to be one sided. P.B.Converse and G. Dupex have rightly stated that, "Politicization

32 L.W.Milbrath defines politicization as the amount of interest in, knowledge about, and conceptual sophistication of politics held by a person.

includes both thought and behaviour. Intensive and extensive democratization depends upon the development of both the acting and thinking aspects which are inseparable parts of the whole process. The development of acting and thinking is an interdependent phenomenon. Sound thinking requires extensive experience of acting and conscious acting requires correct information and sound knowledge of the fact, process or phenomena.

At one end of the thinking process is information receiving and storing, and at the other end is information transmitting into an act. According to Jesse H. Shera, "society is a duality of action and thought, bound together by a communication system that itself is duality of mechanism and message which is transmitted as well as the manner of its transmission." Information is knowledge which functions as a stimuli to transfer it into an act. Thus receiving and storing information (knowledge) is a prelude to acting. According to Robert E. Lane, "while reading, listening and viewing material in the media are sometimes substitutes for civic or political action (narcotizing dysfunction); usually they are preliminary to such actions."

In short, participation development depends on the development

---

of information receiving and information storing. The process of receiving information is a process of communicating information i.e. exposing oneself for information and the process of storing information is a process of accumulating knowledge. Thus exposing oneself to information and accumulating knowledge are two important successive stages at the beginning end of the thinking process.

Information Exposure:

Information communication plays a very important role in making people politically sociable and knowledgeable. Information is always communicated through communication agents. Mass media are the most important communication agents. The invention and development of mass media as an information multiplier has brought about revolution in the field of mass communication. There are two groups of the agents of mass communication: one is of reading and writing skills, that is newspapers and magazines etc., and another is of non-reading or writing skills, that is radio, film and T.V. Information is communicated even to the illiterate through the media of non-reading or writing skills like film or T.V.

Mass media as an agent of information communication performs the following functions:

---

1) As Daniel Lerner has described, it functions as a mobility multiplier.\textsuperscript{38}

2) It opens to the large masses of mankind the infinite vicarious universe.\textsuperscript{39}

3) It disseminates political information and opinion to the large masses.\textsuperscript{40}

4) It helps to persuade people.\textsuperscript{41}

5) It develops the sense of direct participation.\textsuperscript{42}

6) It affects attention, information, interest and action.\textsuperscript{43}

Thus mass media functions as a participation multiplier.

\textbf{Political Knowledge:}

Information storing is as much important as information receiving. As discussed above, information storing is important as it may function as a stimuli to act. In simple terms,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{38} Ibid., p. 53
  \item \textsuperscript{39} Ibid., p. 53
  \item \textsuperscript{40} Leo Bograt, Communication, Mass Audiences, International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, Vol. 3, 1968, p. 72.
  \item \textsuperscript{41} Ithiel De Sola Pool, TV: A New Dimension in Politics; See in Eugene Burdick, Arthur J. Brodbeck (ed.), American Voting Behaviour (1959) p. 236-261.
  \item \textsuperscript{42} Leo Bograt, op. cit., p. 72.
  \item \textsuperscript{43} Ithiel De Sola Pool, Communication, Political: Introduction, International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences, p. 92.
\end{itemize}
information storing means knowing the fact. Fact-knowing is very important in the process of developing the thinking aspect and stimulating the acting aspect. The level of political knowledge helps to know the general level of political consciousness and potentiality of political efficacy. The understanding of the level of political knowledge, therefore, deserves proper attention in the study of the development of political participation.*

Institution

The process of democratic development, like any other process of development, necessarily leads to institution-building. Institution building is a process of planned, structured, guided and relatively stable development. According to Samuel Huntington,

* Note: The discussion of the information aspect is limited only to the level of information and not to the direction or orientation. In fact, the discussion on the information aspect is incomplete without dealing with the social nature of controlling authorities of information communication process, the nature of ideological and programmatic contents etc. In short, who controls the media and what kind of information is communicated are very important aspects which are not discussed here. My objective is to study the level of the participation and not direction and hence the direction part is omitted from this discussion. (Please see methodological Chapter.)
"institutionalisation is a planned and guided social change." According to Milton J. Esman and Hans Blaise, institution building may be defined as planning, structuring and guidance of new or reconstituted organizations which (a) embody changes in values, functions, physical and/or social technologies (b) establish, foster and protect new normative relationships and action patterns, and (c) obtain support and complementarily in the environment.

In the process of development, political participation appears to be of two types, one institutional and another non-institutional. Institutional participation means planned, guided, structured and relatively stable action and thought patterns. According to Bastiaan Vander Esch, "democracy is the ability of every citizen to play some kind of institutionalised political role in the society in which he lives." What is meant by non-institutional participation? Non-institutional participation means unplanned, unguided, unstructured and unstable "support" participation. "Support" to whom? Support to institutional participants. This non-institutional support participation is


always a type of mobilisation that is initiated by institutional participants in their own interests.

It is through institutionalisation that decision-making can be controlled effectively. Karl J, Friedrich, has aptly stated that, "organised (institutionalised) political communities are better adapted to reaching decisions and developing policies than unorganised communities." According to Samuel Huntington, "a society with highly institutionalised governing organisations and procedures is, in this sense, more able to articulate and achieve its public interests." According to Bastiaan Vander Esch, "What is meant by a political democracy is a society whose institutions are so arranged that they afford to each citizen the maximum amount of control over his destiny through political action." Thus, institutionalisation becomes the necessary stage in the process of political development. It becomes the crucial test in understanding the nature of participation development in particular, and political development in general.

Let us now turn our attention to the explanation of the participation crisis in terms of the participation dimensions.

Explanation of Crisis in terms of Participation Dimensions:

(A) Ideally, the maximum and equal participation in terms

47 Karl J. Friedrich, Man and His government
of participation dimensions means:

1) The masses, that is - large majority, should be involved in many activities.

2) Large sections of masses should have access to information and should have knowledge.

3) Mass participation should be an institutionalised one.

(B) And in reality, the minimum and differential participation in terms of participation dimensions means:

1) It is the elites (the privileged few) and not the masses that involve in many activities.

2) Very few people have access to information and very few people are knowledgeable.

3) The Elite participation is an institutionalised one and the mass participation is a support mobilisation.

In short, the mass participation is uni-activity participation with low level of mass media exposure, low level of political knowledge and low level of institutionalisation. The Elite participation is multi-activity participation with high level of mass media exposure, high level of political knowledge and high level of institutionalisation. Thus participation, is

50 N.H. Nie and S. Verba; and L.W. Milbrath have elaborated the concept of differential participation. See N.H. Nie and S. Verba, Oppcit. p. 7 and L.W. Milbrath, op. cit, p. 9.
not a mass developmental but an elite developmental one. Therefore, it may be concluded that the crisis of the democratic development is a crisis of the low and differential participation of the people.

*Causes of Low and Differential Participation:*

Once we arrive at the conclusion that the disease of political development is mainly the disease of low and differential participation, the diagnosis of this disease becomes the urgent and important task. The following are the so far searched out causal explanations of the "low and differential" participation.

I. Individual's Social Status Differentiation:

The individual's status is the cause of differential participation. Political participation, in a vertically stratified society, is always a function of individual's social status.\(^5\)

Individual social status in such societies is always a differential one. This status differentiality, according to behavioralists, is determined by the complexity of different socio-economic variables.\(^5\)

According to the Marxists, it is determined primarily by the economic variables and secondarily by the other


socio-cultural variables.\textsuperscript{53} Samuel Huntington and Nie and Verba explains participation more concretely in terms of social status factors. According to Samuel Huntington, "status model is relevant to all the systems, especially to developing societies and there seems to be a significant and positive correlation in almost all political systems between political participation and socio-economic status measured by such indicators as class or caste differentiation, income levels, occupation, education and levels of literacy and the like. This phenomenon is also related to organizational involvement and a sense of civic obligation and personal efficacy."\textsuperscript{54} According to Nie and Verba, "most studies have shown that participation is accompanied by a syndrome of supportive attitudes - a sense of political efficacy, information about politics, a sense of obligation to participate. In turn these civic attitudes are associated with certain socio-economic characteristics; higher social status such as advanced education, increased income; higher status occupations;

\textsuperscript{53} K. Marx and F. Engles, Selected Works, Vol. I, Moscow, Foreign Language Publishing House, 1950, pp. 443-444: The economic situation is the basis, but various elements of the super structure - political, juridical, philosophical theories, religious views and their future development into system of dogmas, also exercise their influence upon the course of the historical struggles and in many cases preponderate in determining their form.

\textsuperscript{54} Norman D Palmer, Elections and Political Freedom, Vikas, New Delhi, 1976, p. 61.
exposure to mass media; exposure to an urban environment.  

In short, the people of high social status participate more and participate more effectively than the people of low social status.

II. Apathy:

Apathy is a psychological concept. This model explains the minimum and differential participation in terms of the lack of motivation. According to Angus Campbell, passivity has roots in the personality traits and basic predispositions of the individual.

III. Alienation:

Individual's alienation from the process of political participation is also a cause of the low and differential participation. Alienation model states that people are made indifferent to or turned away from the process of political participation. The causes of this type of alienation are fear, feeling of affliction and impotence; lack of time, money, energy and


56 Apathy means lack of emotion or lack of interest, (The dictionary definition).

57 Angus Campbell, The Passive Citizen - The Psychological content; see Political opinion and Behaviour (edt.) by Dreyer and Rosenbaum; Wadsworth Publishing Co, Inc, Belemont, California, 1970, p. 282, 286 and 293.
IV. Fear and Discrimination:

This model explains the minimality and differentiability of participation in terms of economic coercion or economic intimidation. The fear of economic coercion or discrimination, as hypothesized by this model is mainly due to economic dependence. Economic dependence, however, is interpreted not merely in terms of income but more accurately and crucially in terms of the source of income.

Cures for the Problem of Low and Differential Participation:

If the important causes of the low and differential participation are the individual's social status differentiation, alienation, apathy and economic discrimination, then the cure lies in removing them. Some of the important cures suggested by theoreticians working on this problem are discussed below:

I. Modernization:

According to modernization theoreticians, the best cure to develop mass democratic participation and to solve the problem

---


60 Ibid., p. 1288 and 1295.
of low and differential participation lies in the socio-economic modernisation of the traditional and underdeveloped countries.

"Increases in socio-economic modernity and the expansion of political participation seemingly march hand in hand through history." They give the following reasons in support of their view: one, participation is an outgrowth of modernisation. Development of participation depends upon the development of industrialisation, urbanisation, communication, education and social organisation which are the structural ingredients of the process of modernisation. Two, mass participation is possible only in a modern society. Traditional social structure has negative impact on participation of the masses at large. Di Palma, submitting to this view, cites a case of Italy and proves

61 Samuel P. Huntington and J. I. Damigues, Political Development, see Handbook of Political Science, Vol. 3 (edt.) by F. J. Greenstein and N. W. Polsby.


63 Daniel Lerner, The Passing of Traditional Society, Glencoe: The Free Press; He has discussed his communication model.


negative relationship between traditional social structure and participation. According to him, in Italy (comparatively traditional and underdeveloped) social skills and economic opportunities important for participation are in the hands of a privileged minority. In his own words: "thus a social structure like Italy's doubly handicaps mass participation: it produces a large number of individuals who, because of their disadvantaged social position, do not participate, and it makes these particular individuals, compared to individuals of more advantageous social position, especially unlikely to participate." Third, modernisation functions as a participation multiplier by providing and creating all the necessary instruments of mass democratic development. It provides technical instruments, skills and necessary organisations and associations. Fourth, modernisation functions as a participation equalizer by providing the possibilities of equal opportunities to acquire new skills and to develop inherent potentialities. By guaranteeing equal opportunities to multiplied resources, it expands the proportion of higher-status roles in a society; more people become literate, educated, better-off financially.

Thus, modernisation equalizes and multiplies participation.

In the words of Di Palma, "if the nation-state succeeds in its
modernizing efforts - if it creates a dynamic socio-economic environment, protects and fosters political equality, maintains an effective policy-making machine, and, in general, strengthens its institutions - then society creates some of the conditions of solidarity and equality necessary for participation in a national community. 

II. Class Organization:

Advocates of the class organization approach do not believe in the view that modernity is highly correlated with participation. According to them, if the link between modernisation and participation is strong, it is mainly due to class organisations. Independent of class organization, the link between modernisation and participation would be very weak. Modernisation at best guarantees elite development but not mass development. The opportunities of equal and maximum participation that modernisation provides are of formal type and not real. The result is that modernisation in itself functions neither as a "participation-multiplier" nor as a "participation-equalizer." It functions only as a "mass support mobiliser" in the interest of elite development. It appears that modernisation creates within itself the individual social status differentiation.

67 Di Palma, op. cit., p. 18

68 Alessandro Pizzorno, The Individualistic Mobilization of Europe, see S.R.Graubard's (edt.) A New Europe 7 1904.

feeling of alienation and fear of economic discrimination.\(^6\)
The remedy then lies in building up strong class organisations of the people. Class organisations, even independent of high modernisation show strong relationship with participation. What is the possible explanation of this relationship? In an unbalanced, unequal, uneven development and vertically stratified modern social structure, class organisation alone guarantees the redistribution of power and resources which are unequally distributed. Class organisation provides ideology, leadership, institution, and unity of interest to redistribute power and resources. It removes the feeling of inferiority of status, alienation and fear of economic discrimination. Class organisation, thus becomes a device with the help of which people can equally control the political decision-making and ultimately take the powers in their own hands. In short, class organisation helps to create democratic consciousness in the minds of people.

Finally, to conclude, the crisis of the development of political participation is the crisis of low and differential participation. Ideally participation should be maximum and equal but really it is minimum and unequal. The trend should be mass

\(^6\) Di Palma, op. cit., p. 20.

While discussing the limitations of modernisation, he clearly stated that "modernisation obviously does not eliminate social stratification and inequality and their negative effects on participation. At best it develops civil, political and social rights that balance social inequalities. Actually, citizenship— as we may refer to these rights— often maintains and supports the inequalities of social stratification."
developmental but it is elite developmental. The causes of this crisis are individual social status differentiation, apathy, alienation and fear of economic discrimination. The cures so far suggested to this problem are modernization and class organization.

In the light of the theoretical statement discussed above, the general problem posed in this study is to grasp, explain and compare empirically the nature of the crisis of development of political participation, its causes and cures in the given Indian local communities; and to test these findings against available data on Indian national and cross-national participation patterns. This is discussed below in a more concretized form into two parts: first dealing with the objectives of this study and second, with the context of referents i.e., Indian local communities.

**Objectives**

For convenience, elucidation and clarity, the objectives are further divided into four categories according to the sequence given above in a general statement of the problem i.e., (1) the nature of the crisis, (2) its causes, (3) its cures and (4) suggestions.

1) to explore the level of extension of political participation in terms of its involvement, information and institutional aspects in the given Indian urban and
rural communities; to analyse the trends of development and to find out whether they are of 'maximum and equal' or 'minimum and differential'; to compare the emerging participation patterns of these local communities among themselves; and to test them against national and cross national participation patterns available at hand.

2) to apply given causal models (given in the above discussed theoretical statement) to explain participation reality that will emerge out of our data collected from Indian local communities and with this to find out more or less significant causes of the problem of 'low and differential participation'; an attempt would also be made to put these causal models into comparative perspective; this comparative perspective would not be limited only to local community patterns but would also test certain hypotheses which have national and cross-national validity.

3) In a study like this which aims at focussing mainly on exploration of participation extension and causation of participation differentiation, this author could not avoid applying cure models to the given problem. But this could be done in brief and in a summary fashion.

4) And finally an attempt would be made to give an overall assessment of our findings in the context of discussing those theoretical issues which have become the issues
of debate among the western and American Academicians working on developmental and comparative politics taking the third world countries as their referents. In doing this, if this author reaches to the point of suggesting something which will be useful either in practical or academic life, an attempt would be made in that direction also.

The Context of Referents

As the objective of the study is to explain political participation at community level, three Indian local communities are selected. Of these communities, first is urban (a newly developing urban centre), second, peripheral (a rural centre on the periphery of the urban) and third, interior (a rural, one far away from the urban centre). These three communities are introduced fully and comparatively in the chapter on methodology. The focus here is only on the factors of necessity and propriety of selecting these Indian local community situations to explain political participation. In doing so, I have avoided explaining the concept of community in general and the concept of Indian local community in particular and have given stress on citing the reasons of selecting these local community situations. Three reasons can be ascertained in support of this:

1) The first is non-availability of many studies on political participation in Indian local community situations. Studies of such nature are amply available in the United States
and the Western countries. But they are not easily available in India. There are very few studies which depict national level picture and fewer which attempt a comparative perspective of cross-national political reality in which India is one referent. Despite these national and cross-national level studies, there are local community level studies but most of them have dealt only with the electoral politics or voting behaviour. They have not given proper attention to the political behaviour during non-electoral periods. The special merit of this study is that it focuses mainly on in-depth exploration of non-electoral type with electoral one and multi-dimensional political behaviour of the people at community level.

2) The second reason is the fitness of Indian conditions for conducting such microscopic, in-depth behavioural studies. India represents constitutionally and even to some extent practically an open, competitive, multiple type political model. Despite the fact to a very large extent of one party rule for a very long period, it was and is not a closed polity. At group levels, it has always remained a competitive one. More concretely it can be said that, it was an imperfect competition under the dominance of a single party. Further, the Indians have adopted, practised and experienced the parliamentary type of democracy for over a period of more than 30 years. This, in fact, is a unique case in the period of erosion of parliamentary democracy in the rest of the developing world. Constitutionally Indian people have been provided with the guarantee to enjoy democratic rights fully and freely throughout this period till the
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declaration of emergency in the month of June, 1975. However, it yet remains to find out as to what extent the people have actually used these democratic rights by participating in the political process of the country. The present study aims at focussing on that aspect also.

3) The third and the last reason is the practice of grass-root democracy in India in general and in Maharashtra in particular. A very important fact regarding democratic functioning in Indian polity is that its super-structure level parliamentary forms solidly rest on democratic functioning at local levels. Local communities are politically run by Panchayati Raj Institutions in the rural communities and corporations and municipalities in the urban communities. In both the rural and urban communities, the principle adopted in their political functioning is of participatory democracy. The implicit idea here is that of running the local governments by the people themselves. However, it remains to be seen to what extent they govern themselves. It is by finding an answer to this question that we can get the real picture of democratic development in India.

The above cited three reasons show us that Indian local community is a very good model to conduct either behavioural or institutional studies and to develop the discipline of micro-politics.