CHAPTER - I
Political parties have come to play an increasingly important role in modern political life, and many observers regard them as essential agents in the social, political, and economic development of a mass society. The purpose of this chapter is to indicate that a political system consists of several parts and that one of its most important parts is political parties. The chapter also focuses on the problem of political development, for in the literature on political system, the role of political parties has been differentiated on the basis of the developed and developing countries.

Section A: Political System: Definition and Concept

Before going into the definition and the concept of "political parties and political development" in general, let us understand what the concept of "political system" is. The term 'political system' refers to the study of government in its empirical dimensions and from a strictly interdisciplinary approach. A political system is,
therefore, "a set of interrelated variable conceived to be politically relevant and treated as if they could be separated from other variables not immediately relevant to politics". ¹

The concept has certainly acquired wide currency, for the reason that it "directs attention to the entire scope of political activities within a society, regardless of where in the society such activities may be located". ²

---


2. Defining the term, Almond and Powell write: "When we speak of the political system, we include all the interactions which affect the use or threat of the use of legitimate physical coercion. The political system includes not only governmental institutions such as legislatures, courts, and administrative agencies, but all the structures in their political aspects. Among these are traditional structures such as kinship ties, and caste groupings; and anomie phenomena such as assassinations, riots and demonstrations; as well as formal organisations like parties, interest groups and media of communications". G.A. Almond and B. Powell, Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach (Boston, Mass: Little Brown, 1966), p. 117.
The important authors on this subject are Gabriel A. Almond and David Easton. A political system, in brief, is the structure which performs certain functions for a society. It also contributes to the formulation of legitimate policy decisions, which members of the society accept as being in conformity with their conceptions of authority and purpose.

Almond names three properties, viz. comprehensiveness, interdependence and the existence of boundaries, as essential to a political system. The five characteristics of a political system, according to Almond, are:

3. Almond writes: "What we propose is that political system is that system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which perform the functions of integration and adaptation (both internally and vis-a-vis other societies) by means of the employment, or threat of employment, of more or less legitimate, order-maintaining or transforming system in the society...... operation." Almond, Op.cit., pp. 7-8.
1 universality of political system;
(2) universality of political structures;
(3) universality of political functions;
(4) multi-functionality of political structure; and
(5) culturally mixed character of political system.  

Almond thus propounds a theory which explains how political systems change from one type to another, particularly from the traditional to the modern.2

1. Speaking of mixed character of political system Almond Says: "What is useful in these concepts of multi-functionality, cultural dualism, and political acculturation is that they set aside once and for all the geographic, cultural and analytical polarizations which have plagued our efforts at social and political comparison. We have been talking of "modern" and "pre-modern" developed and under-developed", 'industrial' and 'agrarian', 'western and non-western' or the Parsonian Syndromes of universalism - specificity - achievement affective neutrality. The universe of political system is less tractable to simple contrasts than we have supposed. We need dualistic models rather than monistic ones, and development as well as equilibrium models, if we are to understand differences precisely and grapple effectively with the process of political change". Almond, Op.cit., p. 25.

While defining the concept of political system, he has obviously had certain basic assumptions in his mind. First, he assumes that political change can be perceived in terms of development alone—traditional, transitional and modern. Secondly, being a structural-functionalist, he prefers to identify the function of the polity in modern Western systems and then to pursue his analysis of political modernization in non-Western areas by investigating how these functions, which are associated with distinctive political activities in Western systems, are performed elsewhere. Thirdly, he regards the political system as a set of interactions between the roles adopted by the individuals in a society. Yet another assumption is that political systems are "open phenomena" in that they interact with, and are influenced by, entities and systems beyond their boundaries and environments.¹

A political system of each country should be described in reference to a particular figure

¹ Maxton R. Davis and Vaughan A. Lewis, Models of Political Systems (Delhi: Vikas, 1971), p. 34.
of structures and functions in which each element would be shown to be 'involved' by performing in part a number of functions. ¹ Almond presents a seven-fold classification of the functional variables in his input-output model.²

The name of David Easton also needs special attention with regard to the concept of political system as well as model of input-output analysis. His input-output analysis has three variables in the form of demands, supports and feedbacks. In other words, he lays stress on the point that a political system is operated by the forces of environment. These forces appear in the form of demands on the system and the decisions of the men in power who take decisions in order to allocate binding values to them. He calls input-output


² Almond categorizes four input-output functions: (1) political socialization and recruitment; (2) interest articulations; (3) interest aggregation; and (4) political communication. The three output functions are: (1) rule-making; (2) rule application; and (3) rule adjudication.

²Weidenfield and Nicholson,
analysis "a flow model of the political system."^1

Relevance of Political Development Approach to Study Political Systems

However, we are not concerned here with the concept of political system in any specific way. The focus of our attention is on the specific role that political parties play in the political system of the developing societies. The political development approach to the study of political systems has become quite popular in recent years. In brief, the term "political development" refers to a dynamic process of nation-building, modernisation,

---

1. He says: "Thus, a systems analysis of political life rests on the idea of a system imbedded in an environment and subject to possible environmental influences that threaten to drive the essential variables of the system beyond their critical range. Such an analysis suggests that, to persist the system must be capable of responding with measures that alleviate that stress. The actions of the authorities are particularly critical in this respect. But, if they are able to respond, they must be in a position to obtain information about what is happening so that they may react insofar as they desire, or are compelled, to do so. With information they may be able to maintain minimal level of support for the system".

and social change in the newly emerging countries. 1

The process of decolonization and nation-building which involved both disintegration and re-integration of political systems started after the Second World War. It led to the rapid emergence of a series of new states in the Afro-Asian and Latin American regions. A number of scholars were sufficiently attracted by it to undertake empirical and social investigation. As a result, several

---

1. One School of Thought associated primarily with the work of Karl W. Deutsch and Daniel Lerner, gauged modernity in terms of indices such as literacy, urbanisation and access to mass media, with the level of political development or modernisation being conceived as a functional concomitant of the scores of a given society would receive on these indices. Another class of Thought, pioneered by Weber and Durkheim, conceived modernisation in terms of increasing structural differentiation and functional specificity of roles in a given society. Third approach based on Parsonian model, distinguishes traditional and modernity by using a series of pattern variables as criteria. There are other approaches to the concept of political development too.
works were published, pinpointing the concept of political development. What is, however, especially noticeable about the massive literature that was produced is that it "illuminates a situation of semantic confusion", and behind this "confusion" there is a solid basis of argument.

1. These studies centred around assumptions ranging from the "imperatives" of democratic faith to the "logic" of authoritarian necessity. They pinpointed on the importance of several models like the mobilisation, functional models, etc. It placed political system in a three-fold continuum of political development, traditional, transitional and modern.

For a useful survey and critiques of this literature, see:


Section B: Political Development: Meaning, Nature and Scope

Lucian W. Pye's contribution to the concept of political development is clear-cut and vivid.\(^1\) Several political theorists have tried to equate political development with only one aspect of the developmental process. For example, economists like Paul A. Baran, Benjamin Higgins, and others have tried to equate political development as a prerequisite of economic development.\(^2\)

1. He defines the concept of "Political Development" in terms of cultural diffusions, and of adapting, fusing and adjusting old patterns of life to new demands. He emphasized that the first step towards political development was the evolution of nation-state systems which he treated as a "basic concept supporting the gradual diffusion throughout all societies of what we might call a world culture". Lucian W. Pye, Aspects of Political Development (Boston, Little Brown, 1966), p. 33. See also: Lucian W. Pye, Communication and Political Development (Princeton, 1965), p.19.

view, a number of political and social conditions come into play in the process of economic growth, and some of them can play a role decisive enough either to impede or to facilitate economic growth. Some theories seek to establish a link between political development and the pace of industrialization because the former ignores several factors such as forces that threaten the hold of the vested interests, an appreciation of the value of orderly legal and administrative procedures, etc.¹

The concept of political development is also often linked to the operation of nation-states.²


² In this respect, Political Development is considered to be consisting of the organization of political life and the performance of political function in accordance with the standards expected by a modern nation-state. Such idea that political development is identified with the politics of nationalism within the context of socio-political institutions in a modern state has been developed by in the works of: K.H. Silvert, Expectant, Peoples: Nationalism and Development (New York: Random House, 1964), Edward Shils, Political Development in New States (The Hague, 1962); and William McCord, The Springline of Freedom: Evolution of Developing Societies (New York: Oxford University Press, 1965).
Pye, rejecting this view, writes:

"Development entails the translation of diffuse and unorganized sentiments of nation into a spirit of citizenship, and equally the creation of state institutions that can translate into policy and programs, the aspirations of nationalism and citizenship. In brief, political development is nation-building."\(^1\)

Many theorists subscribe to the idea that political development is identical with administrative and legal development.\(^2\) Other scholars consider political development as nothing but political modernization.\(^3\)

---

3. W.H. Morris-Jones writes: "Political Systems and Social change cross and meet at the process of political entry. These processes are the reflectors of social change: They can mirror changes in values, aspirations, perceptions of opportunities, as well as actual structures and roles. At the same time, they exert their own influences in efficiency in selecting persons across their distribution of status and prestige, then efficiency in selecting persons appropriate to the tastes to be carried out; by their flexibility they may contribute to system stability and development, by their rigidity may create points of tension and breakdown". See: W.H. Morris-Jones, *Political Recruitment and Development*, in Colin Leys, ed., *Politics and Change in Developing Countries* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1969), p. 122.
One of the outstanding/ among the earlier works on the process of modernization is by Karl W. Deutsch. He distinguishes between social mobilization and political modernization and considers social mobilization, first as a cause of modernization, and then, over a period of time, as one of its continuing aspects. Karl Von Voys also defines political development within the framework of social mobilization.
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2. Karl Von Voys writes: "It (Political Development) is a process which includes social and economic changes but whose focus is the development of the governmental capacity to direct the course and the rate of social and economic change". "Towards a Concept of Political Development", Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, vol. 19 (March, 1965), p. 358.
The work of Edward A. Shils needs special attention. He classifies the modern political system into two categories, viz. democracy and oligarchy, and their further classification into political and tutelary democracies of the former and modernizing totalitarian and traditional oligarchies of the latter.

Taking political modernization as a valuable touchstone for the stratification of political systems, Shils gives examples of primitive and backward societies where parochial loyalties make it difficult to achieve the norms of modern democratic life like the rule of law and legitimate exercise of political authority; and where the availability of justice in administration and the adjudication process is made difficult, even impossible, owing to the tendency to favour kinsmen, castemen, and co-believers.

In between, we have the case of the developing societies where the inherited body of traditional beliefs, the existing social structure,

scarcity of the human material of politics, and the normal and intellectual qualities of the elites themselves all affect the operation of the political system, revealing its true potentialities and affecting the nature of the ideal sought as well as the means used to attain it.

At the apex of the Shils model, there stand the developed political systems of the world, those which have attained the goal of dynamism, which are concerned with the people, and which are democratic and equalitarian, scientific, economically advanced, sovereign, and influential.¹

A number of writers who have adopted the scheme of classification of political systems on the basis of political modernization have applied this typology by Shils and have modified it.²

---

2. Kautsky and Apter range a few significant types. Kautsky opines that we might analyse political development in terms of five categories: traditional, aristocratic, authoritarian, transitional stage of domination by the nationalist intellectuals, totalitarianism of the aristocracy and totalitarianism of the intellectuals, and democracy. He makes it rather clear that the categorisation "should not be mistaken for an adequate description of any or all existing political systems". John H. Kautsky: Political Change in the Underdeveloped Countries - Nationalism and Communism (New York: Wiley, 1962), p. 4.
David Apter offers a complex but intriguing theory of stages and alternative paths of political development within the larger framework of political modernization.¹

This approach consisting in equating political development with potential modernization is rejected by Lucian W. Pye² and Giovanni Sartori.³

1. Apter gives special attention to the characterisation of traditional societies as the starting points of change, using a two-dimensional classification based on three authority types (hierarchical, pyramidal and segmental) and two value types (instrumental and consummatory). Depending on the character of the traditional base, and subject to the contradicting and varied influences of the western social and political systems, Apter discerns two main developmental consequences: A secular-libertarian model approaching democracy through mobilisation systems and a sacred collectivity model approaching totalitarianism through mobilisation systems. Alternative sequence arise from the processes of ritualisation and "retraditionalisation" leading to non-mercantilism. There is a room in Apter's scheme also for the analysis of modernising autocracies, military oligarchies, and other complex patterns of political modernisation. See: David E. Apter: The Politics of Modernisation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

2. Pye considers that this approach fails to distinguish between the "Western" and the "modern" and ignores the fact that the backward or developing countries may not like to give up for the sake of merely emulating everything that is Western or modern. Pye, Op.cit., pp. 35-36.

3. Pl. see next page..
S.N. Eisenstadt and others give a historical orientation to their concept of political development. Their principal concern is to show (a) how a particular type of political system, viz., a system of historic bureaucratic societies, developed from the traditional system; (b) how the process took shape in these bureaucratic societies; (c) how it managed to maintain (or failed to maintain) a certain balance between the traditional and non-traditional elements in the political system; and (d) how some of these historic bureaucratic
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Sartori argues that "it is an extra-ordinary paradox that the social sciences should be even more prompted to explain politics, by developing a fashion for the "invisible hand". See: Giovanni Sartori, "Sociology of Politics and Politics of Sociology", in S.M. Lipset, ed., Politics and the Social Sciences (New York: Wiley, 1969), p. 94.

societies were transformed into modern political system.¹

Thus, the concept of political development is full of semantic confusion.² One definition

1. "The political development of the historic bureaucratic societies was the result of two pre-requisites: the development by the rulers of "autonomous political-governments" that is goals and aspirations freed from ascriptive-traditional ties; and the availability to the rulers of "free-floating resources" and "generalised political power" both of these being ascriptive-traditional control. The historic bureaucratic societies also exhibited a fairly high degree of social differentiations for it was only the result of the development of new strata and groups that power and resources could be created outside the ascriptive sphere. But, the very processes of social differentiations led to the creation of the principal political institutions of the historic bureaucratic societies: said a centralized bureaucracy, and what Eisenstadt calls "Channels for political struggle" by which he means the institutionalisation of conflict between rulers and various groups and the strata, as well as among these various groups themselves. However, the historic bureaucratic empires maintained a balance between traditional and non-traditional elements. The analysis of the distinction of this balance and of the terms that arose from the efforts to maintain it form the core of Eisenstadt's work". The Political System of Empires (The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1965).

of political development refers to the fact that it is unnecessary and irrelevant to isolate political development too completely from other forms of development. Political development is part of a multi-dimensional process of social change in which no segment of society can lag behind.\(^1\)

However, the concept of political development is fraught with methodological, empirical, and normative difficulties; so much so that it has come for much criticism and has fallen into disuse.\(^2\)

---

1. This concept entails that all forms of development are related, development is much the same as modernisation, and it takes place within a historical context in which influences from outside the society impinge on the process of social changes just as changes in the different aspects of a society - the economy, the polity, and the social order - all impinge on each other.


Thus, the various approaches to the study of political development commonly relate to the general problem of creating, maintaining and expanding the power of the State against a reluctant surrounding. Since this problem is supposed to have reached a happy solution in Europe and America,

1. To sum up, the tradition-modernity continuum approach are divided into "stages" and societies are classified as being traditional, transitional or modern. The modernization criteria (urbanization literacy, GNP, integration, differentiation, etc.) are then used for comparative ranking purposes resulting in broad typologies of which societies are more modern than others.

The structural-functionalism approach conceives 'Development' as the "result when the existing structure and culture of the political system is unable to cope with the problem or challenge which confronts it without further structural differentiation and cultural secularisation". See: G.A. Almond and E. Powell, Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach. (Boston, 1966), p. 34.

Lastly, the political development is viewed by the acquisition of some new capability. A capability, or capacity, is the response of a political system to a developmental "problem" such as natural and industrial revolutions, or 'system crises' such participation, legitimacy, identity etc.

See: Leon and Binder, Crises and Sequences in Political Development. (Princeton, 1971).

the European and American societies are the most modern. In contrast, the newly emerging countries of the Third World are either traditional or non-modern.

**Political Development and Political Decay:**

A discussion on political development will never be complete without referring to the concept of "political decay". It has been suggested that political decay is not opposed to political development and that the two are in fact complementary to each other. It is possible that a state of political decay would lead to the conditions of a more meaningful political development.¹

Huntington's name deserves special attention. He correlated political decay with political development, and notes that institutions decay and dissolve as well as grow and mature. He lays special stress on "reciprocal interaction" between the

¹ Almond and Powell say: "It should also be pointed out that a decline in the magnitude or a significant change in the context of the flow of inputs may result 'development' in the negative or regressive sense. The capabilities of the political system may decline or be over-loaded; roles and structures may atrophy, the culture may regress to a more traditional pattern of orientation". G.A. Almond and B. Powell, *Op. cit.*, p. 34.
ongoing social processes of modernization on the one hand and the strength, stability, and weakness of the traditional, transitional, or modern political structures on the other, and treats the latter as a more determining factor. 1

According to Huntington, the level of political unity that a society achieves reflects the relationship between its political institutions and the social forces that operate in a given society. A social force, in this sense, is a racial, family, religious, territorial, economic, and status group. With modernization, these groupings are supplemented by occupational, class, and skill groupings. A political institution on the other hand is an arrangement for maintaining order, resolving disputes, selecting leaders with power and authority, and

thereby promoting political unity in a political system. 1

In a comparatively little developed system, therefore, a political community may be unified on a purely racial, religious, or occupational basis, and it will have little need for highly developed political institutions. The more complex and varied a society, the more diverse its social groupings, the more it will depend on a high level of political institutions for its existence and maintenance.

Social conflict is, therefore, the very basis of political institutions. And on the basis of this hypothesis, Huntington says that political decay in the developing countries is not antithetical to political development. On the other hand, political

1. Huntington writes: "Historically, political institutions have grown out of the interaction and conflict of social forces and the organizational devices that were gradually developed for dealing with them. Conditions that prepare the way for the development of political organizations include the breaking up of a small, uniform ruling class, the division of social forces into many different groups, and the increased interaction between them. S.P. Huntington, "Political Order and Political Decay", in: Political Order in Changing Societies, (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1968), p. 12.
Section C: Parties and Political Development: A Theoretical Perspective

Political Parties: Origin and Concept:

Parties are one of the foremost signs of "modernity" in a political system. They perform three essential functions: they generate support for a regime; they mobilize and structure public opinion; and they recruit future leaders.

Parties are therefore, one of the major vehicles which play a definite role in the process of institutionalization of the political systems conceived.¹

¹ "Institutionalization is the process by which organizations and procedures acquire value and stability. The level of institutionalization of any political system can be defined by its adaptability, complexity, unity and autonomy. By autonomy, we mean the state and existing or developing without the control of others. If these questions can be compared according to their levels of institutionalization of the particular organizations and procedures within a political system.
of political development in a political system. 1
In other words, in order to understand politics in a society, whether developing or developed, one of the important foci of attention is the working of political parties. Lapalambora and Weiner, argue that the existence of political parties are common to both the developing and developed political systems, irrespective of the fact whether they are

1. A number of students of party system agree that (a) a political system in order to be viable and to succeed in performing tasks of authoritative resource allocation, problems solving, conflict settlement and so on, on behalf of a population of any substantial size, must be institutionalised. In other words, organizations must be created and sustained that are specialized in solving political activity. See: S.P. Huntington, "Political Development and Political Decay", in: Political Order in Changing Societies (Yale University Press, New Haven, 1968).

(b) Robert Dahl speaks of "three great milestones in the development of democratic institutions (1) the right to participate in governmental decisions by casting a vote, (2) the right to be represented and (3) the right of an organised opposition to appeal for votes against the government in the elections and in the parliament. In enumerating these three great achievements of democratic governments, Dahl implies that they are embodied principally in three main institutions: parties, elections and legislatures. See, R.A. Dahl, ed., Political Opposition in Western Democracies (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1960), p. xi.
democratic, totalitarian and authoritative.¹

Party is, therefore, an effective institution which links social forces and ideologies to governmental institutions and serves as a link between the government and public opinion. It is an essential instrument designed to solve the problem of mobilising the new mass of voters into

¹ "The political party is a creature of modern and modernizing political systems, whether one thinks of Anglo-American democracies or totalitarian systems such as the Soviet Union, Fascist Italy and Nazi Germany; emergent African States in the earliest years of independent revolution or Latin American Republics that have hobbled along for over a century, a mammoth democracy or an equally mammoth communist power such as China seeking to mobilise a population through totalitarian methods, the political parties in one form or another is omnipresent". Joseph LaPalambora and M. Weiner, eds., Political Parties and Political Development (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1966), p. 9.
the political community.¹

Parties tend to represent² the interest of

1. The political party emerges whenever the activities of a political system reach a certain degree of complexity, or whenever the notions of political power come to include the idea that the public must participate. Palambar, Joseph La, and Weiner, Myron, eds., Political Parties and Political Development, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).

Eckstein also writes: Parties are one of the foremost signs of "modernity" in a political system. Parties perform three functions: they generate support for a regime or the government, they mobilise and structure public opinion and they recruit future leaders. There are mainly two approaches to the study of parties and political development. Firstly, parties are a dependent variable, which are the result of a socio-economic and political change. Secondly, parties are an independent variable which affects the ability of a society to develop. Political development is seen here as the capacity to meet a number of problems and crises. The specific studies dealing with parties and political development can be divided into three main groups: those based on institutional themes, and those dealing with the various aspects of the process of modernisation. See: Harry Eckstein, "Parties, Political II; Party Systems", in: International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, pp. 436-455.

2. Representation is not only an instrument of manipulation but also a means of political adjustment to social presences. The purpose of representation is to locate the combinations of relationship between parties and social bases which make possible the functioning of an efficient government. Such a view is entertained by S.M. Lipset, in his Introduction to the Civil books paper back edition of Robert Michael's Political Parties (New York, Dover, 1959), p. 54.
social groups that exist in a political system. It systematizes and expresses its ideology, unites the individual with the community, enhances the voters' participation in the competitive polity and also tends to widen the area of his free choice in the selection of their rulers.¹

Democratic governments have pyramidal structures with wide base and narrow tops. As such, it becomes imperative in a democratic political system that living contact be developed between

1. The classical definition that "Political Party is a body of men for promoting the national interests on some particular principles in which they are all agreed has become rather outdated. Others argue that political parties have become essentially political institutions "to implement the objectives of interest groups".

Edmund Burke, Thoughts on the Causes of the Present Discontent, 1970, p. 16.

However, Sigmund Neumann suggests: "A definition of party might as well begin with its simple word derivation. To become a party to something always means identification with one group and differentiation from another. Every party in its very essence signifies 'partnership' in a particular organisation and 'separation' from others' by a specific programme."

the leaders and the followers. Thus, parties play an important role by enhancing political participation and also ensures a proper and healthy functioning of democratic institutions in a political system.

Most students of political parties

1. "Democracy can be defined as a process of decision-making in which the leaders are receptive to the preferences of those who are led. In terms of goals, democratic leadership focuses attention on the role and importance of the whole group, to encourage shared decisions, to decentralize responsibility, to take advantages of the ability and talents of all, in short, to activate the entire social body... In conclusion, the formula for democracy is, or should be the following: neither to eliminate nor submit passively to power, but to make it function; to control the leaders in the exercise of this function and to put in office responsible, accountable and capable persons."

   See: Giovanni Sartori, Democratic Theory (Calcutta, 1965), p. 120.
   See also, David Apter "Political Parties" in Harry Eckstein and David Apter, eds., Comparative Politics (New York, 1965), p. 328, for a distinction between the democratic and totalitarian models of party system.


contd...
relate their origin and growth to the emergence of modern democratic government. Max Weber speaks of mass parties of today as "children of plebiscitarian democracy" whose organisational growth from "purely personal followings of the aristocracy" to "parties of notables" to "parties of plebiscitarian democracy" was impelled by the extension of the franchise and the need to organise votes.¹ Such a view is also held by Maurice Duverger. Duverger considers the emergence of parties as an extension of popular suffrage, although he argues that "parliamentary prerogatives" were also a significant factor as well. Parties emerged not only "to organise the elections by means of committees capable of making the candidates known and of canalising the votes in their direction", but also to enable the members of
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parliament, "to group themselves according to what
they have in common, so as to act in concert. 1

But, this view has been criticized by others
who consider party as dangerous to democratic govern-
ment. 2

Role and Functions of Parties in Developing Countries.

The origin and development of parties is
closely connected with democracy which involves the
extension of popular suffrage and parliamentary pre-
rogatives. "The more the right to vote is extended

xxiii-xxiv. See also: Robert Mclver, The Web
Government (Revised edition) (New York: The Free
H.E. Schattsneider, Party Government (New York,
1942).
Clinton Rossiter, Parties and Politics in
America (New York: Cornell University Press,
Otto Kirchner, "The Party in Mass Society",
World Politics, X (October, 1957–July, 1958),
p. 289-94.
Sigmund Neuman, Permanent Revolution (New York,

2. Such views were undertaken by: George Washington,
"Letter to Francis Hopkins", in A. Koch and W.
Pede, eds., The Life and Selected Writings of
Even Vilfredo Pareto in The Mind and Society
and G. Mosca in The Ruling Class, saw in the
party a vehicle for the perpetuation of an
elitist, oligarchic rule within a democratic
framework. For a criticism of their views,
see: J.H. Meisel, The Myth of the Ruling Class
(Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press,
1958).
and multiplied, the more necessary it becomes to organise the elections by means of committees capable of making the candidates known and of canalising the votes in their direction.

This concept of origin of parties and democracy may explain only the emergence of parties in the Western liberal democracies of U.K. and U.S.A. The origin of parties in the developing countries provides an entirely different picture. In case of the latter, the parties originate out of the historical situation of the movement from tradition to modernity and the problems that go with it.

The role and functions of political parties with regard to the problems of development have been identified as national integration, political participation, legitimacy and conflict management. These problems may even exist before the emergence of the political parties and may therefore, be responsible for shaping the types of parties and party system in a country.

Political participation is one of the indexes to the degree of political development in a political system.\(^1\) The modernizing society is often a "plural society" encompassing many religious, racial, ethnic and linguistic groupings.\(^2\) Parties organize participation; party systems affect the rate at which the participation expands. The stability and strength of a party and party system depends upon its level of

---

1. The political party is therefore, a 20th century mechanism designed to solve the problems of bringing 'the people', the new mass of voters, into the political community.

2. "The problem of integrating primordial social forces into a single national political community becomes more difficult. Modernisation also brings into existence and into political consciousness and activity social and economic groups which either did not exist in the traditional society or were outside the scope of politics of traditional society. Either these groups are assimilated into the political system or they become a source of antagonism to and of revolution against the political system. The achievement of political community in a modernising society thus involves both "horizontal" integration of commercial groups and the "vertical" assimilation of social and economic classes". S.P. Huntington, "Parties and Political Stability" in Political Order in Changing Societies (Yale University, New Haven, 1969) p. 397.
institutionalization and its level of participation. A high level of participation combined with low levels of political party institutionalization produces violence and anomic politics. A party with mass support is liable to be stronger than a party with restricted support. Thus, a party system with a mass base is undoubtedly stronger than a party system with a restricted base.

Secondly, the early phases of party development are almost always accompanied by a problem of legitimizing authority. The early phase of a new

1. Political systems which have a balance between participation and institutionalization at low levels both tend to be unstable and insecure unless the expansion of political participation and development of political institutions are carried on simultaneously and vice-versa. These political systems are both politically modern and developed. They have political institutions which can absorb into the system new social forces and the increasing levels of participation produced by modernisation.

2. Huntington writes: "Strong parties require high levels of political institutionalization and high levels of mass support. "Mobilization" and "organization" these twin slogans of communist political action, define precisely the role to party strength. The party and the party system which combine them reconcile political modernisation with political development". Huntington, Op.cit., p. 402.
government is always a period of uncertainty and instability. The instabilities in many of the developing countries are attributed to the establishment of a new political system which demands the participation of new social forces at various levels.¹

Contesting elections, therefore, is one of the primary tasks of the parties in both developing and developed political systems.² Another problem of development which the political parties and party systems face is the problem of national integration. In a developing society, this task demands greater attention. In a political system,

1. Many new nations experiencing no significant economic or social changes are in the throes of political uncertainty while countries with established political systems are experiencing rapid socio-economic changes with little political turmoil. Weiner and Lapalambora, "Impact of Parties on Political Development", in Political Parties and Political Development, Op.cit., p. 408.

2. The "contesting of elections" distinguishes a party from other organizations, organizers and intermediaries in the political process and also from the informal elites of the community, the personal clique, the fluid and restless faction and the basically non-political group - a Church or a Corporation engaged in political activity.
which is characterized by religious differences, ethnic fragmentation, traditional-modernising group conflict, high urban-rural gap etc., the problem of national integration needs greater attention. Lastly, parties and party systems, are effective instruments in the management of political conflict.¹

In the newly emerging countries, the party systems are often faced with these problems of political development simultaneously. Once political parties come into existence, they are confronted with demands for broader participation, which is often accompanied by crises of leadership, national integration and legitimacy.

¹ By suggesting that parties have an important effect on the integration of a nation, the pattern of extended participation, the legitimacy of its political framework, and the management of political conflict, we are in effect employing that parties are an instrument of political socialization... parties may play an even more important role in the developing areas today than they did during the early phases of party development in the United States, Great Britain, and the European continent in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries."

Political Parties, Party Systems and Political Stability.

Finally, the stability of the parties and party systems depends on their strength. A strong party with high levels of institutionalization and mass support contributes for a more stable and developed political system. A second aspect of party strength is organizational complexity and depth, particularly, as revealed by the linkages between the party and socio-economic organizations as labour unions and peasants' associations. A third aspect of a party strength concerns the extent to which the members of the party view the party as a means to other ends. In highly developed political systems, loyalty to the party is a primary task. It is rare for a political leader to shift from one party to another and the movement of social groups and classes from one party to another is usually a complex and lengthy historical process. In modernising countries, where the parties and party systems are not so developed, inter-party movement of individuals and groups are highly prevalent. Leaders at local levels join
the party which wins the elections, whereas in
the national level, leaders shift from one party
to another in terms of their own electoral and
political prospects.¹

Therefore, parties are a generic phenomenon
in both totalitarian and democratic political
systems; whether they are in the category of deve­
loped or developing nations. Strong national parties
play an important role today in providing stable and
legitimate government and often in laying the founda­
tions for national integration.

This study is guided by the assumptions that
a party is, at bottom, a group of ambitious men who
have chosen politics as a vocation and who seek per­
sonal success in that vocation. In societies of
mass franchise, if a party is to satisfy the personal
ambition of its elite, it must obtain the votes nece­
sary to give it power, and to do this it must appeal
to the people on the basis of platform and ideology.
Therefore, while it may originate as an organisation
designed to acquire power for its elite, a party
necessarily and perhaps unperceptibly becomes an
agent of social development.

¹ Absence of party loyalties among leaders and
followers of parties in developing countries
is one of the important features as compared
to the party systems of Great Britain and
United States.
Section D: Parties, Party System and Political Development in India

The relevance of political parties and party systems in India is highlighted by the fact that India is primarily a developing country which has opted for a parliamentary form of government of the British model.

Therefore, the emergence and working of the party system in India is conditioned by the historical situation of the movement which proceeds from tradition to modernity. In the course of development and transformation, the parties and party systems are bound to face numerous problems that are characteristic features of this evolution.

The party system in India in the pre-independence years was characterized by an 'identifiable centre' which was represented by the Indian National Congress. The INC was the only party which developed nation-wide organization and leaders.²

The Indian party system owes its origin and transformation to this "political centre" of the independence years. While the CPI, the Akali Dal

and the D.M.K. originated from outside the Congress, parties like the Socialist Party, the Swatantra, the B.L.D., the B.K.D., the Janta Party were formed by political leaders who were primarily important and erstwhile members of the Indian National Congress. At regional level also, many parties like the Bangla Congress, the JC and UC in Orissa were the outcome of factional struggle within the Congress. Political dissent has therefore, been a fragmentation of the political centre of the society rather than a projection of autonomous interests in the social and economic spheres.

**Forms of Party System:**

India has evolved a multi-party system which accounts for competitive political process in the country. It is difficult to make a clearcut classification of the Indian party system because of its multiplicity and diversity. To quote Hanson and Douglas:

"Multiplicity and diversity made an attempt to classify Indian political parties a very hazardous undertaking.... Nevertheless, a provisional classification can be made - parties of the left, parties of the right, traditional parties, regional parties, minor parties (sub-regional)."

The Communist Party of India (CPI), the Communist Party of India (Marxist), the Communist Party of India (Marxist-Leninist) and the various Socialist Parties till their merger with the Janta Party in 1977 can all be categorized as parties to the left of the Centre.

The Rightist parties may be classified as the Gantantra Parishad (a regional party in Orissa), Swatantra which represented the feudal elements of the Indian Society. The latter party got merged with the Janta Party in 1977. The traditional parties like Jan Sangh, Muslim League, Ram Rajya Parishad are characterised by the fact that they represent communal and chauvinistic interests. The regional parties tend to represent a particular region of the country (e.g., Akali Dal of Punjab, D.M.K. of Tamil Nadu, G.P. of Orissa, etc.).

Minor or sub-regional parties tend to represent the interests of a particular section of the society. For example, the Gurkha League represents the interests of the hill people of Darjeeling.
Phases of Indian Party System:

The Indian party system has shown wide fluctuations. Five distinct phases of the party system can be pointed out - 1952 to 1967; 1967 to 1971; 1971 to 1977; 1977 to 1980 and 1980 onwards.

Phase I: Congress Dominance (1952-1967)

From 1952 to 1967, the Indian party system was described as a single party dominant system. The dominance of the Congress party during this phase can be attributed to its historical role in the freedom movements, its national wide base, and weak opposition parties.¹

¹ Hanson and Douglas give the following reasons:

1) Congress was part of the mystique of the national movement.
2) It was far more of a national party than most of its opponents and the Congress strength was nation-wide.
3) The presence of an aggregative party at the Centre of the political spectrum left the other parties no other choice but to occupy peripheral position.

1967-71: Phase of Coalition Politics in the States:

The year 1967 proved a setback to the pattern of Congress dominance in India. Greater competitiveness and decreasing institutionalization was the general trend after 1967. Political fragmentation, defection and dissidence were the features of the party system both at the national and state levels. The Congress lost 95 seats in the Lok Sabha elections in 1967, although it did retain a majority. However, the party failed to win majority in many states. The post-1967 period was characterized by intense factionalism within the party and coalition politics which together created instability within the Indian political system.¹

1971-1977: Reversion to Congress Dominance:

The instability in the party system during 1967-71 period came to an end with the re-establishment

¹ "Right and left parties would combine or oppose each other as advantages dictated. With the Congress split, both successes were now drawn into this politics of manoeuvres. Kaleidoscopic changes and strange alliances came to be everyday occurrences". W.H. Morris-Jones, The Government and Politics of India (New Delhi: B.I. Publications, 1974), p. 215.
of the Congress dominance in the 1971 Lok Sabha polls. From 1971-1977 the Congress supremacy in the Indian party system was strengthened by the declaration of national emergency from 1975 to 1977. The Opposition parties were ineffective to a large extent as many of their senior leaders were put into jail.

1977-1980: The Janta Supremacy:

However, with the decision of Smt. Indira Gandhi to hold elections to Parliament in 1977 (January) and withdrawal of emergency, new party alliances emerged in the Indian party system. Opposition parties which had been relegated to the periphery of the Indian political system during 1971-1977; once again made fresh attempts to provide an alternative to the Congress. The Janta Party - a five party alliance - was formed as the major opposition to the Congress. In the elections the Janta Party swept the polls, causing a set back to the Congress dominance of the early years. This process initiated a two-party system in the country.

However, party fragmentation has been a constant feature in India. The Congress party under the burden of staggering defeat and factionalism
split once again after 1969: into Congress (I) under Smt. Indira Gandhi and Congress (U) under Devraj Urs.

1980- Congress Supremacy:

The Janta Party however could not face the challenge from within while undergoing a process of party building and party consolidation. Although it won absolute majority in the State Assembly elections, the party could not escape the process of fragmentation. On the eve of 1980 elections, the party was split into four factions - each faction establishing a separate party.

In the 1980 Lok Sabha elections, the Congress won a thumping 2/3rd majority and the process was repeated in the June Assembly elections. The new political trend once again showed the way to the "Congress dominance system in the country".

Models of Party System and Party Building in India:

An analysis of Indian party system will not be complete without making a reference to the models of party organisation and party structure that operate in the country.
The first model of organisation is provided by the Congress. This party is based on the principles of "federal" system, open membership, and loose party discipline. The Congress model has allowed the functioning of various factions within the broad framework of consensus politics. The membership policy of the Congress party provides an opportunity to the senior political leaders a chance to recruit their supporters without any scrutiny or screening. Such a party organisation tends to be democratic in its decision-making and accommodative and comprising in its policies and programmes.

The parties like the Jan Sangh, the CPI, the CPI (M), are examples of second model of party organisation. These parties restrict their membership to ideologically committed people, besides practising a high disciplined hierarchical relationship in party management. The Congress party authority structures is decentralized and diffused; the Jan Sangh and the Communist parties operate on a highly centralized authority system to ideological cohesion and discipline.
The five constituent units of the Janta Party were familiar with the two models of organizations in the Indian party system.

**Approach to the Study:**

Several approaches have been followed in the study of political parties, party systems and political development in India.

The first is the integration approach which relates to the fact that parties play a positive role in the process of integration, or they may play a negative role, i.e., be a disintegrating force. The two relevant studies are Weiner's

1. Politics at the state level has been approached from a developmental perspective by Myron Weiner in his introductory survey to State Politics in India (1968). The three main criteria for analysis, according to him were political integration, political participation and institutionalization of political power. The two minor criteria were government stability and performance. See: Myron Weiner, ed., State Politics in India (Princeton, 1968), pp. 3-60.

2. "...... Party workers of national political parties campaigning during elections often install new loyalties, attempt to minimize the importance of caste and regional ties, and give voters a sense of his own capacity to influence government through democratic means. But parties and candidates may also strengthen particularistic loyalties to caste and community in an effort to win votes......"

contd...
Party-Building in a New Nation (1967) and Richard Sisson's "Congress Party in Rajasthan".

In his study of one party 'the Congress', Myron Weiner argues that the Congress is successful because it has the capacity to adapt to its environment. 1 He had made a detailed examination of how

F.N. from previous contd...


Such a view is also entertained by Lucian Pye. He observes: "..... A party system is important to the process of development because it provides the basic form and structure for the emergence of a distinct and integration polity". In: "Party Systems and National Development in Asia" (Ch. 13), in LaPalombora and Weiner, Op.cit., 1966, p. 373.

1. His hypotheses was based on a single theme: "..... that Congress party leaders in order to succeed politically, are concerned, first and foremost, with doing whatever is necessary to adapt the party to its environment. This proposition is deceptively simple, but it immediately calls attention to the difference between the Congress party and many other political parties in the developing world. Elsewhere, many governing parties are concerned with either mobilizing or controlling population. In contrast, Congress is primarily concerned with recruiting members and winning support. It does not mobilize, it aggregates. It does not seek to innovate, it seeks to adapt. Though a few Congressmen dream of transforming the countryside in practice, most Congressmen are concerned simply with winning elections". In: Party Building in a New Nation (Chicago, 1967), pp. 14-15.
the Congress Party has acquired the organizational skill for staying in power in five districts in different parts of India.

Richard Sisson, in his study of the "Congress Party in Rajasthan" concludes that the character and change in the Congress system has been an outcome of factional competition and other conflicts at successive points in time.¹ Factional competition and bargaining have served a function of political communication within the Congress and also between the Congress and its higher political environment. New political groups tend to seek political access first through the Congress system. Such groups make demands of both an intermediate and ultimate nature-intermediate in the sense that they include

¹ "Political conflict has not only been important with respect to change in the Congress party itself but also with respect to its adaptation to its political environment..... Factional competition has been conducive to the recruitment of new political resources into the Congress system..... Political competition tends to be greatest in those areas in which factional competition has been most intense. Furthermore, greater the intensity of factional competition, the greater the probability that the representation of social groups will be dispersed....."

Richard Sisson, Congress Party in Rajasthan, Political Integration and Institution Building in an Indian State (Delhi, 1972), p. 320.
aspirations for control over positions of power guaranteed access to them, and ultimate in the sense that there is a desire to shape public policy in a particular way. Thus, the competitive system encourages the transmission of political messages not only from lower to higher echelons of the party organizations but also from opposition parties and groups to the ruling party.

Then there are the approaches which focus attention on polarised disintegration. The two books which had commanded the attention in this field are Selig Harrison's *India: The Most Dangerous Decades* and Carolyn Elliot's article on "Caste and faction among the Dominant Caste: The Reddis and Kammams of Andhra". Basing her conclusion on detailed district-by-district studies, Carolyn Elliot's analysis of politics

2. Im Rajni Kothari, ed., *Caste in Indian Politics* (New Delhi, 1970), pp. 129-171.
in Andhra Pradesh differs from Harrison's. The CPI was not a Kamma Party, nor a continuation of non-Brahminism, but an expression of mobilization along class lines. Kamma support to the CPI was an expression of the sudden entering into the political arena of a large number of newly educated Kamma youth.

Another approach to the Indian Party system has been through what Marcus Franda calls "the federalising process" in the Indian Political system. The class struggle or Marxist approach

1. The core of Harrison's empirical material deals with the conflict between the Kammass and Reddis of Andhra Pradesh, and their relation to the Communist Party of India (CPI). His basic thesis was that the conflicts caused by caste, language, region and class all tend to reinforce each other. The result of these cumulative or reinforcing cleavages is such a polarization as to prohibit the emergence of a functioning party system. He argues that the CPI is strong "only when it is parochial" (pp. 246-47), that is "the successful regional Communist Parties have been those able to manipulate to their own advantages, tensions between one region and another, between regional and the central authority, and between caste lobbies within each region". (pp. 204-205).

to party politics in India emphasizes the primacy of class cleavages. That class is an important determinant of party behaviour is never really debated.\(^1\) Another approach which was most common among political scientists in analysing the Indian party system was in terms of one-party dominance. This was, in reply to the proliferation of single-party regimes in Africa and Asia and what this meant for democratic and developmental goals.

Equipped with the analytical tools provided by Maurice Duverger,\(^2\) political scientists went to the task of explicating the nature of one-party

---


dominance in India, dubbed the 'Congress System' by Rajni Kothari. Finally, there are others who have studied the Indian Political party system through, defection, factionalism and electoral system. For example, Horst Hartmann argues that the integration in the party system is due to the institutional arrangements of elections.

Summing Up:

Thus, political parties play a crucial role in the political system of a developing country. India, being primarily a developing country, the political parties are effective instruments in bringing about desirable changes in the political


2. Horst Hartmann, Political Parties in India (Meerut, 1971).
system. Hence, Indian as well as foreign scholars have concentrated on the study of different elements of Indian political system. These general and specific studies cover caste, class, region, leadership, regionalism, language crises of the society.¹ Our focus of attention is on the political parties in their totality rather than on any of their specific aspects.

This study concentrates on an intensive, micro-study of the political parties in Orissa. What role the political parties play in a developing political system, of Orissa? Whether they have been able to adopt themselves to the new environment? Whether it has been able to assimilate into the new changes the society is undergoing? What are the disintegrating factors that hinder the parties capacity for integration in Orissa? Whether the electoral pattern has led to an integration of the two substructures that exist in the State?

Therefore, this study makes an attempt to study the role of political parties in its several aspects. It makes use of a multi-dimensional approach to the study of political parties and party systems in Orissa.

¹. See next chapter for a review of literature.