CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction:

Modern form of representative democracy has brought forth party system as an indispensable factor in every political society to lay down the rule that political party, in one form or another is omnipresent.¹ This phenomena lays stress on the maximization of political participation in the sense that it enjoins upon the members of a political elite to take the people at large in confidence either for the sake of observing the myth that the 'voice of people is the voice of God';² or to justify the very legitimacy of their leadership and authority. This phenomenon also indicates a mark of political modernization in the sense that it calls for the involvement of more and more people into the process of "authoritative allocation of values."³ Whether it is the rule of a single person (monarch or dictator), or of the few (assembly or elite), or even of the many, the norms of

¹ Joseph La Palombara and Myron Weiner: Political parties and political Development, (Princeton University, 1966), p.3.
³ Ibid.
stasiology demand attachment of sanctity to the norm that the masses must participate in the political affairs of the country as much as possible.\textsuperscript{4}

2. Political Parties:

The term 'political party' emerged in the nineteenth century with the development of representative institutions and the expansion of suffrage in Europe and the United States. It designated organizations whose goal was the capture of public office in electoral competition with one or more other parties.\textsuperscript{5} In other words it is a group of persons who have a common ideology, follow a common program and common line of action. In the party there is uniformity of action and approach. It should be well organized and a good political party obviously tries to have political power, and when not in power it plays constructive role of an opposition and enlightens the people about failings and faltering of the party in power. A good political party is supposed to have national policies and programs and be responsive to the requirements of all sections of society.

\textsuperscript{4} Ibid.

without any reservations. But the most important thing about a political party is that it should adopt only constitutional means and methods.\(^6\)

Different writers have defined the term political party in different ways. The most celebrated view among the English leaders and writers is that of Burke who holds that a political party is "a body of men united for promoting the national interest on some particular principles in which they are all agreed".\(^7\) Reiterating the same view, Disraeli defined political party as "a group of men banded together to pursue certain principles."\(^8\) Maurice Duverger, a leading writer on the subject of Party System, defines political parties as groups organized for the purpose of achieving and exercising power within a political system.\(^9\)

A party serves as a platform or machinery for taking part in the struggle for power. It is a device for catching votes as well as an agency to mobilize people's support at the time of elections. It is also an instrument for the

\(^7\) Burke: Thoughts on the causes of Present Discontent, p. 16.
\(^8\) J. Jupp: Political Parties, p.2.
aggregation of interests that demand their vociferous articulation. "We define a political party generally as the articulate organization of society's active political agents, those who are concerned with the control of governmental powers and who compete for popular support with another group or groups holding divergent views. As such, it is the great intermediary which links social forces and ideologies to official governmental institutions and relates them to political action within the larger political community."\textsuperscript{10} And lastly, Michael Curties advocates the view that, "a political party signifies a group of people who hold certain political beliefs in common or who are prepared to support the party candidates, work together for electoral victory, attain and maintain power".\textsuperscript{11}

They may also be considered as specialized associations and become more complex, organized and bureaucratic as a society approaches the modern type.\textsuperscript{12}

The central object of a political party is to capture power

\textsuperscript{10} Sigmund Neumann: \textit{Modern Political Parties}, p.396.
either singly or in collaboration with others. Thus the first and foremost aim of a political party “is to prevail over the others in order to get into power or to stay in it”. It is this goal of attaining political power that distinguishes political parties from other groups in the political system, although the distinction is rather blurred at times, especially in regard to pressure groups.

3. Genesis:

The origin of different political parties in a society depends on factors like - human nature, religious and communal sentiments, environment, economic interest and ideology, etc. Generally people have different temperaments. If some are moderate, others are extremists; if some are radical, others are reactionary. Thus people form parties to give expression to their combative instincts. The inborn temperamental differences incline the people towards one party or another. Secondly, people have very strong sentiments for their religious or communal order. They want

---

to unite politics with religion. Thus, different political parties come into existence like Sokka Gakkai of the Buddhists in Japan, Christian Democrat in Switzerland, Hindu Maha Sabha, Muslim League and Akali Dal in India. Thirdly, environmental factors also induce people to form or join a particular party. People, in general, inherit politics as they inherit religion. The children get political education from their parents, teachers, neighbors and other elders and so they develop their political orientations. In the United States, for example, the people of Irish descent traditionally show their inclination towards the Democratic Party while the people of German descent prefer the Republican Party. Thus, the attitudes and values prevalent in a society and political culture may be of vital significance in determining the type of political parties that emerge in any society.\textsuperscript{16}

Fourthly, the most important factor is economic. People have their divergent economic interests and so they form and join different parties. While some advocate the course of laissez faire, others desire socialism that stands

for more and more control on man's economic freedom in the public interest. And lastly, the fact of clash of economic interests may be further studied in the factor of ideology that has very important place in the making and working of political parties. Thus, the parties of the 'right' like Fascists and Nazis are interested in protecting and promoting the interest of the capitalist and other affluent classes of the society while the parties of the 'left' like socialists and communists desire a change in the present system so as to give benefits to the unprivileged and under-privileged sections of the society.

4. Functions of Political Parties:

Political parties perform several important functions inside the political system. They are formation of public opinion, acting as agencies of political socialization, leadership recruitment, interest articulation, interest aggregation, political modernization and development, policy formulation, serving as a link between the government and the people, government formation, to act as an Opposition, to maintain discipline and control over the members,
formulating goals and values, performing a number of social
care functions, providing opportunities for alternative
governments, etc.

As such, political parties are essential for every
political system whether democratic or dictatorial,
competitive or non-competitive, parliamentary or
presidential, federal or unitary. They play a key role in the
process of politics. As Finer puts, “Political parties make
policies, create platforms, and obtain seats in the legislative
assemblies and, if they attain a majority, their platforms
tend to become laws”.17

5. Classification of Political Parties:

The classification of political parties being presented
hereafter seeks to characterize a party by identifying its
significant characteristics and the focus of its orientation.
First of all, political parties may be divided into charismatic-
leader oriented party, ideology-oriented party and interest
oriented party. Secondly, on the basis of a three point scale
of ideological spectrum, they may be divided into leftist

party, rightist party and centrist party. Basing on their geographical area of influence and penetration, they may again be divided into national party, trans-regional party, regional party and local party. Finally, as suggested by Maurice Duverger, on the basis of their structure, parties may be divided into four types – the caucus, the branch, the cell and the militia.

The charismatic-leader oriented party is one in which the top leader becomes a rallying point of support and allegiance for a party. By his personal charm, grace and magnetism, he maintains and decides policy matters. His towering personality becomes a cementing force, capable of overcoming weaknesses in party organization. His vision of political life inspires his followers and provides a blue-print for party programs. Naturally this is a phenomenon which is short-lived. At best, it lasts as long as the charismatic leader lives. In case of ideology-oriented party the decisive characteristics of its policy formulation and programs of work is determined by its ideological considerations. This is opposed to what is called the pragmatic style of politics,
marked by flexibility and accommodation. The communist parties on the left and fascist parties and groups on the right are examples of ideology-oriented parties. In case of interest-oriented parties, they may really be called as pressure-groups and factions. They are based on the protection and promotion of specific socio-economic interests of a particular specific group like those of caste, community, tribe, regional or linguistic groups or that of a particular section of citizens, like farmers, workers, shopkeepers, consumers, etc. or a combination of a few or more of them.

Sometimes parties are classified with reference to the three point scale of the ideological spectrum i.e. left, right and centre. They are called left and right on the basis of their attitudes towards the established political order and system. In early European assemblies, the most liberal, democratic and innovative members sat on the left-side of the Parliament and those who defended the establishment on the right side. Radical revolutionary parties, like the socialists and the communists are called parties of the left.
The conservatives, traditionalists and reactionaries constitute the parties of the right. The liberals, the evolutionary changers, as opposed to revolutionaries, and the non-radical progressives are included in the centrist parties.

Parties can also be classified on the basis of the geographical area of their influence and political support base. This is particularly useful in the case of federal politics. Parties whose influence extends to the whole country are called national parties. In India, for instance, they are also called all-India parties. Depending on these criteria some can be designated as trans-regional parties, others as regional parties or local parties.

Maurice Duverger, a leading writer on the subject of party system, has suggested a four-fold classification of political parties on the basis of their structure, functions and the methods they employ to obtain political power. They are the caucus type, the cell type, the branch type and the
militia type. He, however, added that these four basic types of parties are found in mixed rather than in a pure form.

The caucus type of party has a small membership of activists, officials, opinion leaders, etc. It avoids mass membership and is mainly concerned with electoral activities like mobilizing the voters, raising funds for election, using media, TV, Cinema, etc. for influencing the voters on behalf of its candidates. Between elections it remains dormant. The major American Parties, the Republicans and the Democrats, fit the description.

The branch type of party is a mass party with open membership and a hierarchal party structure, dominated by the central leadership. It is a permanent party, active continuously throughout the year. Its branches, covering the entire country and different segment of the population are the main source of its strength. Delegates are elected through the branches to the party congress, which remains the highest policy making body. The British Labor Party, the
German Social Democratic Party and the Congress Party of India are good examples of this type.

The cell type is an invention of the Fascist and Communist parties. The 'occupational' units of the ruling party are scattered in every nook and corner of the country and every cell has a much greater hold on its members than the caucus or a branch. The members of the cells carry much importance than other members of the party. The entire network of the cells is controlled by the highest unit of the party composed of the real decision-makers at the top.\textsuperscript{\textit{18}}

The militia type of organization is modeled on the army command and control pattern. Its organization is hierarchical and it expects complete allegiance of its members to party leadership. Mussolini's fascist militia and Hitler's Nazi storm-troopers are of this type of party.

Duverger's classification in effect is really focusing attention on four types of parties – the American type (the

caucus) the West European liberal democratic system (the branch), the Communist Party Structure (the cell), and the Fascist-Nazi pattern (the militia).

6. Political Parties and Party System:

Political party and party system are different from one another. The term political party refers to the organized groups of people, united by similar ideas or ideology and participating in political process through the functions of interest articulation, interest aggregation, political communication, decision making, election, political socialization, etc.\textsuperscript{19} The latter, however, is used for identifying the nature and system of power wielded by the political parties from time to time. The term party system is used to refer to the system of wielding power by the political parties.\textsuperscript{20} Political party and party system constitute separable subjects also in two other senses. First, defining party system as competitive interaction patterns among parties implies that political systems could conceivably have


\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
parties without having party system. Manifest cases in point are those monolithic parties that serve regimes as instruments of control, coordination and permeation; rather than being structures of genuine political competition. Secondly, a party might stand outside of the party system of a polity even where such a system exists.\textsuperscript{21} A party will do so if it does not competitively interact with other parties in a substantial way – for example, if it is a very minor party exercising very little political influence or if it is essentially a pressure group that goes through the motions of party competition only to publicize or disguise itself or to get advantages that party status often confers.

7. Party System:

The term ‘party system’ is a compound of two words, i.e. ‘party’ and ‘system’. The term party derives from the Latin word ‘Partier’ (verb) which means to divide. However, in politics now-a-days it means a group of people which is characterized by “its simple identification with one group and differentiation from another. Every party in its very

essence signifies 'partnership' in a particular organization and 'separation' from others by a specific program."\(^{22}\) Keeping all such essential points in view, Curtis goes to the extent of saying this: "Essentially party signifies a group of people who hold certain political beliefs in common or who are prepared to support the party candidate, work together for electoral victory, attain and maintain political power."\(^{23}\) On the other hand the word 'system' has been used and defined, differently by different writers belonging to different disciplines. Ludwig von Bertalanfy describes system as "a set of elements standing in inter-action."\(^{24}\) Hall and Fagen define system as "a set of objects together with relation between the objects and between the attitudes."\(^{25}\)

Parties make for a system, then, only when they stand in interaction. The study of party system has two major facets. One involves their characteristic as discrete entities – for example, their various social bases, histories, goals and appeals, formal organization and actual power structures.

\(^{24}\) Ludwig von Bertalanfy: "General System Theory" in *General Systems*, vol.1, 1956, p.3.
\(^{25}\) Hall and Fagen: "Definition of a system", p.18.
This is the study of party units. The other involves the competitive interaction patterns among party units or, as Duverger puts it, "the forms and modes of their co-existence".26

A party system is essential in a democracy. Because the party system is the mechanism through which conflicting interests are sifted and aggregated. People choose a party and consequently the government and the people. A state having one party system can never be a democratic state in the conventional sense of the term in so far as there is no choice before the electorate. In fact electorate does not matter at all in the political system because a democratic system is essentially based on the free choice of the people. They have the right to elect a party government and subsequently to change it to another party government as and when they desire so.

A party system that comes to develop and continues to operate in a political system is determined by the environment of the system. Political parties are the products

of the socio-economic and politico-cultural factors which characterize the environment of a political system. It is a reflection and manifestation of the diversities in the social fabric of the state. Its working, whether good or bad, efficient or inefficient, stable or unstable, beneficial or harmful to national interests, depends upon the environment. The development of the system of communication and technology also has its own impact upon the rise and growth of party system. Better services of transport and communication enable people of a country to have wider contacts. This process facilitates the task of making organization. Free press, radio and television communicate news to the people to enable them to form their views according to their standard of judgment, while a totalitarian order keeps monopoly over the media of communication. As a result, totalitarian communication "directs the inflow of information to a single political structure and limits the outflow of communication to the purposes of the communist elite."27

8. Evolution of the Party System:

Party system is a modern phenomenon. In England party system started acquiring a proper shape only after the Settlement of 1689 when William III of Oreinge, the Stadholder of Holland, in a bold international coup, seized the English throne on the strength of his Stuart connections. The Whigs and Tories constituted the first English political parties. After the enactment of the Reforms Act, 1832, the Whigs changed their name to “Liberals” and the Tories changed into “Conservatives”. The Liberals and Conservatives dominated the political scene and competed with each other for power till the rise of the Labor party to power in the second decade of the twentieth century. The rise of the Labor party seemed, for a time, to threaten the two-party system in England. But the simultaneous decline of the Liberal party helped to maintain the traditional two-party system.28

In the United States the founding fathers did not believe in the party system. They thought that its influence

was bad. The contemporary American party system emerged out of the turmoil of the American Civil War (1861-65).\textsuperscript{29} In Japan the party system is an extra constitutional growth. The origin of political parties may be traced back to early January 1874 when Itagaki organized the Patriotic Public Party to carry on a government for the realization of liberty and attainment of popular rights. On 18 October 1881 Emperor Meiji declared that a national assembly would be established and constitution would be granted in 1890. Soon after the issuance of the Imperial Declaration, the Liberal party and the Progressive party were formed to carry on the movement for popular government.\textsuperscript{30}

\textbf{9. Classification of the Party System:}

The typological study of party system on the numerical basis was first made by Mourice Duverger (1951) under categories of One Party System, Bi-Party System and Multi-Party system. Later, this simple typology was modified by Giovani Sartori (1976), and was further improved by Klans

\textsuperscript{30} V. Bhagwan and V. Bhushan, op. cit., pp. 70-71.
Von Beyme (1985). This scheme, as developed by Maurice Duverger, seeks to place all political systems of the world in one of these three categories. These three categories are again divided into a number of sub-categories.

9.1 Single Party System:

This type of system “is characterized by the party in power either dominating all other groups, trying to absorb the political opposition, or in the extreme case suppressing all opposition groups which are regarded as counter revolutionary or subversive of the regime as forces dividing the national will”.

This principal category has two sub-categories – totalitarian and democratic. It is a case of a single party system of the totalitarian model if the party in power allows no other party or group to live or act in opposition to its authority. On the other hand, it is a case of single party system of the democratic model if the ruling party exercises its authority in a way that it may sometimes take the help of

---

another party, or there are parties that even when put together are in no position to wrest power from the dominant party, or there is one party absorbing all other parties within the fold. In this category, the party in power allows other parties and groups to exist and operate. In this situation which looks like the model of a multi-party system, the party in power enjoys a dominant position.

To carry the point of categorization further, we may say that even the totalitarian model of a single party system may be said to have two more sub categories - ideologically committed and ideologically non-committed. This means that the only party in power may and may not be committed to a particular ideology. Moreover, even this ideological commitment may be of two types – rightist and leftist. While the ideology of the right stands for the maintenance of the status-quo, the ideology of left aims at the liquidation of the present system and its substitution by a new order that is
more equitable and just for the interests of the weaker, oppressed and exploited sections of the community.\textsuperscript{33}

In order to support our categorization with the help of factual cases, we may say that while the Fascist or Nazi party systems constitute the case of a totalitarian party system committed to an ideology of the right, the communist party systems belong to the latter category where we find a single party system committed to the ideology of the left. In this way while we may put Italy and Germany (of the second World War period), Spain and Portugal in the first category, we may place the erstwhile Soviet Union, China, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungry, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, East Germany, Cuba, North Korea, North Vietnam and Mongolia in the second category. We may also take note of the fact that military dictators followed the same pattern as Egypt under Arab Socialist Union of Col. Naser, Burma under Socialist

\textsuperscript{33} Ibid.
Party of General Ne Win and Indonesia under Golkar Party of General Suharto.  

One-party system is often criticized as undemocratic because it is antithetical to the working of a democratic system. It is another name of a totalitarian system whether of the right (fascism) or of the left (communism).  

“The one-party state is founded on the assumption that the sovereign will of the state reposes in the leader and the political elite. This authoritarian principle found expression first in monarchies and more recently in dictatorships. Needing a monopoly of power to survive, dictatorships abolished all opposition parties. In order to stifle recurring resistance, it is driven to adopt techniques of physical coercion such as purge and liquidation, and to employ measures of psychological coercion through extensive and vigorous propaganda campaign.”

It is argued that the single party is the reflection of national unity, and that democratic pluralism sacrifices the

---

34 Johari, op.cit., p.575.  
35 Arthur Halcumbe; Political Parties of Today, p.591.  
36 Rode, Anderson and Christol: An Introduction to Political Science, p.405.
general interest of the nation for private and sectional interests in the cracked mirror of parties with the result that the country no longer recognizes its own image. The single party preserves the unity of the nation and looks at all problems from the national point of view.\textsuperscript{37}

This model is also said to reflect the social unity of the people. As contended by the Marxists, each party is an expression of the social class. Since a communist society has a singular character, and is a state of the toilers, it must have only one political party. Different political parties may exist only in a bourgeois country where different social classes exist.\textsuperscript{38} A single party state is "a bearer of ideas", "an incarnation of faith", "a moral or an ethical system" and "a new religion". As such, a single party can alone function in its defense.\textsuperscript{39}

\textbf{9.2 Bi-Party System:}

A bi-party system can be said to exist where there are only two parties sufficiently strong to share the major part

\textsuperscript{38} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{39} Ibid.
of the electoral vote and to exercise political control, though other parties may exist and obtain some seats in the representative assembly. There may be other parties but the alternation of power remains between the two major ones. A two-party system may be said to have three sub-categories, namely, a) two-party system where alternation of power takes place between two major parties, b) ‘two-plus’ party system where some other party or parties may seldom have a chance to share power with either of the two major parties, and c) ‘two-party system in the midst of many’ where parties other than the two major ones have chances, now and then, to share power. In order to carry the point of typological illustration further, one may say that the two-party system has its two more sub-categories – distinct and indistinct. When two major parties have policies and programs clearly different from each other and struggle for the seizure of power, it is a case of a distinct two-party system. Britain is a leading instance here where power alternates between the Conservative and the Labor parties.

\[40\text{ Michael Curtis, op.cit, pp.154-55.}\]
The Liberal and the Communist parties are there, but they hardly have any chance to rival the other two. Some regional parties are also there like Irish Nationalists and Plaid Cymru of Scotland, but their existence is almost negligible. The case of indistinct bi-party system finds its example in the United States where the Democrats and the Republicans have no ‘ideological differences’ but, as Robert Dahl says, “ideological similarity and issue conflict”.\textsuperscript{41} The cases of West Germany and Canada may be put in this category. It may also be possible that the two major parties, off and on, take the help of other minor parties that makes it ‘a two-party system in the midst of many’. The cases of Belgium, Luxembourg and Ireland may be placed in this category.\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{9.3 Multi-Party System:}

It is a party system in which no single party is able to obtain majority control over the legislature. Such a system often leads to the formation of coalition governments on


\textsuperscript{42} Ibid.
account of the absence of any particular party that may be in a position to capture power and run the government itself. Such a party system exists in most countries of the world like, France, Holland, Belgium, West Germany, Italy, Switzerland, Canada, Australia and India. One may again say that even this multi-party system is of two types - stable and unstable. It is stable where many parties struggle for power, and they run the government without going to the extent of making the political system unstable which is often alleged as the salient evil of a multi-party system. The case of Switzerland is very conspicuous in this regard where Social Democrats, Radical Democrats, Liberal Democrats and Communists struggle for power without creating conditions of political uneasiness with the result that the political system is never pushed to the direction of political disintegration or decay.43

Different from this is the case of France where political parties struggle for the seizure of power in a way that even the very existence of political system is threatened. The

---

43 Johari, op. cit., p.429.
Socialists, Communists, Gaullists, Liberals and Republicans have often taken the matters to such an extent that sometimes even the existence of the political system has become a matter of serious concern. Thus France affords the case of an unstable multi-party system even after the inauguration of the Fifth Republic in 1958.\textsuperscript{44} Another example is afforded by Italy where the Communists, Socialists and Democratic Socialists follow the lines of their French counterparts.

10. Relative importance of the three-types of party system:

Very often a question is asked as to which type of the party system is the best. Traditionally, the political scientists have given answer to this question by comparing the relative merits and demerits of these systems. A majority of them have been supporting the Bi-party system as the best; e.g. Laski (A Grammar of Politics, 1925, p.314), Barker (The Party System, p.19). The single party system is considered undemocratic as it deprives the people of their

\textsuperscript{44} Ibid.
freedom of association making and action, and or because it contains the germs of centralization and is more or less dictatorial in nature. The multi-party system is likewise considered less useful because it often leads to political instability inside the political system, which in turn leads to weakness and inefficiency in the working of the government. As against this, the Bi-party system with its possible three sub-categories ensures the exercise of political freedom by the people, provides the possibility of alternative government, makes political struggle orderly and systematic, prevents political instability, etc.\textsuperscript{45}

Undoubtedly, the theoretical analysis on the above lines brings out the desirability of establishing or creating a bi-party system. However, one must not forget that political parties are the products of the socio-cultural, economic and political factors which characterize the environment of a political system. A political system, with sharp and big diversities - social, economic, political, cultural, religious, linguistic, geographical, caste, etc., as has been the case of

Indian political system, is bound to have a multi-party system. Likewise, a political system established on the ideological foundations of a particular ideology, for example a socialist political system based upon the ideology of communism or Marxism, is bound to go in for a single party system. A theocratic state, with religious fundamentalism as its creed, is bound to organize and maintain a single party system based on the religion of the majority community. In any event, the advantages and disadvantages of the different types of party system are relative to the intelligence and culture of the community. The essential thing is that government should rest on as broad a basis of opinion as possible, maintaining, in spite of its party character, the unity of a whole people.\footnote{R.M. Maclver: \textit{The Modern State}, (Oxford University Press, London, 1972), p.420.}

\textbf{11. Merits of the party system:}

1. The parties harmonize the organs of government. They give coherence to the very complicated mechanism of government established under the federal and state constitutions. To some extent they mitigate the
disadvantages of the federal system by harmonizing the policy of the state and nation in those cases where political action, to be effective, must take place simultaneously in both quarters.

2. The national party organizations alone make it possible for the enormous electorate to function at all effectively. Without them national politics would take the form of a conflict between innumerable competing groups, a conflict so confused, so obscure, and so unintelligible that it will not be possible to ascertain public opinion.

3. The parties have been instrumental in developing and maintaining a sense of national unity. Parties check religious intolerances. They also tend to assimilate foreign elements and they soften the clash of economic interests.\(^{47}\)

11.1. **Demerits of Party System:**

1. Parties cause a bias and every voter is more or less attracted or repelled to such an extent that he is unable to

---

\(^{47}\) E.M. Saït: *Political Institutions*, pp. 159-164.
form an entirely unbiased judgment either on questions of policy or on the merits of the candidates.

2. Parties produce unnatural divisions and thus falsify public opinion.

3. Two parties especially involve only 'yes' or 'no' to only one proposition. It means that the differences are not integrated. Every vote is given not for the whole, but for partial cause.

4. It is the extreme elements that always lead the party; the moderate elements are mere huggers on. They merely follow; they do not break away from the party, because they can do no other. This mean public opinion remains falsified.

5. Sometimes, the extreme elements fire the heads of the leaders to do and say things which the latter do not desire. In that case too the real opinion remains unrepresented.\(^{48}\)

12. Concluding Remarks:

It is said that parties are in accord with human nature. Since people differ in respect of their ideas, beliefs and commitments they have different political parties. The successful prosecution of democracy demands a successful party system. Far from being in conflict with the theory of democratic government, party system is the only thing which renders the latter feasible. Party system avoids the risks of direct legislation. It is on account of the party system that elections are made easy and possible and legislative excellence is promoted. The tendency of Caesarism is checked. "The existence of a party of opposition, with a program fairly within the limits of a possible public opinion is a bulwark against the tyranny, not only of a despot but also a practical political majority."\(^{49}\)

However, there are some political scientists who consider parties and party system as an unnatural political phenomenon. Members belonging to different parties, as Leacock says, remain in a state of "willful inconvincibility

\(^{49}\text{Lowell, op. cit., pp. 97-98.}\)
with individual judgment frozen tight in the shape of the party mould.\textsuperscript{50} It creates factionalism as it "tends to make the political life of a country machine-like or artificial. The party in opposition, as it is sometimes called the outs is always antagonistic to the party in power or the ins."\textsuperscript{51} The talent of the people is ignored on account of party politics and the interest of party is given precedence over the interests of the nation. Hollowness and insincerity get encouragement. The vision of the members is narrowed and their individuality crushed with the result that the evils of favoritism, nepotism and spoils system are multiplied. The system of administration is de-established on account of rapid changes in the position of parties. There is wastage of money, explosion of opportunity for self-seekers and excessive pandering to the masses. Marriott rightly fears that party allegiance, if carried to excess, "may easily obscure the claims of patriotism. Concentration upon the business of vote catching may tempt party leaders and party

\textsuperscript{50} Leacock: \textit{The Elements of Political Science}, p.312.
managers to ignore or to postpone the higher call of the country".\textsuperscript{52}

However, in spite of all these, it must be remembered that the idea of ‘party less democracy’ is purely utopian. It has nothing more than academic significance. Such a theory having its roots in the political philosophy of the American Federalists like George Washington and James Madison and finding its reasoned argumentation in the works and utterances of recent Indian thinkers like Mahatma Gandhi, M.N. Roy, Acharya Vinoba Bhave and Jayprakash Narayan is far from the world of political reality.

In short, party system, in one form or the other has to be there in modern representative democracies. It is said that “a modern democratic state without this somewhat artificial and yet essential unanimity would become a brawling chaos of individual opinion.”\textsuperscript{53}

\textsuperscript{52} Marriott: \textit{Mechanism of the Modern State}, vol.II, p.431.
\textsuperscript{53} Leacock, op.cit., p.313.