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(i) GOVERNMENT

The study of Government has followed several main lines of inquiry. These include both an examination of the source and distribution of authority and the classification of types of Government (such as presidential systems and monarchies), as well as analysis of levels of Government (including such units as national societies, clubs, churches and trade unions).

At the most general level, Government consists of a group of individuals sharing a defined responsibility for exercising power. At this level the definition applies to cases where Government is sovereign, as well as to cases where it is not. Sovereign Government, the most important type, consists of a group of individuals sharing a defined responsibility for the maintenance and adaptation of a national autonomous community, on behalf of which it exercises a practical monopoly of coercive powers. If by "a defined responsibility" we mean its legitimacy (the sanctified right to exercise power on behalf of others by means of decision-making), then the characteristics of sovereign Government are as follows: a Government is a group of individuals exercising legitimate authority, and protecting and adapting the community by making and carrying out decisions.

These characteristics impose certain limits of variation upon Government. One limit is efficacy, i.e., the capacity of a Government to cater to community needs. A second refers to the internal structure of a given type of Government, i.e. its form. Changes in form which occur when one type of Government is transformed into another are ordinarily related to the efficacy, or performance, of a particular Government. Hence, the limit upon Government is observable when for any reason (inability to make decisions, failures to comply with widely distributed but central values) it can no longer function. If this is not merely a matter which can be remedied by changing the incumbents of political office, i.e., if the political roles and supporting offices are no longer acceptable, then the withdrawal of legitimacy denotes that the system of Government is no longer regarded as appropriate by the public; its limits have been breached. At that point, change from one type of Government to another is likely.
The most common distinctions that have been made between types of Governments include the following: Is the Government competitive or monopolistic? democratic or totalitarian? pluralistic or monistic? presidential or monarchical? Of course, these well-known categories overlap considerably. For example, it is possible to have a totalitarian presidential system. As is the case with all dichotomous variables, these distinctions force the observer to put a particular Government in one category or the other, even when it demonstrates characteristics of both. Such distinctions are based on two criteria: the organization of Government and the degree of control it exercises over the community. These criteria combine the moral, or normative, dimension of politics with the dimensions relating to Governmental structural and political behaviour.

Let us ignore all these variations in form and say boldly that centralized power begins from the top and is applied downward through a specific delegation of authority. A military organization or a bureaucracy represents a clear-cut "command" case, with autocratic and totalitarian Governments defined as those which employ this system of hierarchy. Government may then be represented by a single figure, a king or dictator, or by an oligarchy or junta. Such highly centralized systems show the following characteristics: concentrated power is subject to few checks; power inheres at the top; subordinate authority is derivative and there is strong reliance on the personality of a particular leader.

Decentralized authority represents an opposite conception of power; power is generated by the public through the aggregation of their political wants, is expressed through various groups, and is regulated by an abstract system of rules. (Its usual normative expressions include the acceptance of the principle of majority rule, protection of rights, and representation). This is what we mean by a democratic Government. It is characterized by checks and balances, parliamentary control over the executive and some form of election as the method of political recruitment to sensitive positions. Of course, such practices do not exhaust the forms of decentralization. Decentralization may be functional, based on the allocation of the economic power in society among various grouping, such as guilds, protective associations, professional associations, and other interest groups.
(ii) Political power

Ever since Hobbes produced his "Leviathan", the concept of power in the realms of national and international politics has become a momentous subject so much so that now it is regarded as the most significant area of fundamental research. It is so in spite of the fact that the real meaning of this term has been a matter of controversy on account of its social, economic, political, psychological, sociological and spiritual ramifications. Recently, the idea of power has assumed an importance in its own in the realm of political theory. The reason for this lies in the fact that the meaning of politics has changed from one of being a 'study of power'. As Curtis says, "politics is organized dispute about power and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interests and demands. The study of politics is concerned with the description and analysis of the manner in which power is obtained, exercised, and controlled, the purpose for which it is used, the manner in which decisions are made, the factors which influence the making of those decisions, and the context in which those decisions take place".

The problems of defining the term 'power' in very precise terms arises from the fact that different writers have taken different views with the result that its real meaning seems to hover from Friedrich's description of it as 'a certain kind of human relationship' to Tawney's emphasis on the identification of power with the 'capacity of an individual, or group of individuals, to modify the conduct of others in the manner which one desires' not merely this. While a great political thinker like Hobbes identifies power with 'some future apparent good', a modern psycho-analyst like Harold Lasswell likens it with "influence". We also find that while a great Marxist like Mao Tse-Tung claims that 'power comes from the barrel of a gun', an apostle of non-violence like Gandhi substitutes the force of gun and bomb with the power of love and truth.

Thus, the word 'power' is used in different senses. Power is ascribed to different grounds. For instance, we speak of horse power, power of ideas, economic power, power of social status, healing power, brain power, purchasing power, executive power, military power and the like. The common thread among all is that the term 'power' behaves in much the same way. As the word 'power' derives from certain Latin and French words which mean 'to be able', one may,
therefore, take a generalized view of power as one denoting "the whole spectrum, of those external influences that, by being brought to bear upon an individual, can make him move in a required direction".5

If so, the sense of the term 'powers' becomes interchangeable with several related theses like control, influence, authority, force, might, persuasion, coercion, domination and the like. Some other writers, however, warn against the insidious tendency of equating power with other kindred concepts. For instance, Max Weber says that power and authority are different things in as much as the latter invariably conveys within its fold the sense of 'legitimacy'. Force and power are dissimilar things in view of the former necessarily involving some brutal manifestation which, may, or may not, form an integral part of the idea of power. Bertrand Russell takes power as 'the capacity to influence the actions of others'6.

Keeping it in mind, the important points of distinction between power and other related themes may thus he noted;

1. Power: It is the faculty or capacity to conquer in a contest. The potency or capacity to manipulate the will and activities of others to make them conform to the power seeker's will is the central point in power. Power is one of the key concepts in political theory. It has both normative and empirical dimensions. It is not only a fact to be achieved and possessed, but also a value or an ideal that should be pursued and aspired for. It has both qualitative and quantitative aspects. If not only hints at the capacity of the man to achieve the development of his personality, but also informs him to extract benefits form others by peaceful means like persuasion, manipulation and negotiation or violent means like coercion, control, influence, sanctions and the like.

Power is a very comprehensive term. Although it is often identified with other related themes like authority, influence etc., it can, however, be distinguished from all. People obey not because they realize the powerful position of their rulers, but because of their conviction about the genuineness of the commands of their 'superiors'. Thus, the concept of political power is integrally connected with political legitimacy.

In the context of decision-making process, power is identified with the role of active participation. But, it also involves the situation of non-participation. Thus, there is no need to restrict the notion of power by attaching any sanction
to it, since a decision could be affected by arguments and persuasion, threats, strikes, demonstration and violence. Power, so understood, may or may not, be identified with influence, authority and other related themes.

The problem of contemporary political theory is how to make conditions for the proper use of political power so that 'maximization of democracy' takes place. The operation of a political system should be such that no man's power to use his natural talents is diminished.

2. Force: Force is an adjunct, not an essence, of power. It is the most brutal manifestation of power. When we talk of force, the invariable connotation is of physical force. Its techniques are coercion, physical threat, intimidation, blackmail, terrorization and military domination. Force is manifest power.

3. Influence: Influence represents the sublimation of power. It is an indeterminate exercise of power. It may be due to social prestige, intellectual eminence, moral worth and the like. The most important distinction between influence and power is that, while the former is persuasive, the latter is coercive. Submission to influence is voluntary, while power requires compulsory submission.

4. Authority: Authority represents the moralization of power. It may also include the legitimisation of power through the provision of legal sanctions to it an through becoming rooted in the traditions, historical institutions and value constellations of a community. Authority is essentially the institutional code within which the use of power as a medium is organized and legitimized. If, then, authority be conceived as the institutional counterpart of power, the main difference lies in the fact that authority is not a circulating medium.

5. Control: Control is more comprehensive than power, but less concentrated in the intensity of its manifestation than power.

The following inferences may be drawn from the above observations.

1. Power is a social phenomenon par excellence, and not merely a political or economic phenomenon.

2. It is useful to distinguish power from prestige, influence, dominance, rights, force, authority and the like.
3. Power is latent force, force is manifest power, and authority is institutionalized power.

4. Power, which has its incidence only in social opposition of some kind, appears in different ways in formal organization, in informal organization, an in unorganized community.

5. The sources and necessary components of power reside in combination of numbers (especially majorities), social organization and resources.

   In fine, power "is the ability to determine the behaviour of others in accord with one's own wishes". It "influences the behaviour of others in accordance with his own intentions". Likewise, we ascribe power to those "who can influence the conduct of others even against their will". Again, it "is simply the probability that men will act as another man wishes. This action may rest on fear, rational calculation of advantage, lack of energy to do otherwise, loyal devotion, indifference or a dozen other individual motives". Certainly, it is because of this wide diversity in the meaning of the term 'power' that its whole study has become like a 'bottomless swamp'.

(iii) Politics (Comparative)

Much of the great tradition of political theory, in contrast, is essentially comparative, classificatory, typological. Comparison is such an intrinsic methodological assumption that it is not separated out as a specific subfield or approach. This background suggests the thesis of this article: that contemporary comparative politics is a movement rather than a subfield or subdiscipline.

The case for comparative politics as a movement is quite persuasive. We start from a tradition in which comparison is an intrinsic aspect of political theory, then move to a situation in which it practically disappears along with the creative political theory of which it is a part, and arrive at the contemporary situation, in which it is a salient and separate part of the political science curriculum.

How can we explain this development? Perhaps we may begin by commenting on the fate of the Aristotelian classification scheme and theory of political change in the history of political science. On the surface it would appear that this Aristotelian macrotheoretical tradition continues straight on through subsequent
millennia up to and including Dahl's Modern political Analysis. And yet it would be misleading to say that the Aristotelian approach to comparison continues as a dominant intellectual construction in present-day political science. Enlightenment political theory moved away from the relativistic and cyclical approach of Aristotle to a unilinear approach to political history and political development. This is particularly marked in British, French, and American political theory, where at first democracy justified as the best form of Government on the basis of natural law and social contract, and then as the democratic revolution spread, as the inevitable direction of human history. Locke and Rousseau are typical of the first approach to democratization while Tocqueville is among the first to view it as historically inevitable. His Democracy in America reflects a growing conviction that democratic politics is the political form of the future. America is the laboratory from which he seeks to derive some sense of the political, social, moral, and cultural consequences of this inevitable democratization.

(iv) Democracy

The term democracy indicates both a set of ideals and a political system - a feature it shares with the terms communism and socialism. "Democracy" is harder to pin down, however, than either "socialism" or "communism"; for while the latter labels have found in Marxism an ideological matrix, or at least a point of reference, democracy has never become identified with a specific doctrinal source - it is rather a by-product of the entire development of Western civilization. No wonder, therefore, that the more "democracy" has come to be a universally accepted honourific term, the more it has undergone verbal stretching and has become the loosest label of its kind. Not every political system claims to be a socialist system, but even communist systems claim to be democracies. Since world War II, "democracy" encompasses everything; as stated by a UNESCO report: "... for the first time in the history of the world... practical politicians and political theorists agree in stressing the democratic element in the institutions they defined in the theories they advocate".

One reaction to this state of affairs has been to avoid using the term. As has been forcibly stated, "... discussions about democracy... are intellectually worthless because we do not know what we are talking about". The alternative is, of course, to dissect the term as analytically as possible.
Democracy is, to begin with, a principle of legitimacy. So conceived it is both the minimal and the sole common denominator of any and all democratic doctrine. From the democratic viewpoint nobody denies that power is legitimate only when it is derived from the authority of the people and based upon their consent. Nobody questions that democracy is the opposite of autocracy. But this agreement is short-lived and indeed rests on fragile foundations, for democracy as a legitimizing principle lends itself to two diverging interpretations:

1. that the consent of the people can be a mere presumption, an untested assumption; or 2. that there is no democratic consent unless it is verified through adhoc procedures (which exclude, notably, consent by sheer acclamation). And these opposing views are related to an even more fundamental disagreement over the very meaning of the term people - a hazy notion indeed.

"The people" can be understood as a singular term (in fact, people, Volk, and popolo are singular nouns in French, German, and Italian) or as a plural, that is, as a single entity or as "everybody". And, clearly, it is only the latter notion that calls for a legitimacy ascertained by means of reliable procedures; for "the people" conceived as an entity, or as an organic whole, easily combines with a legitimacy assumed on the sole basis of acclamations and plebiscitary approbations. Therefore, on the grounds of democracy conceived merely as a principle of legitimacy, any and all Governments can easily claim to be democracies simply by switching from verified consensus to presumed consensus. By itself, then, popular consent does not suffice to qualify any particular political system as a democracy. Such qualifications is given only by the procedures of consent and these are controversial.

From a normative standpoint the definition of democracy strictly derives from the literal meaning of the term- "power of the people". We may say that the ought of democracy amounts to etymology of the term. There are, however, three different normative approaches; oppositional, realistic, and perfectionistic (or utopian). Used as an oppositional concept, democracy indicates what ought not to be; realistic normativism points to what could be; while utopian normativism presents the image of the perfect society that must be. Moreover, since the normative attitude is basically future oriented, it is easily converted into "futurism" in the sense that "democracy" becomes a long-range projection unrelated to
current needs. The use of undemocratic means to achieve democratic ends finds its justification precisely in this attitude.

A descriptive standpoint leads to definitions that bear little resemblance, if any, to the normative definitions of democracy, a concern with what democracy is in the real world seldom, if ever, makes reference to the notion of people. As Dahl puts it, in actuality democracies are "poliarchies". and the standard definition provided by most authors describes democracy as a system based on competitive parties, in which the governing majority respects the rights of minorities. The discussion is focussed on the concepts of representation, majority rule, opposition, competition, alternative Government, control, and the like-hardly ever on the notion of a self-governing people. Even descriptively, however, the approaches can be quite different: structural, procedural, or behavioural. These are not clear-cut distinctions, for both the structures and the procedures of democracy are meant to elicit and to enforce a given behaviour. Yet procedures are not necessarily related to institutional structures; and moreover the behavioural definition may be incompatible with the structural and procedural definitions.

According to the minimal standard, roughly half of the world may be included in the realm of democracy; according to the medium standard the number of democratic countries dwindles; and according to the high standard a mere dozen or so countries have achieved a satisfactory degree of democracy. And it requires little effort to imagine how easily the label "democratic" can be turned into "undemocratic", and vice versa, simply by switching from one standard to another.

A distinction must also be made between small-scale and large scale operations, between microdimensions and macrodimensions. Microdemocracy applies to face-to-face relationships, i.e., to small groups. Macrodemocracy applies whenever a collectivity is too large and/or spatially too scattered to allow any direct interchange among its members and any kind of face-to-face relationships. The distinction implies that a macrodemocracy is not some kind of enlargement of a microprototype. Their respective properties have very little, if anything, in common at least in the sense that voluntary associations and small political units provide no clues for understanding a modern political democracy. They are perhaps the most essential inner nourishment of a democratic political system, but they can neither replace it nor dispense with it. In particular, they provide no model for macrodemocracy. It may be argued that no definite line can be drawn
between small and large, which are indeed relative concepts; nonetheless the fact remains that micro and macrodemocracy are inversely correlated; the greater the geographical extension of democracy, the less its intensity as a real experience of shared decision making.

(v) Authority

The concept of authority, like the related concepts with it, is frequently associated with power, influence and leadership. It is used in a variety of ways in political philosophy and the social sciences. In part, the diversity stems from the ubiquity of the phenomenon. Whether it be defined as (1) a property of a person or office, especially the right to issue orders; (2) a relationship between two offices, one superior and the other subordinate, such that both incumbents perceive the relationship as legitimate; (3) a quality of a communication by virtue of which it is accepted; or (4) countless variations on one or more of these logical forms of definition, the phenomenon of authority is basic to human behaviour. One philosopher, Bertrand de Jouvenel, has put it more strongly: "The phenomenon called 'authority' is at once ancient and more fundamental than the phenomenon called 'State'; the natural ascendency of some men over the others is the principle of all human organizations and all human advances. In any event, the problem of political authority, as distinct from the quest for a precise definition of the concept, is at least as old as Government itself. Since the emergence of the social sciences, authority has been a subject of research in a variety of empirical settings; the family (parental authority); small groups (informal authority or leadership); intermediate organization, such as schools, churches, armies, industrial and Governmental bureaucracies (organizational and bureaucratic authority); and society-wide or inclusive organizations ranging from the most primitive tribal society to the modern nation state and international organization (political authority). To what extent these are different kinds of authority remains an open question. Definitive answers must await more research on their interrelationships: for example, how attitudes toward parental authority condition subsequent attitudes toward civic participation and how the dominant style of political rule affects the ways in which authority is exercised in primary and intermediate organizations."
(vi) Elections

Elections may be regarded as one procedure for aggregating preferences of particular kind.

Liberal democratic theories attribute special authority to the amalgamation of the expressed preferences of individuals through recognized procedures. They reject the idea that social choice can be made by some sort of group mind or interpersonal entity built out of individuals but different from them in kind. They also reject the idea that social choice is a mere illusion, that is, the notion that what appears to be a choice between alternatives is really no more than the consequence of the interplay of various courses.

Liberal theories would certainly accept the idea that in certain cases social choice is made and should be made through the market or by relying on authority. But they postulate also that there are and should be public decisions in which citizens make an explicit choice between alternative courses of public action. This can be done in practice only through forms of procedure generally accepted as binding within the political society.

Voting is one of these procedures but not the only one. Choice might be made by vote, by explicit agreement after negotiation, or "as if by the inspiration of God". Certainly one finds everywhere, even in the most developed societies, choice by bargaining between factors and choice by acclamation and there may be other procedures as well. It appears, however, that in "liberal societies voting is held in reserve as a procedure possessing special authority within the group, organization, or state. Conversely, elections are by no means the only occasion for procedure by vote. Voting on propositions is of great practical importance in many different social and political situations, and it raises similar problems of formal analysis.

Voting in nation-wide elections has a position of special importance in the Western type of democracy. Its authority is strengthened because similar procedures are used for social choice in many institutions, large and small, public and private, throughout the society. (It is not greatly weakened by the existence of formal paradoxes of voting, even though these anomalies are of some tactical importance to groups seeking victory for their own interests). This predominance
has led to the export of voting in elections to countries where voting procedure
has not historically possessed the same social authority as in the West countries
of the Soviet bloc on the one hand and developing countries on the other.

Thus, it is not always easy to answer the question: What is a real election?.
It may be useful to attempt a formal definition.

One enquires, first, the concept of recognized positions or roles (offices)
which confer certain powers and duties within an organization. Individuals may
be assigned to office either by choice or by a method independent of choice, such
as a rule of inheritance, or regulated trials by competition. Next, a general
concept is needed, such as "to choose a man for a job" or perhaps "to decide
between candidates for a job". Within this concept, one must distinguish among
"electing", "Appointing" and "co-opting" a man. Each word has overtones of
political evaluation. Election (provided it is free) would be deemed "democratic"
and therefore good, but for certain positions only. Appointment would be regarded
as patronage that tends to increase the power of the patron, except in so far as
it is hedged to the rules specifying the field of "qualified" candidates. "Cooption"
smacks of oligarchy, the self-perpetuation of a ruling group, unless similarly
regulated.

On this basis, election might be defined as "a form of procedure, recognized
by the rules of an organization whereby all or some of the members of the
organization choose a smaller number of persons or one person to hold office of
authority in the organization".

This definition raises a number of points:

1) It attempts to embrace both formal procedure and social significance of
both "rules" and "choice". Ideally, both elements should be present in
an election. To mark a ballot paper and drop it in a ballot box is not
"electing", unless the actor "chooses" in some socially significant sense.
But equally a choice is not a "vote in election" unless the chooser conforms
to the specified legal procedure. Nevertheless, it may be convenient to
use the word "election" for something that falls short of such completeness;
for instance, where procedure is followed but no choice is present, or
where there is a significant element of choice without close conformity to a socially recognized procedure.

2) The rather loose word "organization" is chosen here deliberately. The word "election" is not used only for "state" elections to a hierarchy of public bodies. Indeed, it could be maintained that state elections are effective only where electoral procedure is regarded as usual procedure throughout the society and is therefore written into the rules of all sorts of non-public bodies, such as business companies, trade unions, free churches, sports clubs and so on. Nor would it do to replace an "organization" by a "society". This might imply that a voter can choose only within his society, whereas multiple membership overlapping organization is characteristic of complex societies, and one man may be a voter in may different capacities and under different rules systems.

3) Two phrases in the definition - "the rules of an organization" and "the members of an organization choose" refer to fundamental conceptual problems in social science. All that need be said here is that ordinary language about elections deals with persons acting within systems of ethical norms and legal procedures. It is possible to reject this language as would happen if either economic determinism or behaviourism were strictly applied in social science. Such studies might have substantial predictive value in relation to electoral behaviour but they would have unanswered some fundamental questions about what men think they are doing when they participate in elections.

4) The word "office" implies a position designated by the same system of rules that determines the electoral procedure. The general problem is that in all social systems persons must somehow be linked to offices; election is one of many different procedures used to ensure legal succession to office in different organization and societies.

5) It remains to distinguish election from appointment or co-option. There are ambiguities in usage here. For instance, fellows of a college would use the word, "elect" both for choosing a master and for choosing a junior colleague. Critics of the college system might accept the former
usage but would describe the latter as "co-option". Political advantage may be drawn from these ambiguities at various levels of political debate; in England, "election" is a good word, "patronage" is a bad word, and "co-option" lies in between. This usage suggests the following distinctions.

a) In an election the choosers are a relatively numerous body. Choice by one voter would, of course, be an appointment. But how many choosers are needed to make an election?

b) There is a question of proportion as well as of absolute number. If ten choosers voted to fill one office, one might call it election; if they filled 100 officers, one would ten to call it appointment (or even patronage). But once again there is no sharp point of division.

c) There is a question of relationship between the choosers and the office to be filled. A person co-opted would be a colleague; a person appointed would be a subordinate, even though he might exercise great discretionary power; a person elected would hold an office of authority, which might include authority over those who elected him.

d) It may be said that when electing, the voters act independently of one another and more or less at the same time, whereas an appointing body acts in consultation with each member sharing in the deliberations and expressing his point of view in turn until a conclusion is reached. This is a very important problem in the study of political development, but it seems to be a distinction between election and appointment. Deliberative procedure in council is very widespread in human societies at all stages; under some circumstances (which have nowhere been seriously studied) the device of voting is used to bring issues to a conclusion. But election does not inevitably entail voting; in certain societies the proper procedure for election is by council, in others, by acclamation and in yet others by voting.

The persistence and adaptability of the use of electoral procedure may be regarded as a means of legitimating the assignment of a person to an office of authority. It is a point at which an individual preference becomes a social
commitment. The words and acts are "preformative", if correctly said and done in the right context; they establish new social relationships of a binding character.

Such acts are generally associated with ritual which underlies the multiple relationships linking them to a complex system of behaviour and belief.

Thus, it is possible to speak of elections in general as a "ritual of choice". The binding character of election derives from the participation of an individual as chooser in a social act, and legitimate authority is thus conferred on the person chose. But such a generalization tells us little about the position of election in any given society.

Men are called by different kinds of elections to different offices in different societies. But it is rash to talk of the function of elections. This may be illustrated by a general election that chooses a governing body and thus Government, though powerful has not a monopoly of legitimate authority in the political system. This authority is shared by many others—those professionally qualified by education and experience, the leaders of organized interests, property owners of various kinds, and so other functions besides choice of a Government, the party organization based on it serves as a market place and reconciler of interests, a ladder for the political careers of national and local officials, a forum of national discussion, and so on.

The doctrine or ideology is one of great and continuing power; but it remains empty until expressed in terms of institutions and interests, and its simplicity is then observed and complicated by arguments drawn form other streams of political doctrine.

Where choice is an element in determining authority in simpler societies it is entangled with other factors such as seniority, lineage, and personal ascendancy. Isolating one factor would distort the situation. In complex societies elections appear in any different contexts, private and public, electoral procedure often survives as a ritual, although the element of choice to take the forms of electoral procedure as a guide in unraveling the complexities of modern political structure. The part played by elections is relatively small even in established democracies, if elections are considered separately as a single fact. An attempt to isolate this factor might therefore break down, but it could hardly fail to sharpen our perception
of the problem, which is of central importance in political science and now within
the grasp of empirical inquiry.

(vii) Political Elites

Even since the issue of the political role of elites - small minorities who
appear to play an exceptionally influential part in political and social affairs - was
first explicitly raised with relation to liberal societies in the closing decades of the
nineteenth century, it has remained a central concern of political science, sociology
and political and social thought. For some, elites are the 'decisionmakers' of the
society whose power is not subject to control by any other body in the society.
For others, elites are the sole source of values in the society or constitute the
integrating force in the community without which it may fall apart. Elites have
been regarded as the chief threat to the survival of democracy. Their existence
has been taken to be the very denial of democracy. Elites which have exceptional
access to 'key positions' in the society, or which appear to wield control over
crucial policies disproportionate to their numbers can understandably seem to be
living contradictions of the notion of 'Government by the people'. Despite this,
other writers have seen elites as the bulwarks of democracy, protecting it from
the dangers of totalitarians, it is impossible therefore to begin a study of the use
of the elite concept in political science with a definition of the term. One has
to regard as political science with a definition of the term. One has to regard
as political elites not merely politicians but also the many minority groups, each
with its inner group of leaders, which attempt to exert some influence, legitimate
or otherwise, over the allocation of values in a society. Theories of elites produced
in the past, such as Plato's portray an elite as the one guarantee of political 'truth'
or 'virtue' or 'success' or mere 'stability'.

However, the real object of elite studies is to examine the structure of power
in communities, to see whether it is in the hands of a cohesive, self-conscious
minority, to test whether this is an inevitable or a merely contingent development,
and in doing so to illuminate the question of the nature of 'power'. In all
communities it is concentrated in the hands of single cohesive elite, or, which is
not the thing, of a very small minority of the population. Political institutions,
political behaviours, political power and political ideology - all find a place in the
controversies surrounding elites. Elitists have forced political philosophers to
reconsider the status of many of the values commonly associated with democracy,
such as equality and liberty, and consequently have impelled a revision of democratic theory. Even the opponents of the theory of elitism have been unable to ignore its conclusions.

The study of elites was established as part of political science in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as a result of the work of two Italian sociologists, Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923) and Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941). Political theory always reflects upon political practice and in many ways the political circumstances of the time favoured attempts to theories about the nature of control and the role of leadership in society. The state appeared to be extending its influence into areas of society with which for a long time previously it had shown little concern. Government were legislating in such matters as the limitation of hours of work, the regulation of working conditions and the provision of pensions and other rudiments of the welfare state.

A celebrated series of lectures by A.V. Dicey argued that even in England the years since 1870 had witnessed a revolutionary change, whereby, legislative collectivism as the principle behind Government action. In order to administer these measures the executive branches of Government has to be extended and made more efficient. The trend towards a stronger executive had been continuing intermittently since the seventeenth century and there were clear indications by the late nineteenth century that this process was being furthered than arrested in the more democratic states. The civil service was being organized on more bureaucratic lines. The establishment of modern bureaucracy was hailed by many as part of a progress towards a more open society and even a stem towards the democratization of Government. Bureaucracy offered a 'career open to the talents' and its establishment was a major aim of many nineteenth century liberals. In principle, entry into Government service was now open to any man of talent and was not dependent on influence or patronage. The study of bureaucracy indicated a new highly efficient potential power behind the recognized political authority. At the very least the bureaucracy constituted a new source of political influence. Some regarded it as the real power behind the power of the Government.

The trend towards a stronger executive continued at the same time as the franchise in many countries in Europe was extended to much larger sections of the community. From the 1860s onwards the general outlines of modern mass democratic politics were laid down. In principle this permitted a larger proportion
of the people to participate in determining the political affairs of their country. 'Government by the people' and 'the will of the people' seemed apt slogans to describe the developing political situation and the aims of the reformers. As early as 1861, however, John Stuart Mill had warned of the fallacy of identifying 'Self-Government' with individual self-determination. Rule by the majority implied merely rule by the majority amongst those elected by the majority. Liberty would still need to be safeguarded against this ruling group. The controllers still had, if not to be controlled, at least to be kept under close surveillance. Nevertheless Mill believed that a mass influence in political affairs was not to be avoided and strove rather to ensure that the majority should at least be enlightened by the participation in the parliament of representatives of the intelligent minority of the community. This was to be attained in part by a system of fancy franchise giving extra votes to the better educated and the more technically qualified so as to ensure the appearance of the very elite of the country in parliament. This elite would still be a minority in the assembly, but the intelligence of their contribution to debate would force the majority to raise the standard of their own arguments as a whole. Mill's aim was neither to predicate nor to justify elite rule, but the liberal goal of raising the level of culture and enlightenment in a democratic society.

But it was Walter Bagehot who, in 1867, hinted at the line that was to be adopted by so many writers on mass democracy. The masses could be accommodated in the existing system. Only they could be persuaded to accept the political direction of minority. This the masses could be expected to do. They would follow an idea, such as glory, empire or nation. The masses would defer to the 'theatrical show' of the 'dignified part' of the constitution, would believe that the Queen rules and not merely reigns. The masses cheer the apparent rulers in the splendid leading coaches of the procession whilst: "The real rulers are secreted in second-rate carriages; no one cares for them or asks about them; but they are obeyed implicitly and unconsciously by reason of the splendour of those who eclipsed and presided them".

As a result of its differential behaviour, the majority', abdicates in favour of its elite, and consents to obey whoever that elite may confide in. So long as this disposition continued in the masses, the established leadership need not fear being displaced as a result of the extended franchise. The 'will of the people'
thus threatened to be a myth concealing the continued rule of an uncontrolled minority.

One result of the extension of the franchise was the emergence of the mass parties. The parties sought the support of the expanded electorate, opening membership to all who possessed the vote and who were willing to subscribe to the party's aims. The more radical parties even established constitutions, which aimed at ensuring that the party's leaders stayed in line with the policies laid down by the mass conference representing the party members.

Once again, then the political system might appear to be opening up under the pressures of mass politics. But, once again, there were skeptics. Lord Randolph Church might affirm that... in a struggle between a popular body and a closed corporation, the latter in these days goes to the wall. But contemporary students of political parties say things in a different light. Ostrogorski, looking at the emergence of the mass party in England at the end of the nineteenth century, concluded that the caucus would gain power over the party but would itself become the machine of a small group of men not accountable to the public. Robert Michels, a disciple of Mosca and friend of Max Weber, in a celebrated study of the German social Democrats, concluded that the tendency would be for control of prices to fall into the hands of combination of parliamentary leaders and party bureaucrats.

Students of politics were with one breath relating the advent of the mass into politics - were discovering 'the crowd' - and with the next breath were saying that power had never been more restricted to a narrow few. It is not, in the circumstances, surprising that these students began to ask whether or not the various leadership groups, in parliament, the parties, the bureaucracies, in industry, showed signs of being concentrated into a single elite. They aimed to inquire about the techniques of leadership, the relations between leaders and their followers. what sorts of people attained positions of leadership etc., Elite studies were thus coeval with the era of modern politics and offered a way of understanding its structure, in particular the aspect that many saw as central - the relationship between leaders and the masses.

The code of the elitist doctrine is that there may exist in any society a minority of the population which takes the major decisions in the society. Because
these decisions are of such wide scope, affecting the most general aspects of the
society, they are usually regarded as political decisions even where the minority
taking them are not 'politicians' in the usual sense of members of Government
or legislature.

The elitist thesis does not merely assert that in society the minority makes
decisions and the majority obeys. Its argument is much stronger one. It is that
the dominant minority cannot be controlled by the majority, whatever democratic
mechanisms are used. No mechanism for ensuring the accountability of the leaders
to the public, no ideology which enshrines the principle of majority will can
prevent the elite from imposing its supremacy over the rest of society.

Because of their power, their organization, their political will or their personal
qualities, the members of the elite are always potentially capable of exploiting
their positions so as to preserve the elite's domination. An implication of this is
that the supposed elite constitutes a coherent, united and self-conscious group.

The elitists regard power as cumulative. Power gives access to more power.
Power is a means to obtain other social good - wealth, economic influence, social
status, educational advantages for their children etc., in turn, these become
themselves powers - wealth makes for greater wealth and for access to political
power, a group's social prestige adds weight to its political activities. Both wealth
and educational opportunities will tend to maintain the elite's domination in
subsequent generations, converting it into a hereditary caste. These advantages
emphasize the exclusiveness of the elite and the difficulty of obtaining entry into
it in many respects indicated by its ability to lay down the terms for admission
to the circle of the politically influential terms with the inclusion of conformity
to standards of wealth, social background, educational attainment and commitment
to the elite's interests and ideology. On the other hand, the elite's survival may
depend on its capacity to adjust to pressures from outside itself and even to admit
elements from other social interests into the elite.

The lower stratum of the elite is a bridge between the core of decision-makers
and the rest of society. It mediates between the rulers and the ruled by transmitting
information in either direction and by providing explanations and justifications for
elite policy. It may also be the source from which the higher elite is recruited
as well as the level at which outsiders first enter elite circles from below.
The upper stratum of political decision-makers is insufficient in strength and numbers to perform the great range and variety of leadership functions necessary in a society. Decisions and legislation issued by the leaders have to be explained and justified to the rest of the society. The opinion leaders who perform this task are drawn from the lower stratum of the ruling class.

The cohesion of a society depends on the lower stratum of the elite which provides the leadership material for the society as well as the essential linkage with those who are led. The simple fact that those who take the 'decisions' in a society do not comprise all those who have 'influence' gives rise to the elite theory of C.Wright Mills who distinguishes between an 'inner core' and the 'outer fringes' of the 'power elite'. The inner core is made up of the men who are 'in' on the major decision, whilst the outer members are 'those who count', whose views and interests have to be considered and conciliated by the inner core even where they do not actively participate in a given decision.

An elite owes its power predominantly to its organizational abilities the elite's domination has to be explained not as a product of the personal qualities of its members but of the positions they hold in a number of key institutions within the society.

The 'Classic' texts of elitist thoughts are undoubtedly Pareto's "The Mind and Society" (Treatise of General Sociology), Mosca's "The Ruling class", and Michel's "political parties". To these might be added Burnham's "The Managerial Revolution" and C.Wright Mills's "The Power Elite". Mosca and Michel adopted an organizational approach, Pareto a psychological one, Burnham an economic one and C.Wright Mills on institutional one.

The crucial criticism of elitists has come from Robert A. Dahl and his research associate in the new Haven Project, Nelson. It is that they have failed to define the 'scope' of the influence wielded by members of the elite. To assert that a person has power or influence is meaningless, unless it is specified which realms of activities he is able to influence. A person may influence agricultural policy but not industrial policy. His influence may thus be confined to a single 'issue area' or he may exercise a more general influence over a number of areas. Furthermore, influence in any area should be measured for intensity. The members influenced need to be estimated as well as the degree of effort needed to be
persuaded from their original intentions. Some persons and groups will be more hostile to moving in a new direction than will others. The person able to move such men may be thought of as more influential than those who can convert the more fickle.

Elitists, believing power to be cumulative, have tended to regard all influential as 'generalists' who exercise power in all matters. They speak of elite 'power' as such, giving the impression of monolithic, undifferentiated entity in the hands of the few.

A powerful man is not necessarily wealthy, a wealthy man not necessarily powerful. But wealth often goes along with the control of economic resources, direction of an industry, control of investment funds, determination of wages and prices. These can very often be used in such a way as to reduce another's life-chances by refusing him credit for his business, rejecting a wage claim, hiring him or firing him and so on. The life-chances of the wealthy man and the poor man must be counted as resources which either can use of to influence his situation. They are in this sense 'powers' defined and 'present means to some future apparent good'.

To list a person's resources does not necessarily identify him as a man of influence. An individual or a group has to possess interest, determination and skill before committing resources to action. Someone with fewer total resources may use them with greater enthusiasm and imagination than someone with far greater potential power.

The political leader is the person granted the authority to decide. This does not mean, however, that the political leadership wields absolute power. It is restricted by the competitive nature of democracy. It must draw up policies to gain more support from the electorate than its opponents can obtain. Here Schumpeter stresses the competition between the members of the political elite itself. The chief danger to the existing leadership comes from other ambitious politicians looking for a pretext to stake a claim for the foremost position rather than from any movement amongst the electorate itself. Such a movement is only effective when harnessed by one of the leaders to his own or his party's ends.

Elites are not an imperfection in a democracy, but, where they are themselves democratic, are the guarantor of the system, because democracy is as much
dependent on the quality of its leaders as any other regime. The real danger for democracy, according to Sartori, comes from the absence of leadership which could result in the mass being exploited by anti-democratic counter-elites. The people assume a Government role in a democracy only at the time of elections. The object of elections, in fact, is to select leaders. The best form of election will be that which selects the best qualified leaders. That such leaders might group themselves as elites which consciously attempt to mould public opinion would be, for Sartori, a welcome development. The real participants in public affairs are the members of the political elites in the parties and in public office.

Democratic elitists, however, show a concern for a range of political values of which the central appear to be liberty, stability and legitimacy, the latter to be achieved by means of the electoral system. Where popular influence is very weak (it is never totally absent), a regime can certainly be termed elitist, where it is very strong, a system in which it is impossible for all members to take part in key decisions, may still be called democratic. It may also be said of society that it has elements of democracy, but that it should be made more democratic by opening up its institutions to greater participation; or it could be said that a society is sufficiently democratic and should be balanced by an elitist element. Politics is one of those areas of human life where what is at issue is often a matter of degree. But it is seldom a matter of mere degree.

(viii) Political Parties

The term “Political parties” emerged in the nineteenth century with the development of representative institutions 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. The role of political parties in the system of responsible or representative Government is not only dominant but creative and comprehensive. A party is the political force that emerged to make democracy workable in its indirect form, when its classical order had become unworkable in the western mass societies. A party serves as the firm foundation of representative democracy and performs all its major institutional and functional activities. A party formulates the policies and programmes of Government and implements them in furtherance of its objectives. It provides stable basis for the majority principle in democracy and makes it legitimate and realizable.
The distinction of a democratic Government lies in its resolve to reconcile its authority with the rights and liberties of its citizens. However, the conditions necessary for this reconciliation obtain only when politics is competitive enough to create in the contending parties, mutual restraints, vigilance and the fear of dislodgment. Paradoxically, democracy is a political partnership between opposing groups. The party in opposition is not a mere watch-dog, it is essentially a national force to repel any possible inroads by the party in power into the realm of freedoms and institutions which guarantee them. It is not an inimical entity but an integral part of the structure of Government. It must make effective the system of checks and balances against the party in power and, if necessary, be able to offer an alternative administration. As between the party in power and the party or parties in opposition, the difference in the responsibility for the able management of representative democracy is not of kind but of degree. Therefore, without a well-evolved system of parties, the success of representative Government would be problematical.

It is the activities and opinions of parties, small minorities, that are in reality attributed to a majority normally indifferent or pathetic. The theoretical installation, finally, of the adult population as the ultimate sovereign armed with the weapon of the ballot, was itself a party effort, a group maneuver, accomplished more with the intention of facilitating the seizure of power than of exalting the average adult to the summit of sovereign authority. The choice before the electorates in any democracy is between different parties, as Government by independents is mere wishful thinking in modern society. Hence, even in casting his vote the elector's freedom is limited to the candidates of parties who should as a rule be taken for representatives of the people. The great majority of the voters are taken to the polling booth by the contending parties themselves; their manifestoes, speeches, propaganda, canvassing, procession, demonstrations and various other inducements count more in driving the voters to the polls than the inspiration of their independent minds filled with sovereign pride.

It is neither the majority of the people nor the majority of the electoraye that extends or ends the life of a party Government in normal circumstances, but it is, as established, the majority of the party representatives in the legislature, apparently taken in the context as representatives of the people.
The displacement of party in power normally cannot be brought about by the people nor by the electorate of their own. It can be done only by a strong opposition party by mobilizing public opinion, creating dissatisfaction against the existing Government by exposing its shortcomings and follies and organizing a strategically superior election campaign to secure the confidence of the people in its capacity to deliver the goods.

(ix) Voting

Voting is a means of aggregating individual preferences into collective decisions. It is not the sole means; market mechanisms frequently perform similar functions, as do processes of informal interaction in many social and political groups. The aggregation of individual preferences by voting raises a variety of issues (How many alternatives are voted upon? Is a complete or a partial preference ordering required of the individual elector? What rule shall determine the collective outcome?) These properly belong to the study of elections. The study of electoral behaviour may be viewed as concerned more narrowly with the formation and expression of individual preferences.

The diffusion of voting gives the study of electoral behaviour an exceedingly broad empirical terrain. However, electoral studies have, in fact, mainly treated the behaviour of large-scale electorates in the national states of North America and Europe. By the end of the nineteenth century the spread of liberal democracy in these nations had given the public the power to intervene in Government through the choice of elective office holders. Since the voting of mass electorate was a significant element of the politics of these nations, it was an inevitable that it should attract the attention of later empirical studies, and the systematic study of voting has now extended to a number of Western and non-Western nations.

Methods of electoral analysis:

In any large electoral system, the aggregation of individual preferences through voting involves extensive record keeping, and the immense wealth of data issuing from the conduct of elections has been a primary resource of the study of voting.

The returns for a given election in a given electoral unit furnish two kinds of information:
1. The total of ballots will measure the level of participation or turnout, if the size of the electorate is known and if the turnout is not obscured by some form of multiple voting, and, 2. the total of votes for particular parties or candidates will measure the distribution of preference. The analytic use of which of these two kinds of information are put has varied according to whether the investigator examines a single election only or change between two or more elections. Single-election analyses typically have considered the tendency of the vote to vary with other known characteristics of the electoral units involved. Thus, Ogburn and Talbot compared the proportions of votes cast for Alfred E. Smith in each of a sample of countries in the 1928 U.S. Presidential election with the proportion of electors within each country who were Roman Catholic, foreign-born, urban, traditionally democratic, and favourable to the repeal of prohibition. They found that the presidential vote varied less by religion than by attitude towards prohibition. Similarly, another analyst examined support for the Communist party in postwar Finnish elections across a set of electoral units, which he classified in social and economic terms, and demonstrated that the communists did better in poor and wealthy communes than in communes of intermediate wealth. Where candidates for several offices are voted for, analyses of single elections may exploit differences of turnout or party preference between offices. Thus, Silva has questioned Smith’s responsibility for the debacle of 1928, by contrasting the Democratic Presidential vote with the party vote for other offices in that year.

Electoral behaviour has attracted the interest of an extraordinary range of disciplines, as social and clinical psychologists, sociologists, psychiatrists, and economists, as well as political scientists, have added to the body of empirical knowledge. It is quite impossible to survey the field thoroughly in a few pages. Findings from a number of studies; indeed, one summary of findings from a limited group of studies lists several hundred empirically based generalizations. In this enormous accumulation of findings, it is possible, however, to identify several problems which have attracted the widest attention.

(x) Participation

There has, first of all, been sustained interest in the sources of the broad public’s participation or lack of participation in politics. This problem is not easily disentangled from the ideology of liberal democracy, in which the citizen’s participation in periodic elections is a basic norm. But in view of the colossal
dimensions of modern electorates and the tenuous links between electoral behaviour and Government action, an equally interesting problem is to identify the reasons why the citizen participates at all.  

It is possible to categorize factors in participation as normative, instrumental, and expressive. By normative is understood a response to the value, usually positive, which the elector perceives the act itself to have. There can be little question that very broad parts of the mass public respond to the norms of "citizen duty" which are so much a part of the ethos of liberal democracy and which are heavily reinforced by the propaganda encouraging participation which suffuses many election campaigns.

Equally common in conceptions of liberal democracy is the idea that electors participate for the instrumental reason of wanting to influence the actions of Government. Although a long series of studies has shown how little the ordinary voter knows about Government policies, there is no doubt that responses to perceived differences in the general policy images of the parties or their candidates are among the motives for participation. It is here that, the forces governing the electors' two choices- whether to vote and how to vote-come together, and many of the factors which may lead the voter to prefer one party to another become forces inducing him, to participate. Thus, the explanation of differing levels of participation offered by Lipset and his colleagues relies heavily on the assumption that electors will have used their ballot for instrumental purpose.

An attempt to explain participation mainly in these terms is confronted, however, by the obvious difficulty that a voter who knows that he is a minuscule part of the whole may think that his behaviour will have very little effect on the result. There are really two questions here: whether the voter thinks that his ballot can influence the further course of Government. As to the first, the familiar tendency for turnout to be higher when the party vote is close presumably reflects some sort of calculus of possible influences. Yet there is really very little data on either of these points. This information would be especially important in the analysis of electoral behaviour within multiparty systems, in which elaborate bargaining among political leaders may intervene between popular elections and the formation of Government.
Participation may also be expressive behaviour, an act which is undertaken for gratifications that are not related to any policy of Government. Many writers have commented on the similarity of the psychological involvement of mass public in political contests. Certainly, the vernacular of Western political competition is rich with the idiom of sport, and much of the political interest of electorates is similar to the interest shown by mass sporting publics. The expressive functions of voting broaden the sources of participation to include subconscious, or "nonrational", factors as in the case of voters whose adult partisan commitments express a rebellion against the political beliefs of their parents.

Of factors which may inhibit participation, none has received wider attention than the phenomenon of "cross pressures", which was first made prominent in the work of Lazarsfeld and his associates. Many studies have observed that electors who are subject to contradictory partisan stimuli will tend to defer their vote decisions or not vote at all. Thus, Allardt and Bruun have found that political participation among the Swedish language minority in Finland is greater in areas of high Swedish concentration than it is in areas where the intermingling of Swedish-speaking and Finnish-speaking people can lead to substantial cross pressures. The theoretical point of view underlying the cross-pressure hypothesis is that of theories of cognitive dissonance: confronted with dissonant stimuli (for example, middle-class work associates who are Republican; Catholic coreligionists who are Democratic), the elector resolves the conflict by putting the voting act out of mind. However, it is by no means clear how often the deferred or reduced participation of cross-pressured subjects should be taken as evidence of genuine avoidance behaviour. Persons whose political stimuli are not mutually reinforcing will naturally have less strongly one-sided preferences and will therefore be less motivated to vote so as to affect outcomes or express symbolic support. But this is far from total withdrawal from voting motivated by a desire to resolve a situation of dynamic conflict.

A more diffuse set of ideas surrounds the assertion, variously rendered, that limited participation indicates the "alienation" of the citizenry from the party system, the regime, or society as a whole. Closely related is the concept of anomie, although the withdrawal of the anomie citizen from social and political participation presupposes less actual hostility on his part than on the part of the alienated citizen. The theoretical discussions of alienation and anomie may have
extended a good deal beyond the evidence, yet they have shown that the low sense of political efficacy found in many nonvoters is linked to a more general sense of their lack of competence in dealing with various aspects of the social environment.

Those who consider nonparticipation to be simply the consequence of political uninterest and those who consider it the consequence of actual alienation from politics tend to offer very different judgments of the prospects of liberal democracy. The pessimistic view is that the changing structure of society, involving a disintegration of relationships binding the individual to the wider social order, tends to produce a mass society characterized by low participation and high potential support for extremist or authoritarian movements. But those who see nonparticipation as a sign of acquiescent uninterest maintain that the presence of a nonparticipating stratum prevents the polarization of society into fanatical political elements, and that the relative freedom of this stratum from partisan bias allows it periodically to supply the needed support for political change.

(xi) Local Government

Local Government may be loosely defined as a public organization authorized to decide and administer a limited range of public policies within a relatively small territory which is a subdivision of a regional or national Government. Local Government is at the bottom of pyramid of Governmental institutions, with the national Government at the top and intermediate Governments (states, regions, provinces) occupying the middle range. Normally, Local Government has general jurisdiction and is not confined to the performance of one specific function or service.

This simple definition obscures wide variations in Local Governmental systems and operational patterns, and it should be supplemented by a system of classification for both description and analysis. In the past, Local Governments have been classified largely in terms of their formal structures. In the United States great stress was laid on the question of whether a Local Government had a mayor with broad executive powers or a mayor who was little more than a presiding officer of the city council (the strong versus the weak mayor "plans"); whether the council members divided among themselves administrative responsibility for the several aspects of Local Government (the commission plan); or whether the council
employed a professional executive agent to administer the city’s affairs and be accountable to the council (the city manager plan). Similar emphasis was placed on form and structure by authors attempting crossnational comparisons of Local Governmental systems.

The formal structure of Local Government, important as it can be to the character of a system, is not the only nor even the most significant determinant of the style of Local Government. The quality and character of a Local Government are determined by a multiplicity of factors (for example, national and local traditions, customary deference patterns, political pressures, party influence and discipline, bureaucratic professionalism, economic resource controls, and social organization and beliefs). That a Local Government is located in a nation controlled by a communist party may be an infinitely more important fact than the structural forms it has. That an American city is located in the South, where Negroes occupy an inferior social position, may explain far more about the Local Government than its structure. The existence of a huge economic enterprise within a given municipality may be more determinative of the style and policies of a Local Government than its organization. And, it might be added, this may be as true in a totalitarian regime as in a democratic one.

There are hundreds of thousands of Local Governments in the world, and we lack sufficient information about their operational characteristics to make completely confident generalizations about the nature of Local Government or to isolate the most critical variables that shape it. In the process of moving towards surer understanding of the phenomenon it is useful to pursue answers to three basic questions about any Local Government. First, to what extent, is there Local Self- Government? For example, do the people of the community have an opportunity to participate in Government through meaningful elections and to have access to public officials to express their opinion by organized and individual activity? Second, to what extent does the municipality have relative autonomy and discretionary authority to act? That is, is there a deconcentration of authority from the central Government to the locality with little or no local discretion, or is there decentralization of authority with relative discretion, or is there decentralization of authority with relative discretion to undertake programmes on local initiative and with relative freedom from strict supervision and restriction from the Central Government? Third, is the Local Government vital and significant
force in the lives of the people? Is the Government an institution with the will and the authority to undertake activities that deeply affect the lives of people, or is it so marginally an aspect of life that the citizenry is scarcely aware that it exists?

To facilitate discussion of Local Government in terms of these broad questions, five broad categories of Local Governmental systems may be postulated: 1. Federal-decentralized, 2. Unitary-decentralized, 3. Napoleonic-prefect, 4. Communist, the meaning of each category will become clear in the discussion.

Federal-decentralized systems

Those federal systems which decentralize much authority to the regional Governments that compose the federation also tend to be the nations that allow the broadest range of discretionary authority to Local Government. This is not true of all systems, that are called federal, however, but only of those with actual decentralization. The Soviet Government was formally organized along federal lines, but such decentralization of authority to the districts as exists occurs under strict central Government controls; it is made abundantly clear that the subunits of the Soviet system (the "republics" and their subdivisions) were in reality agents of the Central Government and the Communist party. In federal systems with much decentralization (for example, Australia, Canada, Germany, Switzerland, and the United States) the degree of autonomy of Local Government varies considerably from country to country, but in all cases a considerable degree of local independence prevails.

This variation extends deeper than the country-by-country comparison, for there is often much variation among individual states or provincial regional Governments as to the forms and authority of Local Government. For example, the closeness of supervision by administrative agencies of regional Governments varies widely from fairly extensive reporting and oversight to almost none, except in cases of flagrant corruption. Likewise, certain states in the United States grant "Home Rule" to municipalities by statutory or State constitutional provisions that permit municipalities to alter their forms of Government at will and that grant local authority to "make all laws and ordinances relating municipal concerns", or broadly the "powers of Local Self-Government", while in other states the
municipality has to appeal to the state legislature for specific permission to undertake a particular programme.

The idea of "Home Rule" as local independence is an ancient doctrine, but as a legal concept it originated in the late nineteenth century when American state legislatures interfered, often corruptly with the functioning of Local Government. Gradually, home rule has extended, with varying degrees of effectiveness, to most of the states. Home Rule does not grant total autonomy by any means, since legislature through general law and the courts through interpretation still restrain Local Government. Nevertheless, the concept contradicts the principle of municipal inferiority that previously stood as a basic rule of law. In the late nineteenth century judge John F. Dillon stated the classic principle of the status of the Local Government by saying that municipal corporations were completely creatures of the legislature which could control or even destroy municipalities at will. In the famous Dillon's Rule he stated:

It is a general and undisputed proposition of law that a municipal corporation possesses and can exercise the following powers, and no others: first, those granted in express words, second, those necessarily or fairly implied in or indictment to the powers expressly granted; third, those essential to the accomplishment of the declared objects and purposes of the corporation—not simply convenient, but indispensable. Any fair, reasonable, substantial doubt concerning the existence of power is resolved by the courts against the corporation and the power is denied.

The vitality of Government in the federal decentralized countries varies both within and among countries. In the United States the role of Local Government expanded greatly with the maturation of industrial society in the first half of the twentieth century; protective, regulatory, welfare, planning, economic promotion, cultural, and other activities were initiated or expanded. But the extent of expansion varies greatly with the size of the city, the area of the country, and even for adjacent cities. In the largest cities, where the functional expansion has been greatest, the hugeness and impersonal nature of the Government probably make Government appear to impinge less on the lives of the citizens than it does in fact. In smaller rural or suburban communities, Local Government ranges from the moribund to the fairly vital. Likewise in other nations the degree of vitality and impact of Government varies widely. In the Swiss communities where a town-meeting style of Government prevails, the sense of involvement and the level
of participation are high. The English-speaking Commonwealth federal systems appear to have a range of variation in the vitality of Local Government that compares generally with that in the United States.

**Unitary-Decentralized Systems:**

Great Britain and the Scandinavian countries are examples of nations with Unitary (that is, non-federal) Governments which have a considerable degree of decentralization of autonomous power to localities. Although in all cases there is supervision by the Central Government, and although localities can take only such actions as authorized by the Central Government, Local Governments in these nations do have fairly wide responsibilities and make independent decisions about them. The independent status of the English city has a long history, as evidenced by ancient royal charters of cities. The first charters were just agreements by the King to recognize certain concessions that local leaders had bought or bargained for, but in time the charter became regularized and the basis of a considerable area of local discretion. As early as the fifteenth century merchant guilds and borough councils originated the rudiments of Local Self-Government. Parliament remains the supreme source of local authority but the practice of permitting local prerogatives is so firmly established that curtailment is always registered and comes only after great deliberation. Nevertheless, there has been a considerable diminution of local independence since the nineteenth century. Although the functions of the municipality have in some respects been enlarged with the coming of new problems and public policies to meet them (for example, public housing), an extension of the Central Government's concern for formerly purely local matters has taken place simultaneously. Particularly in the fields where the Central Government has provided a percentage of the cost of programmes through grants-in-aid, Central Government departments have greatly extended their control over local decisions. Centrally established minimum standards of performance have unquestionably raised the efficiency of Local Government, but at the same time they have curtailed the independence that once existed.

British Local Government is representative Self-Government. The local council is directly elected, although the local executive is not. The Mayor (or Chairman in certain local bodies) is chosen from among the Council Members, but he is not the Chief Executive in the same way that an American Mayor is.
The British Mayor is more a ceremonial and presiding official than an active executive leader, and to the extent that he is the latter it is the result of his personal qualities or his political position. The major operating element of the British Local Council is the Committee System, into which non-Council Members are co-opted on aspects of policy covered by the particular committee. Although, the Council must ratify all committee actions before they are valid, the committees are the active elements in the process rather than the Council as a whole. The Town (or Country) Clerk also plays a significant role in Local Government in his relationship to the Committees. It is he who prepares information for the Committee and sets the agenda, but he is not a British parallel to the American City Manager, for he is not directly given the function of overseeing administration. Traditionally clerks are not trained in administrative management but in the law, although their apprenticeship in Local Government necessarily emphasizes administrative matters, and as the problems of Local Government become more complex it increasingly falls to the clerk to provide expertise and to coordinate the diverse elements of Local Government.

Since the early nineteenth century Local Governments in the Scandinavian nations have been allowed a fair degree of autonomy. The list of powers for Local Government is extensive, and while regional appointees of the Central Government who are in some respects similar to the French Prefect oversee local operations, the actual supervision is not strict and does not compare with that in nations with prefectural systems. In Norway all actions involving expenditures must be cleared with the Provincial Governor before they can be carried out, which on the surface suggests that Norwegian Local Government in vital matters has broad scope, and is a very important aspect of the nation's political-Governmental system. Local Government is a common recruiting ground for higher political office, and local forms and practices have been used as modes for creating regional institutions and practices. Denmark also has close supervision of fiscal matters, but the check on Local Government that this might imply is not apparently onerous. Local Government is democratic, has a fairly wide range of discretion, but is somewhat less autonomous and vital than Norwegian Local Government. In Sweden Local Government activities are divided between those that are "free" of supervision, except on legal challenge, and those that are "regulated". Generally speaking, the free functions are those concerned with municipally provided utilities and cultural-recreational activities, whereas the
regulated ones include a long list of functions extending from welfare services to town planning, local courts, and school administration. As in Norway and England there is extensive use of Committees of the Council for conduct of business. Finland's Local Governments have somewhat less discretionary authority and are subject to closer supervision, but the general pattern appears to be not markedly different from that in other Scandinavian nations.

The Role of Local Government

Paradoxically, Local Government in the twentieth century seems to expand the number of functions it performs at the same time that it faces increasing Central Government supervision and a narrowing of its independence. As the problem of large and complicated cities and metropolitan areas grow, at least to the extent that financial means to cope with the problems exist, the city has greatly extended its role. Cultural activities expand simultaneously with programmes on housing, redevelopment, air pollution control, and the recruitment of business enterprises. Many of the most dramatic and important of these functions are financed in good part by grants-in-aid from higher level Governments, thereby decreasing local discretion at least to some extent. Also the expansion occurs simultaneously with a narrowing of distances between the Central Government and the municipality as the means of communication develop and as areas once isolated economically and politically become an integral part of a national economy and political system. It is, therefore, sometimes difficult to say whether Local Governments in a particular nation are now more or less significant agencies of Government than they were in a simpler age.

In the case of the smaller communities there is not much doubt that increasing centralization has affected their range of discretion negatively. Although the capacity of a Central Government to control tends to dwindle with distance for the simple reason that remoteness prevents control, the growth of rapid communication tends to undercut this source of independence. Likewise, smaller communities caught up in the sprawl of metropolitan growth suddenly cease to be independent units and become entangled in the complications of overall metropolitan areas. This leads to the development of regional institutions that in some degree may supplant or at least supplement Local Government, and it also tends to force local officials into governing in part through negotiation with officials from higher levels of Government and with those of neighboring Municipalities.
Finally, it is important to note that the role of the Municipal Executive has grown greatly in the present century, owing to the same forces that have heightened the role of the executive in national Government. The technological complexity of the problems being dealt with increases the power of the bureaucracy; and the diversity and diffusion of modern life also tend to lead to a stronger executive which seems to be the only functionary capable of controlling the bureaucracy, focusing public attention on key issues, and pressuring the various actors on the city scene to respond to the challenges a city faces.

(xii) Local Politics

Politics consists of the process by which goods, services, and privileges are allocated by Government or the rules are established for their allocation by other social institutions. Local Government is a political subdivision of a national or regional Government which performs functions that are culturally defined as being "local" in character, which in nearly all cases receives its legal powers from the National or Regional Government but possesses some degree of discretion in the making of decisions and which normally has some taxing powers. Local politics, therefore, consists not merely of local activities which relate to national political matters, but it involves a degree of choice to be made within the boundaries of the local unit of Government relative to the selection of office holders and the making and execution of public policy. These decisions are not necessarily made unilaterally through a local political system and its institutions. Often decisions are shared with other Governments, and local political institutions and processes are commonly interwoven with those of neighboring localities and with regional and national political systems.

The patterns of politics at the local level are greatly varied. They assume a particular character in a particular locality according to the prevailing influences of ideology, social structure, and technology in the society. In primitive social systems there may be little in the way of recognized political institutions, but of those that do exist, the local political systems are often more important than the national so far as the typical citizen is concerned. In more complex societies, where Governmental bureaucracies are specialized, where much is expected in the way of Governmental functions, and where rapid means of transportation and communication exist, the activities and relative importance of Local Government become largely a function of ideology—the belief systems and traditions that condition
the minds of a politically significant portion of the population. In some cases, as in Nazi Germany from 1933 to 1945, Local Government has been important in theory and quite important in practice.

In societies, in which the concepts of change, "progress" specialization, or economic interdependence are little developed, Local Government is dominated by a politics of consensus. Traditional functions are accepted and honoured. Politics may center largely on particular politicians, with the size and importance of personal followings determining political power. One of the functions of politics may be that of entertainment for the ordinary citizen who has little else to amuse him. Innovation is not expected from the local political process. The notions of ameliorating social problems or elevating the standard of living may be unrecognized or unacceptable concepts. African, Asian, and Latin American village societies tend to follow this pattern. Even in fairly complex, industrially developed societies, the dominant ideology in rural areas may call for this kind of function to be performed by Local Government. The village, in all societies, tends to have a politics based on face-to-face relationships, with the behaviour of politicians tempered by considerations of the expectations of friends and neighbors.

In complex industrialized societies, local politics may be analyzed according to 1. images of the ideal function or goals and Local Government, 2. the degree to which Local Government is integrated with or insulated from the national political process, 3. the degree of autonomy of Local Government in relation to the national Government in terms of discretionary powers in policy making, 4. the distribution of power within the community.

Local politics and democracy

Studies of local politics since the end of World War II indicate that the bulk of citizens in American democracy do not exert much individual influence, even at the local level. In fact, the pattern at the local level appears to be not much different from that at the national, despite the prevalence of nonpartisanship and the supposed significance of physical proximity to the decision makers. The level of information possessed by the typical citizen is low, citizens take their cues from various political leaders and decisions seem to be largely the product of bargaining among leaders. Voter participation at the local level is typically lower than it is for national and state elections, and some scholars have been concerned,
about the high level of alienation at the local level, although evidence as to the significance of this, if it exists at all, is inconclusive. The indifferent do, however, seem to move towards the extremes of the political spectrum when they become activated, just as is the case in national elections. In the 1960s, then, the study of local politics leaves unanswered some questions that are important for democracy. Particularly, it is still uncertain how much citizen participation is necessary for healthy democracy at the local level, what form this should take for the viability of democracy, or to what degree present systems of Local Government provide adequate or satisfying representation and access to decision makers by all segments of the local population.

Local Self-Government (the case)

The case for Local Government rests on political, social and economic grounds, first Local Government has a value as an education for democracy. It is educative for the electors, who are called upon to do their voting in relation to issues that are readily comprehensible to them. It is educative for the councilors also since they can gain experience in the art of responsible leadership, without being confronted with issues, at that stage, may be beyond their grasp. The representative can maintain a direct and close contact with his constituents in human terms, without having to rely upon these synthetic initiations of contact which are characteristic of party politics upon the national scale. It is, therefore, easier for Local Government than for national Government to be close to the people.

Secondly, Local Government creates among the people a sense of their common interest, in common affairs and of their individual as well as common duty to take care that those affairs are efficiently and honestly administered. "Localities—they are not simply areas and sites, but groups of men and women living together as neighbors—feel that they, at any rate, differ from the abstract average of humanity legislated for by the Central Government, and claim discretion to apply its uniform rules in a way more closely fitting their real needs and their own ideas of themselves."24.

Thirdly, local institutions train people not only to work for others but also to work effectively with others. They develop common sense, reasonableness, judgment and sociability. Those who have to bring their minds together learn
the need for concession and compromise. Thus is ensures the recognition of the worth of knowledge and tact in public affairs and that of judging men by performance rather than by professions or promises. Forthly, one of the responsibilities which Local Government has to bear is financial responsibility. The connection between the payment of local taxes and the enjoyment of local services is clear and direct and this fact is more convincing to the taxpayer and more stimulating to his interest than the remote connection which is often so difficult to see in the national budget.

Fifthly, in developing countries, local authorities have a special role to play. These countries, including India, have to make rapid headway in the sphere of education, public health and communications in order to keep pace with the march of world events. The local authorities have the foremost place in the execution of these important services. Their weakness not only retards the political development but also reacts on the progress in all other spheres of national life. As a matter of fact, as time has gone, the grievances of political tutelage and economic underdevelopment have become even more closely intertwined.

(xiii) Urban Government and Politics

The term 'Urban' derived from the Latin word "URBAN-US" means (i) pertaining to or characteristic of, occurring or taking place in, a city or town, or (ii) exercising authority, control, supervision, etc.; in or over a city or town.

Some other terms related to 'urban' have definite meaning which are as follows:

The term 'Urbanity' means, 'the character or quality of being urbane' courtesy, refinement, or elegance of manner; refined or bland politeness or civility.

The term 'Urbanization' means, 'the process of investing with an urban character; the condition of being urbanized.'

The term 'Urbanize' means (i) to render urbane or civil; to make more refined or polished; or (ii) to make of an urban character to convert or transform into a city.

In recent years, urban politics is becoming one of the most richly plowed fields of political research. In terms originally introduced by David Easton,
political scientists have long been concerned with inputs, but more recently they have focussed their attention on other system variables, particularly the political culture and policy outputs of Municipal Government.

The study of urban politics has been forced to a position of prominence by contemporary events. Where once it was a step child of other fields and interests - public law, state and Local Government, public administration-it has become the focus of interest of politicians, scholars and reformers. To some extent it may be noted that the growth of the field is manifest in the development of new journals and the initiation of substantially more research on urban politics and in the rapid establishment of urban studies courses, institutes, and programme at colleges and universities.

The principal problem in the study of urban politics is less with its means than with its ends. The journals and book shelves are choked with articles and volumes arguing at white heat and some times strident tones the methodology of urban political studies, arguing in short, the means by which one should seek the answers to questions in this field. Comparative analyses of urban political system are hard precisely because it is so difficult to specify outcomes.

Analyzing urban political system as system can not be done simply by trying to look at the system “whole”, for there are always as many “wholes” as there are observers. Furthermore, it may be that not all of urban politics has the character of a “system”- that is of a set of interdependent variables. Attention must therefore be given to the appropriate units of analysis. Most recently, the unit employed by the political scientists has been the issue, and that employed by some (though by no means all) sociologists has been the elite.

Urbanization the process of and Urban politics

Urban areas are defined administratively by the Indian census authorities in terms of demographic characteristics and status of municipal bodies. However, a sociological definition assigns certain individual and social characteristics to the process of urbanization. The involvement of our researchers and writers have been very limited. Writers on urban politics in India remain content by selecting an area, defined as Urban by the census, and label all that goes within that area as ‘Urban Politics’.
Recently there is no attempt to relate the political process', to the Urban process: India is undergoing a phase of over-urbanization. Urban areas develop despite their failure to industrialize not because of industrialization as they did in almost all western countries. The present growth of urban areas in India is due to growth of population and also due to migration from the rural to the urban areas for livelihood. In a rapid developing country the process of urbanization leaves little time for individual adjustments and for the assimilation of immigrant social groups into the Urban life of the people. Consequently many cities and towns have acquired rural cultures. With the availability of some macro studies and some single town case studies it is possible to formulate some hypothesis relating to the urban political process and its relationship with social process. Studies on Indian urban politics are mainly concerned with the description of urban problems, rather than prescription and in this respect, they are seeking the help of the sociologists to get the answer to the most important question of 'who rules the urban communities'. Much of the political activities in the cities and towns may not fit well with the 'who governs, where, when and with what effects' formulation.

Awareness of these problems of urbanization has attracted the attention of social scientists while attempting to understand the complexity of the city. Studies on "urban politics" have developed so far an attitude of ignorance towards the contributions made by social science disciplines.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

There is no dearth of literature on local Governments as such. Some of its related dimensions have also been touched upon by scholars. For example:

Ranga Reddy, G. in his book "LOCAL GOVERNMENT - A COMPARATIVE STUDY" (Padmini Publications, Hyderabad 1965) clearly states the comparative study of the local government between India and U.K. The author explains why there should be local government and why it should assume a democratic form. The author deals with the structure of U.K. local government, its three tier-system, the relations between the three-tiers, and points out how each local body deals with a number of functions. In conclusion the author emphasises the problem about local government in India.
The book "URBAN GOVERNMENT" written by Benjamin Baker, (East & West Press, New Delhi, 1965) discusses the Municipal political institutions and their development. The author emphasises upon the dynamic character of these institutions. The municipality and its functions are presented as being in a constant state of flux and its authority and responsibility as being highly sensitive to the changes in the society.

Venkata Rangaiya & Pattabhiram, M. in their book "LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INDIA SELECT READING" (Allied Publishers, Bombay, 1969) describe local self government in ancient India and India under the East India Company, British Crown and various resolutions regarding local self-government in India. It includes all the relevant state papers, pronouncements of states, new recommendations of committees and commissions which have shaped the system of local self-government in India over these hundred and odd years.

Bharadwaj, R.K, in his book "MUNICIPAL ADMINISTRATION IN INDIA" (Sterling Publishers (P) Ltd. New Delhi, 1970) presents the working of local bodies in India mainly with the purpose to impress readers on civic affairs as based upon practical experience in order to inculcate in them the social and civic sense. The author emphasises the working of the civic administration and its day-to-day dealing with the public, which requires lot of improvement.

Mohit Bhattacharya in his book "ESSAYS IN URBAN GOVERNMENT" (The World Press (P) Ltd., Calcutta, 1970.) analyses the structure of urban local governments in India and cabinet system in municipal Government, state machinery for municipal supervision and also the problems of management and financing of water supply in the urban areas of Bihar, Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh.

Krishnamani, P.N. in her book "ELECTIONS CANDIDATES AND VOTERS" (Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1971) seeks to explain briefly and broadly the laws as it stands today regarding electoral candidates. The book covers the introduction to the apparatus and the ground rules of the electoral process and for the simple and lucid way in which the author had tried to explain a highly technical subject. The law and procedure relating to elections are for the most part highly technical, legalistic and complicated for an average voter to
comprehense. There is thus a great need for a popular presentation of the law and practice relating to elections.

Subhas, C. in his book "ELECTIONS AND ELECTORAL REFORMS IN INDIA" (Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1971) explains the electoral process and apparatus which are basic to the design of a constitution and the quality of government in a democracy. The electoral system is a determinant as well as a concomitant in modern democracies. It provides the institutional workshop for hammering out a government on the of popular choice. The history of electoral reforms reflects in a broad sense the upsurge of public opinion as decisive factor in the political process, carrying in it seeds of increasing politicization and democratization of the electorate.

Dr. Sachdeva, in his book "LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES IN INDIA" (Raj publishers, Jallendar, 1974) explains the aims and principles of the local government and also emphasises on the expansion and strengthening of rural local-government and how it functions.

Norman D. Palmer book "ELECTIONS AND POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT" (Vikas Publishing house (P) Ltd, New Delhi, 1976) deals with the electoral process and the role of elections in the political system, methodological techniques and theoretical approaches. The purpose of this book is to examine the electoral experience of the countries of South Asia from a comparative and developmental point of views and different roles and functions of elections in various South-Asian States.

Nandakar, V.G. in his book "LOCAL GOVERNMENT ITS ROLE IN DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION" (Concept publishing Co, New Delhi, 1979) narrates the origin, development and new role of the local governments in the development of administration and also explain the panchayat raj bodies.

Abhijit Datta, A. (ed) in his book "MUNICIPAL AND URBAN INDIA" (The Indian institution of public Administration, New Delhi, 1980) devotes first three articles to the system of municipal organization, legal, administrative and financial. The next four articles are concerned with the internalities of municipal administration and municipal financial management and the last article deals with the municipal taxation and expenditure and also devoted to the wider theme on
urban affairs and cover diverse themes such as, financing and organization of urban development, goals of urban planning, urban economic base, urban land values, urban housing policy, urban community development and grass root politics.

In Hartmann, Herts' book "POLITICAL PARTIES IN INDIA" (Meenakshi Prakasham, Meerut, 1982) attention has been drawn on three essential aspects of political parties how they have developed and built up their organization, how they portray themselves in the context of Indian, and how they operate in the election at the centre and the state levels.

John Stewart in his book "LOCAL GOVERNMENT : THE CONDITIONS OF LOCAL CHOICE" (George Allen & Unwin, London, 1983) gives a clear perspective on the working of local government and also describes the local authority as both a political institution and a provider of services. The local authority's role is dependent on its institutional form as elected Local Government. This book divided into three parts. Part one sets out the conditions under which local authorities operate. Part two deals with the main elements in the working of local authorities, actors, settings, values, procedures and boundary relations. Part three examines constraints and choice in the working of a local authority. Finally, the book provides a perspective on the working of local authorities and on the condition of local choice.

Gupta, R.L. in his book "ELECTORAL POLITICS IN INDIA" (Discovery publishing House, New Delhi, 1985) deals with the Electoral Politics in India. Elections are the cornerstone of democracy. They lie at the heart of democratic process and are an expression of popular will. The main feature of the outcome of the elections has been an unequivocal reaffirmation and commitment of the Indian electorate to the ideas of national unity, stability and integrity. The elections of the Lok Sabha, the state Assemblies and the municipalities clearly establish the fact that the performance of the political parties - whether in office or outside greatly influence the voting behaviour of the electorate. Finally, the author concludes that the elections are a tribute to the maturity, sagacity and sophisti of the voters.

Kaushik, S.L. in his book "LEADERSHIP IN URBAN GOVERNMENT IN INDIA" (Kitabmahal, Century printers, Allahabad, 1986) discusses the urbanisation system in various countries in the world. Urbanisation is a world-wide
phenomenon. Presently the world population is increasing at the rate of 6.5 percent and it is likely to be over 8 billion in 2000 A.D. These have been several experiments in the area of urban governments with an emphasis on the provision of not only a workable local government but also an increasing effectiveness of its performance. The increasing urban population calls for effective treatment to local problems through democratic means. There has been a feeling among the general public that municipal institutions, have by and large, failed to deliver the goods. However, when one starts seriously examining the various facts of urban local governments, it becomes increasingly clear that apart from other factors, deterioration in the quality of political leadership has been largely responsible for such a state of affairs.

Jagannadha Rao, V. in his book “LAW RELATING TO MUNICIPALITIES AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES IN ANDHRA PRADESH” (Asia lawhouse, Hyderabad, 1988) explains clearly A.P. municipalities rules 1986, i.e., reservation for backward classes and women for the post of municipal chairmen and councillors. Identity cards are introduced to the voters based on the suggestions given by the author.

Srinivasan and Sharma, A.V. in their article “POLITICS IN URBAN INDIA - A CASE STUDY OF FOUR CORPORATIONS” (Quarterly journal of local self governments institutions, Bombay, 1966) discuss the role of political parties in four corporations i.e., Delhi, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras, the role of Mayor, Committees of the corporations and the role of commissioners, civic and other issues in the council, councillors’ privileges and administration.

What is conspicuous is the absence of the comparative study of municipal council of 1981 and 1987 in Chittoor district in Andhra Pradesh. Hence the present modest attempt in this direction through this study.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The value of Municipal Institutions in a democratic set up is inestimable. Not only they contribute to the physical, moral and intellectual development of individuals in their respective localities as social service organisations but also serve as political training centres since times immemorial. Indeed, the democratic system can function more effectively and usefully in the urban areas rather than
in the country-side, on account of the comparative political maturity found in the citizens of the towns and cities.

The advantages of urban Government in a democratic country are enormous. Besides, furthering social welfare the Municipal Government provides ample opportunities for men and women to participate in the local administrative matters freely, actively and wisely.

The importance of Municipal institutions for the spread of political and administrative knowledge is enormous. It is said that local-self government institutions are the nurseries of democracy. But, actually it is the urban administration only that citizens will be in a position to understand their problems, in view of the environmental advantages they enjoy compared to the rural folk. This enables the urban citizens to become experts in capturing as well as managing political power and authority.

Practical political wisdom and efficiency improves only when citizens exercise real powers and participate actually in government and administration, mutual co-operation, mutual accommodation and mutual adjustment enable them to realise the benefits of peaceful existence. Out of the simple local self-government institutions emerge responsible representative governments at higher level, serving as training for a democratic theory and practice.

A Municipal government is nowhere the people belonging to a specific locality elect their representatives to govern that locality and manage its affairs. Consequently, in the formulation, execution and implementation of public policy, no other system of representative government can prove to be more effective and efficient. The political consciousness and creative faculties of the citizens are greatly encouraged by the Municipal institutions. For promptness in decision and firmness in action the initiative and enthusiasm shown by the local citizens contribute a great deal. Constructive, intelligent and patriotic thinking as the part of citizens, finds excellent opportunities in the various urban community development programme, which can be extended to the State and National levels.

This thesis is an attempt to throw light on the working of urban Government and politics in Chittoor District with special reference to a comparative study of the Municipal elections of 1981 and 1987. It would be the endeavour of this researcher to point out the striking difference between the two elections for the
purpose of better understanding of the urban political phenomena in one of the important districts of Rayalaseema in Andhra Pradesh. While the 1981 Municipal elections were indirect councillors electing the Chairman of the Municipal Council, the 1987 Municipal election was marked by a qualitative difference in this respect, allowing the chairman to be elected directly by voters of the entire Municipality. There were no party based elections in 1981, unlike the party based elections in 1987. While there were only independent election symbols in 1981, specific political party symbols were permitted in 1987. The absence of voter identification was in vogue in 1981, whereas voter identification with photo was insisted upon in 1987.

The political implications of the contrast between the 1981 and 1987 Municipal elections of 1981 and those held in 1987:

i. At the time of the 1981 Municipal elections in Andhra Pradesh the ruling party at the State level was Congress (I) which, of course, ruled both the rural and urban areas also through the local self governing institutions.

ii. At the time of Municipal elections in 1987, the ruling party in Andhra Pradesh was the Telugu Desam Party which however, could capture only a majority of the Mandals and Zilla Parishads but failed to repeat the same performance in the urban areas where the Congress (I) party scored Majority.

OBJECTIVES: The present study is an attempt:

1. to study the importance of local government in India;

2. to trace the historical background of urban government in India and Andhra Pradesh.

3. to present the profile of Chittoor district in Andhra Pradesh.

4. To introduce the Urban Political Elites of Chittoor district and examine their contribution to the political development; and

5. to deal with the theme of similarities and differences between the 1981 and 1987 Municipal elections in Chittoor district.

Methodology: - The study is based on primary and secondary sources. Introduction on the subject has been collected from published documents of political parties, Government records and reports, journals, periodicals, newspapers both
in English and Telugu. Historical, interview, comparative and case study methods have been followed in this study.

Historical method is employed to understand the historical background of the Local Self Governing Institutions in India and Andhra Pradesh with special reference to the Municipal councils in Chittoor district. A Knowledge of the past is absolutely essential for a proper understanding of the present problems and effecting improvements for a better future. The 1981 and 1987 Municipal elections posed certain problems in so far as the electoral experience is concerned both from the point of view of the advantages and disadvantages of the indirect and direct as well as non-party based and party based elections to the post of Municipal Chairmans and Councillors were concerned. The historical approach followed in the connection has enhanced the value of a thesis of this nature for a clear comprehension of the issues involved.

By adopting the interview method the researcher interviewed personally leading politicians who are in power and out of power belonging to various political parties and those of other knowledgeable persons.

Comparative method is also adopted in order to record the merits and defects of the indirect and direct, the non-party and party based electoral systems. The comparative method employed for the study of 1981 and 1987 Municipal elections has helped a better comprehension of the relative merits and demerits of the both the systems.

Case study method too adopted to study Municipal council elections in a particular district. It is not possible for the researcher to study Municipal council elections in all twenty five districts of Andhra Pradesh, hence the researcher has used the method to study in a particular district which has given a comprehensive picture and understanding of Municipal council elections of a particular district i.e., Chittoor district in Andhra Pradesh.
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