CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

(a) The Conceptual Framework
(b) Objectives of the Study
(c) Methodology
(a) The Conceptual Frame-work

(i) Political System:¹

The term "Political System", a new terminology, has become increasingly common and reflects a new way of looking at Political Phenomena. It includes some new names for old things and some new terms to refer to activities and processes which were not formerly recognized as being parts or aspects of politics.

The concept of Political System has acquired wide currency because it directs attention to the entire scope of political activities within a society, regardless of where in the society such activities may be located.

Many political scientists defined the term Political System, while the precise language of their definitions vary considerably, there is some consensus. David Easton speaks of "authoritative allocation of values".

¹ An exhaustive discussion on the conceptual meaning and significance of "Political System" can be seen in Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell's Comparative Politics - A developmental approach. Amritind Publishing co. Pvt. Ltd., 66 Janpath, New Delhi
Robert A. Dahl speaks of "Power, rule and authority". The meaning of all the definitions imply legitimate, heavy sanctions, the rightful power to punish, to enforce, to compel.

Political System includes the study of the Governmental institutions such as legislatures, courts and administrative agencies but all structures in their political aspects. It includes traditional structures like Kingship ties and Caste groupings and as well as organization like parties, interest groups and media of communication.

Broadly speaking, the Political Systems are classified into three classes; 1. Primitive systems 2) Traditional Systems 3) Modern Systems. This classification scheme is closely related to the problem of political development and change. Political System considerably rest upon social and economic development.

Now-a-days large number of individuals are urbanized and become literate. Therefore, they have been exposed to changed economic enterprises. The spread of instrumental and participatory attitudes among the people creates both problems and potential for the political systems. Political awareness aroused in the people because of independence
movements. And mobilisation and exposure to modernity have been confined to a small elite. The modern political party is penetrated by traditional elites and is forced to appeal to traditional and communal loyalties and also manipulate mass activity in both democratic and authoritarian systems.

The boundaries of Political systems are subject to relatively large fluctuations. Specially at the time of war the boundaries become extended because men join into military service and of other type of regulations. Even at the time of elections the boundaries again are greatly extended as voters become politicians for a day and during normal conditions the boundaries of Political System contract.

In studying any Political System, we must know its underlying propensities and its actual performance. I refer propensities to psychological effects like attitudes, beliefs, values and skills which are current in an entire population.

Sometimes the study of Political System is underlying special propensities. These are located in particular groups of particular culture. Thus the Political System
is consisting of interacting roles, structures and sub-systems of underlying psychological propensities.

David Easton is the first political scientist to analyse politics systematically. He has introduced two types of inputs into the Political System, "Demands and Supports".

The term "demands" refers to allocation of goods and services, rates of wages, hours of work, roads and transport - Political rights, demands for communication and information etc. A Political System may face these sorts of demands in many combinations, forms and degrees of intensity.

The term "Supports" refers to Payment of taxes, obedience to law and regulations, Governmental communication, defence, ceremonies etc. Generally speaking "demands" affect the policies or goals of the system while "supports" regulate the means to carry out the goals.

Some Political Systems are primarily regulative and extractive in character. Totalitarian systems suppress demands coming from their societies and are unresponsive.

(2) David Easton, "An approach to the Analysis of Political Systems": PP - 383
to demands. At the same time they regulate behaviour in their societies and seek to draw maximum resources from their population. In democracies regulation, extraction and distribution are more affected by demands from groups in the Society.

The classic typology of traditional Political Systems is that of the German Sociologist Max Weber. The three types of traditional authority are - Patriarchial, Patrimonial and feudal.

S.N. Eisenstadt in a recent book refers to another class of Political Systems, which he places between the traditional Political Systems and the modern ones. He refers to this class as the historic bureaucratic empires. He includes in this class the bureaucratic empires of the Egyptians, the Persians, the Romans and the Byzantines, as well as the absolutist Kingdoms of Europe of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth centuries.

One difference between the patrimonial kingdoms of Max Weber and the bureaucratic empires of Eisenstadt consists of structural differentiation and structural autonomy of two Political Systems.


Merle Fainsod analyses the Political Systems with special reference to Bureaucracy. He classifies it into five patterns:

1. Representative bureaucracies
2. Party State bureaucracies
3. Military dominated bureaucracies
4. Ruler-dominated bureaucracies
5. Ruling bureaucracies

The first type, representative bureaucracies he describes as characteristic of Political Systems in which the ultimate political authority is determined by a competitive political process.

Fainsod describes party state bureaucracies as the by-products of totalitarian regimes and other one-party dominated Political Systems. The Party-State type of bureaucratic system grades off into Political Systems where there may not be a single party but rather a one party dominant pattern, as in the case of India. The Indian Congress Party has been in office ever since the attainment of Independence except for 18 months of Janata Rule.

But again, the Indian Congress Party is not the disciplined, homogeneous party that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union tends to be. The Congress Party itself is a coalition of interest groups, and hence its control over the administrative services is less homogeneous and less centralized.

The third category military dominant bureaucracies are common pattern historically known and also can be seen in contemporary world. The fourth category that is Ruler-dominated bureaucracies are Political Systems in which an autonomous ruler imposes his rule through a bureaucracy or officialdom.

The final category the ruling bureaucracies is one in which the bureaucracy itself provides the ruling element in the Political System. Fainsod's classification of Political Systems according to the role played by the bureaucracies are of enormous importance in the performance of the communication function in political systems. Even in democratic Political Systems, the bureaucracy is one of the most important sources of information about public issues and politically significant events.
Only of the five bureaucratic systems described by Fainsod two types provide either a military or civil clique as the ruling element in the Political System.

To analyse Political Systems it is desirable to classify the types of structures which mainly perform communication functions. There are five types of structures: 1. Informal face-to-face contacts which spring up more or less independently. 2. Traditional Social Structures: such as family or religious group relationships 3. Political 'output' structures such as legislatures and bureaucracies 4. Political input structures: including trade Unions and similar interest groups and political parties and 5. Mass Media.

The liberal political theorists of the 18th and 19th centuries similarly treated the performance of Political Systems in ethical and normative terms. The liberal political theory argues that "That Government is best which governs least" emphasising in favour of a Political System which limited itself to maintaining basic order in a Society and to defend the Nation.

Marxist theory argues that the class structure of a Society determined the structure and process of the Political
System and its performance in Society and in the international environment. Marxists believed that the capitalist form of Society produced a Political System dominated by the bourgeoisie, acting in its own interests and following a policy of international aggression in order to maximise markets and profits.

The novelty in the capabilities approach attempted to understand the performances of the Political System in its domestic and foreign environments. Definitely the political change can come mainly from Political System of Home and abroad.

Democratic Political Systems can be divided into three subclasses 1) The High subsystem autonomy. This type can be observed in Britain. Here British Trade Unions are affiliated with the labour party, but the Parliamentary labour party when in power is relatively independent of Trade Union pressure and British trade unions tend to exercise self-discipline in attempting to influence the policy of a labour cabinet. 2) Limited Subsystem autonomy. In this system political parties, interest groups and the media of mass communication tend to be dependent one upon the other. This can be observed in Italy and Weimar Germany.

3) Low Subsystem autonomy - These have been referred to as one party dominant system. The best example is Mexico where the Institutional Revolutionary Party (PRI) typically receives about 80% of the total popular vote. Its candidates dominate State and Federal elections in almost all areas and its Presidential candidate has never failed to win.

In a sense every Political System is "responsive" to something. That means Political System must be responding to some set of internal and external pressures and demands.

II. Party System:

"Party is organized opinion", said Disraeli. But truly speaking the modern parties have the longest continuous history and party is more than what Disraeli said.

The word 'Parties' is used to describe the factions which divided the Republics of antiquity, the troops which formed round a condottiere in Renaissance Italy, the Clubs where the members of the revolutionary assemblies met and the Committees which prepared the elections. They gave shape to the institution "Party". The role of all these institutions is to win political power and exercise it. In 1850 no country except America knew political parties in the modern sense of the word. There existed popular
clubs, philosophical societies and parliamentary groups but not real parties.

Maurice Duverger thinks that parties are of necessity of the democratic system. Also he says the modern party system is modern. It is twentieth century mechanism which is designed to solve the problem of how to bring 'the people' the new mass voters into the Political Community.

The 18th Century third fold division of Governmental powers takes no account of political parties as organs of Government because parties of the contemporary type did not then exist. Actually, political parties as they now operate are far reaching modifications of these constitutions through usage and convention.

Political participation in Politics, Morris Jones, thinks as any one else would also, must contain some measure of party system. Party System provides the people not only a Government but also opposition.

"Without such party organisation", Mac Ivor explains, 'there can be no unified statement of principle, no orderly evolution of policy, no regular resort to the constitutional

(7) J.A. Corry "Democratic Government and Politics"
Ed: University of TORONTO Press P-231.
device of parliamentary elections, nor of course any of the recognised institutions by means of which a party seeks or to maintain power.

ii) **Party System:**

The characteristics and the competitive interaction patterns among party units are as Maurice Duverger puts it "The forms and modes of their coexistence" define the "Party System". This study involves two major facets, one involves the internal structures for example their various social bases, histories, goals and appeals, formal organisations and actual power structure. The other involves competitive interaction structures for example numbers, respective sizes, alliances, geographical localisation, political distribution and so on. A party system is defined by a particular relationship amongst all these characteristics. Party systems are the product of many complex factors. Some factors are peculiar to individual countries and some factors are general.

The general study of enquiry of party system includes three levels. First and foremost one needs adequate description concepts for characterising, distinguishing and

(8) An exhaustive discussion on the conceptual meaning and significance of "Party System" can be seen in Maurice Duverger's "Political Parties" - Methuen & Co. Ltd., London (Publishers)
classifying party systems, secondly the problem of finalising the determinants of various forms of party systems, thirdly the problem of functional impacts of different party systems with a political and social systems in which they exist.

The classical division of party system is single party system, the Anglo saxan two party system and the multiparty system. This numerical typology involves the difficulty of application to concrete cases.

It cannot sensibly be taken to mean literally what it says, and it is difficult to use in a non-literal sense. For example the concept of one party system cannot be accepted. If party system involve interactions among party units in the process of electoral competition then the idea of a one party system is logically absurd. Moreover a single party without competition cannot be genuinely engaged in electoral competition.

The same is the case with Two party system. This category is not logically absurd, but two party system in the literal sense are extremely rare, if indeed they have ever existed. Truly speaking minor parties do operate along with the two major parties which always share power.

The concept of multiparty system also possess a logical difficulty. If we take the meaning literally, it is a
classification that does not classify. Virtually all party systems fall under it.

Keeping in view the above facts, one can say that a set of concepts for characterising and classifying party systems require 1. Technical precision about establishing the number of competing party units so that the numerical dimension can be precisely used. 2. Proper attention to other dimensions of variability.

Party structure:

Benjamin Constant in 1816 wrote "A party is a group of men professing the same political doctrine". Present day parties are distinguished far less by their programme or the class of their members then by the native of their organisation. A party is a community with a particular structure.

It is a fact that the originality of twentieth century parties lies in their organisation. It is also a fact that this organisation is tending to become an essential factor in the activity of the party in its influence and its function. The organisation of parties depends essentially on unwritten practice and habit. It is almost entirely a matter of custom. Moreover the party life is deliberately
shrouded in mystery. It is not easy to obtain precise information about parties even on elementary points. Inspite of years of investigation still a political scientist feels that there are many omissions and points of uncertainty.

In more recent times Communism and Fascism have created a still more novel sociological type. In contrast with the semi decentralisation of Socialist Parties they have in common a very strict centralisation, a system of vertical links ensuring that the elements at the base are strictly divided into cells this being a protection against any attempt at Schism and division and ensuring very strict discipline leadership based on autocratic methods in which the influence of Parliamentary representatives is practically non-existent.

Organisation:

9 "Without such party organisation Mac Iver explains, "there can be no unified statement of principle, no orderly evolution of policy, no regular resort to the constitutional device of parliamentary elections, nor of course any of the recognised institutions by means of which a party seeks or to maintain power.

---

"A party is not a community but a collection of communities, a Union of small groups dispersed throughout the country (branches, caucuses, local associations etc.) and linked by co-ordinating institutions".

The component units professional groups like Trade Unions, Co-operatives, Guilds, Leagues etc. compose an indirect party and they are in one way the basic elements of the party from which party springs. Still party will be strengthened by sheer supporters, youth movements, Women organisations, Sports clubs, Cultural organisations etc.

The basic elements of each party have their own particular form. For example 'Caucus' is the feature of American Parties and act as electoral agents. It consists of a small number of members and seeks no expansion. Its strength does not depend on the number of its members but on their quality. It is a group of their influence. The Caucuses are an archaic type of political party structure. And parties are nothing but federations of caucuses.

(10) Maurice Duverger, "Political Parties: Their Organisation and Activity in the Modern State" - P.17
Methuen & Co. Ltd., London
John Wiley & Sons, INC: New York
The other form is 'branch' and is a socialist invention. The branch is only part of the whole, and its separate existence is inconceivable. The caucus stands of quality but a branch stands for quantity. It always tries to enrol members, to multiply their number and to increase its total strength. Apart from socialists, the only parties that were able to make the branch really alive are Catholic parties or parties with fascist tendencies. The Italian Fascist Party had Fasces as its basic unit.

The third form is 'Cell' a smaller group than a branch. Cell membership never reach a hundred. Cell is perfectly suited to clandestine action. This 'Cell' existed in Russian factories. They formed the very basis of Russian parties. Branches are socialist invention and Cells are communist invention. Cell has an important and precise basis of action. Cell as the basis of Organisation changed the very concept of a political party.

The fourth form of party organisation is 'militia'. It is a kind of private army whose members are enrolled on military lines, and are subjected to same discipline and same training as soldiers, wearing uniforms and are ever ready to march with weapons. There are two categories of militia. One constitute a kind of active army and the others simply a 'Reserve'.
Hitler maintained the first category of militia. On the other hand almost all parties are to form kind of militia. When they wish to maintain order at their meetings and for protection. The militia is a fascist creation.

The question now arises is how the basic elements Caucuses, branches, cells and militia - constitute a party. The primary groups of the party have profound influence on the party ideology, methods and principles. There will be either vertical links or horizontal links. The community party provides the best example of a strict system of vertical linkage. It is an admirable way of maintaining the unity and homogeneity of the party.

The structure of political opportunities determines not only the extent of the party organisation but also its quality or content. In party organisation, leadership is a contribution of first importance. Voluntary character of most contributions to party activity makes it most useful for someone to move people to participate, to make agreements with other leaders and to bring together the materials of party combat. Moreover the contribution of leadership is also difficult to assign.
There are two broad categories of party leaders which in fact may or may not merge. There are *public leaders*, men who also represent party as its candidates for public office and they are the association leaders, men whose office is limited to the party organisation.

The major task facing the leaders of the nuclear organisation is the choice of its candidates for office. There are two aspects to the process. One is the recruitment and discouragement of candidates for the nomination. The second is the choice of the nominee from among the active seekers. Party organisation give evidence of actively recruiting candidates for offices where there is little expectation of victory.

**Political Culture:**

Political culture is . . . of attitudes, beliefs and sentiments which give order and meaning to a political process and which provide the underlying assumptions and rules that govern behaviour in the political system. It encompasses both the political ideas and the operating norms of a Policy.

Political Culture is thus the manifestation in aggregate form of the psychological and subjective dimensions
of politics. It is the product of both the collective history of a political system and the life histories of the members of that system and thus it is rooted equally in public events and private experiences.

Political Culture by embracing the political orientations of both leaders and citizens is more inclusive than such terms as political style or operational code, which focus on elite behaviour.

The concept of Political Culture can be seen as a natural evolution in the growth of the behavioural approach in political analysis for it represents an attempt to apply to problems of aggregate or systematic analysis, which were developed initially by studying the political behaviour of individuals and small groups.

The content of political culture is in large measure unique to each particular society. Studies of different political cultures therefore tend to emphasise different themes and the ultimate test of the utility of a theory of political culture will depend upon its value for comparative and generalised analysis.

Every political culture must define for its society the generally accepted scope or limits of politics and the legitimate boundaries between public and private spheres of life.
In democratic political cultures there is usually a clear sense of the appropriate boundaries of political life, explicit recognition of new issues as they arise and respect to some degree for functional specialisation in the handling of issues and for the relative autonomy of the different domains of political decision-making.

In totalitarian cultures there are few established boundaries of political sphere of activity, explicit knowledge that all issues can become political and some respect for functional specialisation but little for the autonomy of the different domains. In transitional systems there are usually no clearly accepted boundaries of political life.

**POLITICAL BEHAVIOUR**

The reason why behaviouralism has developed in Political Science is because of the growth of other social sciences, notably Sociology and Psychology, from both of which the behaviouralists have borrowed concepts and techniques, but the chief reason has been a reaction against the traditional approaches to the study of politics, the legitimate study of formal political institutions on one hand, and normative and speculative political theory on the other.

(11) Howard Elcock - "Political Behaviour"
Pub: Methuen & Co., Ltd.
The behaviouralists, by contrast wanted to discover how people carry on their political activity whatever the formal rules of the constitution and the law might say, and they sought to do so by looking objective and indisputable facts which could be analysed systematically. For behaviouralist, facts are objectives and verifiable by anyone who wishes to check them.

One of the behaviouralism's basic characteristic is the acceptance of logical positivism as an epistemological system. Facts publicly verifiable and sensually perceived, are regarded as the only valid basis of truth or reality. Values are seen differently as normative preferences whose validity is not subject to scientific proof.

Behaviouralism is properly identified with empiricism, by which I mean a temperamental and methodological affinity for aggregate factual data and field research.

Accidental or not, the publication in 1908 of two seminal books, probably marks the beginning of the modern political behaviour approach. Wallas called for a revival of the study of "human nature" in politics. Bentley suggested that activity and relationships of those social groups whose unending interactions constitute society, is "raw material" to politics.
Political behaviour analysis refers to a number of modes and methods of inquiry in the discipline of political science and is having four general characteristics. Firstly, the analysis takes into consideration the individual person's behaviour. That means not only his acts but also his orientation to action. Secondly, the analysis is a frame of reference from the behaviour sciences like anthropology, psychology and sociology. It is good to consider the possible effects of social, cultural and personal factors on political behaviour.

Political behaviour analysis takes into consideration the theoretical propositions for the purpose of research. It is concerned with the problem of research design, reliability of data gathering and measuring instruments, criteria of validation and other features of scientific procedure. Finally, the analysis chooses methods and techniques of inquiry, for the purposes of description and testing of hypothesis, sociometry and psychiatric procedures, laboratory and field experiments multivariational analysis and computer programmes.

"Political Behaviour" can be seen in Heinz Eulau's article in David L. Sills (ed.)
Political behaviour\textsuperscript{13} is not a field of Political Science, rather, political behaviour research is one way of studying most of the customary subject matter of political science. The political behaviour approach is distinguished by its attempt to describe government as a process made up of the actions and interactions of men and groups of men. It is concerned at the minimum - as is all political science - with the activities of governments, political parties, interest groups and voters. The study of Political behaviour attempts to discover the extent and nature of uniformities in the actual behaviour of men and groups of men in political process.

This approach involves two basic requirements. In the first place, it calls for the formulation of concepts, hypothesis, and explanations in systematic terms, borrowing whenever appropriate from other social sciences. Secondly, it depends upon empirical methods of research, whether adapted from other social sciences or developed distinctly. Since the actions of men and groups cannot be known except through direct observation or through inference from other behavioural data.

\textsuperscript{13} "Political Behaviour" - A reader in Theory and Research-Edited by HEINZ EULAU, SAMUEL J. ELDERSVELD MORRIS JANOWITZ
The inquiry into how men ought to act is a separate concern of political science and is not a concern of political behaviour. Values, laws and formal structure, however, are important in determining the behaviour of men. It suggests in fact that systematic observation of behaviour is an especially useful way of understanding the character of values that operate in Political System.

The political behaviour approach seeks to go beyond the data supplied by constitutions, statutes, administrative decrees of judicial decisions - themselves evidence directly or indirectly of political behaviour to a more complete description of Governmental structure-in-action.

The political behaviour approach is not a completely new way of studying Government. It is rather an orientation which can be traced back many years and which deserves renewed emphasis. Work has been done in the study of political parties and pressure groups which utilises this approach and there is sensitivity to it in the study of Public Administration.

Although the study of political behaviour is concerned with the actions of men and groups of men in politics, there are basic similarities between the actions of men
and groups of men, in politics and the actions of men and group of men in other social institutions and situations. Consequently many of the techniques and concepts developed, particularly by psychology, social psychology and sociology for the study of human behaviour in general are applicable to the study of human behaviour in politics.

A new technique and concepts are evolved in related disciplines, they afford new opportunities to the student of political behaviour to reappraise his own problems, theories and methods. This does not mean that the procedures of other social sciences can be incorporated in their entirety into political behaviour research. Political behaviour is more concerned with being systematic about political realities. A genuinely behavioural science of politics is essential to the full development of general social science.

The interest of the student of political behaviour is more in being systematic about political realities than in being systematic in experimental situations. It requires important use of historical knowledge. Moreover an adequate description of current behaviour and understanding of social habits, and traditions which reflects in contemporary attitudes and actions.
The development of the behaviour techniques may effect politics sometimes even in other ways. It is told by Prof. H.J. Eysenck, that when voters were told by the polls that one party was in the lead, people might switch their votes to that party because they wished to be on the winning-side.

The analysis of political behaviour proceeds from the assumption that politics as a special form of human activity is not and cannot be independent.

**POLITICAL EFFICACY:**

The concept of political efficacy is used by the student of political behaviour to identify a citizen's feelings about the effects of his action on political events.

Efficacy has its origin in social psychology and is closely related to "ego strength", "Subjective competence" "Self confidence" and "Personal effectiveness".

The concept has political relevance for assessing behaviour in democratic systems when a premium is placed on citizens participation and where there are accessible channels for expressing political needs.
Efficacy refers to the individual's perceptions of his effectiveness, not his actual influence. Studies focussing on efficacy at the citizen's level is because

(1) Antecedent conditions accounting for distribution of efficacy
(2) Data explaining about other political attitudes and behaviour
(3) The consequences of efficacy distributions for the functioning of the general political system.

The concept of efficacy has proven useful in examining certain orientations of political officials. For purposes of analysing legislative behaviour the concept is redefined to mean a legislators sense of effectiveness in his political roles.

POWER:

Power since a very long time viewed as a moral problem. "The desire of power in excess caused the angels to fall". However it is not the moral problem of power but we are concerned with the scientific problem how to define, how to study, how to measure and how to analyse it.

The English word "Power" derives from certain Latin and French words which mean "to be able". Power is ascribed to different things on different grounds.
The impulse to power touches something deeper even than the desire to acquire wealth and the control of means of production or to avoid poverty. Saints and sinners alike desire power because they aspire to control the means to achieve their ends, pious or impious.

The word Power is used on many occasions. For instance a physical sciences student uses the word "Power" which means to him "energy". An engineering student's view of "Power" is electricity. Besides we speak of horse power, economic power, purchasing power, military power, executive power and the like. The common meaning in the above context of power is nothing but "ability" or "capacity"

Therefore one may take the general view of Power as one denoting "The whole spectrum, those external influence that, by being brought to bear upon an individual, can make him more in a required direction".¹⁴

In the modern days, the idea of Power has assumed an importance of its own in the realm of political theory. The reason for this lies in the fact that the meaning of politics changed from one of being a "study of state and Government", to that being a "study of power". The

(¹⁴) Finer S.F., - "Comparative Government"
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 facts which influence the making of these decisions and the context in which those decisions take place.

Different writers have taken different views in defining the term "Power". Thomas Reid wisely wrote "Power is one thing, its exertion is another thing. It is true that there can be power which is not exerted".

Mr. Alan Bullock says in "The Life and Times of Ernest Bevin (1960)" "Influence, unlike authority is not susceptible of constitutional definition".

Hans Morgenthan said "International politics, like all politics is a struggle for power".

Lord Russell felt that he is concerned to prove that fundamental concept in Social Science is 'Power'.

It is stated more succinctly still by Arch Bishop Fenelon, "Power is Poison".

(15) H. Morgenthan - "Politics among Nations"
Fredrick describes Power more relevantly saying that it is "a certain kind of human Relationship".

Tawney thinks of power as "Capacity of an individual or group of individuals, to modify the conduct of others in the manner which one desires".

Max Weber on his "Political Beruf (1948) said that "Politics is the struggle for power or the influencing of those in Power and embraces the struggle between states as such and between organized groups within the state".

Further we may advance the hypothesis that "All Politics is by its nature Power politics". This analysis is more fundamental than the Marxist since it rests on the supposition and the problem of certain permanency of social controls.

Subject to explicit reservations, that it is not yet complete as a Science and may well be a Science of more than this, we can yet provisionally say that "Politics is the Science of Power". The study of Politics is that of influence and the influential and continue what then is to get may be summed up Power. It is therefore ability

to be free in effecting our own will and to control whether exercised or whether not exercised but potential.

A well known dictum of Lord Acton in a letter of 1887 to Bishop Mandell Creighton of London - "Power tends to corrupt - Absolute Power corrupts absolutely" - imports an ethical valuation into power itself.

Power has many species, to understand our social structure it is better to study all. We must not be misled or hypnotized by the cliche "Power Politics", which usually refers to that traditional relation between States. In the writing of many political theorists 'Power' and 'Domination' are habitually confused or identified. Departing from the common professional language of Political Science Dr. Reinhold Neibuhr makes 'Force' and 'Prestige' the major factors of Politics. 'Force' or 'coercion' is closely associated with 'Domination' or 'dominion' and then again with the essence of power. The most dangerous confusion is between 'Power' and 'Force'. 'Force' is indubitably 'Power' of exercised. But some important forms of Power involve physical force, which may be manned by its temporary and unstable quality.

The act of control as manifest patently is 'actual'. This power is other than vain glory and it is other than influence. We may have a full and actual power to do something which is not a matter of influence but of competent decision to do or not do something. However not every act of control may require 'Force' or 'Domination'. Control indeed unlike force implies an element of stability or permanence and projects itself into the immediate future of reference. Also the potentiality to control at wish and will is more than influence. English imperfectly renders the difference by distinguishing 'power' and 'potentiality'. The distinction is of great importance. Briefly 'influence' indicates a Potentiality in shaping decisions.

Thus the term 'Power' sometimes became interchangeable with several related terms like control, force, influence, authority, coercion, domination, persuasion and the like. But although it is often identified with related terms still it can however be distinguished from all. People obey not because they realise the powerful position of their rulers, but because of their conviction about the genuineness of the commands of their Superiors. Therefore we can say that the concept of power is integrally connected with political legitimacy.
FORCE

Force is manifest power. It can be said as one kind of guarantee of control. All power is not coercive, but domination is only one species of Power, and coercion one species of its exercise, Force is only one species of control. And it offers such prospect of continuation and guarantees future action which lie in the very meaning or definition of control. Its techniques are Physical threat, coercion, blackmail, terrorisation and domination.

INFLUENCE:

Influence like education, may contribute to build up a control system, especially of a consensual habitual, or cooperative order as distinct from command and coercion. Successful influence is a name for mental control and propaganda is a species of it. Influence is due to family background, social prestige, personality, intellectual eminence, moral worth, film background and the like. But influence is only voluntary.

AUTHORITY:

As the urge for freedom is instinctive and natural so too the growth of authority is natural and not artificial,

(19) G.E.C. Catlin - Systematic Politics - Elementa Politica and Sociologica" - University of Toronto Press - P:80
arbitrary, or by deliberate contract. It includes legitimisation and represents moralisation.

CHARISMA

The term 'Charisma' - a miraculously given Power was transferred by Max Weber from its original religious meaning to Politics. He described it as "the absolutely personal devotion and personal confidence in revelation, heroism or other qualities of individual leadership". 'Charisma' is leadership based on custom and tradition related to rationally created rules of Law.

The charismatic leader is one whose claim to rule is neither as a Perpetuator of traditional values nor as one who resolves conflicting interests by reasonable and just means but as one endowed with superhuman powers to solve political problems. He is seen by his followers as being all-powerful all-wise and morally perfect. One of the outstanding characteristic of charismatic rule is its mass base.

To sum up, we can say that study of "Politics is the Science of Power". In a nut-shell, power is the ability

to determine the behaviour of others in accord with one's own wishes". Power is that which influences the behaviour of others even against their will.

Because of the varied meaning of the term the whole study has become a "Bottomless Swamp".

ELITES:

Historically speaking the concept of 'elite' has been used just as much in liberal and democratic as in the aristocratic theories. Etymologically, "elite" means "worthy of choice" and it is the only term in current Political vocabulary that conveys the idea of selection of power based on qualitative superiority.

The Political elites comprises the power holders of a body politic. The power holders include the leadership and the social formations from which leaders typically come and to which accountability is maintained during a given generation. In other words the power elite is the "top power class".

(22) H.A. Dahl : "The Concept of Power".
The study of elites was established as part of political science in the late nineteenth century and early Twentieth century as a result of the works of two Italian sociologists, Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923) and Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941).

The new nations have experienced four broad types of political leadership over the past half century. Colonial, traditional, nationalist and economic. In the chaos of recent events the elites of various countries have manipulated political activities in a variety of ways. It goes without saying that Nationalism is an integral part of the philosophy of the new elite and one of the factors that distinguishes it from traditional elite. The legislative elite is being increasingly felt and recognised in the political process of the country. The State level elite serves as a link between the elite at the grass-roots and at the top in centre.

Anywhere the population of each society consists of two strata: The elite and the masses. Persons at the top[1] in every branch of human activity can be called the elite and the rest masses. Scholars have defined the term elite in a variety of ways. Vilfredo Pareto observes—

So let us make a class of the people who have the highest
indices in their branch of activity, and to that class give the name of elite".\textsuperscript{25}

Vilfredo Pareto discussed about 'governing elite and for a student of political science this concept is certainly important.\textsuperscript{26}

According to Pareto a study of social equilibrium will help is one divide that elite class into two classes. 1) A governing elite - comprising of individuals, who directly or indirectly play some considerable part in the Government and 2) The non-governing elite comprising the rest.

Graetana Mosca, the first to make a systematic distinction between elites and masses. He says that in all societies "the classes of people appear - a class that rules and a class that is ruled. The first class always the less numerous performs all political functions, monopolising power and enjoys the advantage that power brings, where as the second the more numerous class, is directed and controlled by the first in a manner that is now more or less legal, now more or less arbitrary and violent".\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} H. Lasswell - "The Comparative study of elites" P-13
Still another authority on this subject, H.D. Lasswell writes that political elite comprises the power holder of a body politic. The power holders include the leadership and the social formations from which leaders typically come, and to which accountability is maintained, during a given period. Again like Lasswell, Ramond Aron makes an attempt to establish a relation between the elite and social classes.

C.Wright Mills defines the power elite in the same way as Pareto says - "Power elite in terms of the means of Power as those who occupy the command posts".

On the basis of power Robert A.Dahl also divides the individuals in four groups - the apolitical strata, the political strata, the power seekers and the powerful. Of those groups the last two groups may be termed as Political elite.

It may be argued that the concept of political elite is opposed to modern democracy because the emphasis of the elite theory is on the inequality of individuals while

There are five ideal types of elite groups also exist. However in the developing countries, some other types are also in the creation of new forms of society.

Agents in the creation of the new forms of society are:
1) High-ranking government officials - all act as a vital
2) The intellectuals
3) Managers of industry
4) Men of commerce
5) Men of agriculture

Among the said groups, which constitute the elite, have been replaced by new social groups. Among these social groups which constitute the elite, there have been different times different and emergence of the other. In different times different history, we find the decline of one set of elite of circulation of elites. Thus the theory gets support from Pareto's pupil, Marie Kalabinski discussed about the theory of democracy which is not democratic.
of elites who customarily and variously take the leadership of the industrialization process (1) The dynastic elite 2) The middle class 3) The revolutionary intellectuals 4) The colonial administrators and 5) The nationalist leaders.33

It a new source of wealth develops in a society, if the practical importance of knowledge grows, it an old religion declines or a new one is born, if a new current of ideas spreads then, simultaneously, far reaching dislocations occur in the elite classes.

Anti-democratic approach to the problem is now more and more frequently spelled out as "elitism" a very unfortunate terminology and conceptual choice. The assumption that elitism has as such, an anti-democratic implication perpetuates a methodological fallacy and should hence be rejected on logical grounds. The derogatory meaning of elite that is conveyed by the label 'elitism' reverses the original connotation.

Elites play an important role. They are the 'decision makers' of the Society. They have been regarded as Chief threat to the Survival of democracy, they are also regarded

as bullworks of democracy, protecting from the dangers of totalitarianism. Political institutions, Political behaviour, political power, political modernisation, Political sociology, Political culture and Political Ideology all find a place in the controversies surrounding elites. Therefore even the opponents of elitism were unable to ignore its conclusions.

The Champion of Liberty John Stuart Mill\(^{34}\) felt Rule by majority implied merely rule by majority amongst those elected by majority. Liberty must be safeguarded. Also Mill believed that mass influence in political affairs can't be ignored. Majority Will should be enlightened. And he advocated plural voting system to the intelligent community by a system of fancy franchise by giving extra votes as to ensure the appearance of "the very elite of the country" in parliament.

In any society the minority of the population is taking major decisions in the Society. The dominant minority cannot be controlled by the majority. This is so because of their political capacity or their personal capacity the elites are always capable of preserving their domination. The elite thesis does not merely assert that in a society the minority makes decision and the majority obeys.

\(^{34}\) J.S. Mill - "Representative Government" (Oxford Blackwell, 1946)
Because these decisions are of such wide scope, affecting the most general aspects of the Society and are regarded as political decisions and people are considering them as members of Government or legislative.

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 institutions within the Society.

Participation beyond the level of ritual voting and party identification is rare among citizens in most democratic societies. Even though the hegemonic elite in India is widely dispersed across regional and linguistic barriers, its collaborative strategies have issued for it nearly total control of all levels of Government. The policy output of the National Government have mostly supported the interests of dominant landowning castes, even much publicized socialist policies have benefited them.35

Although the ruling elite are dispersed widely over localities and between occupational groups, they share the basic attributes of a hegemonic class. They dominate the economic and cultural orders and control local and

(35) Jayant Lele - "Elite Pluralism and Class Rule"
Pub: Popular Prakashan Pvt. Ltd.,
35C - Tardeo Road - Bombay-400 034.
regional governments. Their economic interests are intertwined with those of large corporations as stock owners, and they often seek entry into regional and national politics depending upon their place in the intra-elite rank structure.

Since the elite enter the public sphere with the intention of controlling it and having their specific interests safeguarded through governmental action, we should expect to find a good deal of variation in their participation. The political influence of the rural elite is recognized but it has been analysed only piecemeal in the studies of state politics. The rulership strategy between the elites and the ruled was described as patriarchal-patrimonial. The intra-elite interaction is characterized by personal rulerships which enhance elite privatization of the public sphere.

The ruling elite in all democracies display ability to make temporary alliances with conscious segments of the deprived groups. Since the hegemonic elite dominates the political activity there emerges a correspondingly high statistical relationship between all of them.

Politics is being ruralised today and a bulk of legislators come from the rural areas. It is primarily
admitted that India is a predominantly agricultural society.

So far the legislative elite is composed of the persons coming from well-to-do agricultural families. They are reasonably educated and are mature in terms of age. The legislative elite is trying to absorb the substantive values of our political system. Democracy followed by social justice are the values they cherish the most and this is reflected in their thought, processes and actions.

The influence of caste on politics has been accepted by the legislative elite as a natural phenomenon. They consider it a two-way process that is to say not only caste influences politics but politics also influences caste. So far as process values are concerned most of the elite have faith in the efficacy of the ballot box and to a considerable extent, adopted themselves to the values of democratic politics.
POLITICAL SOCIALISATION: 36

With the growing recognition that political behaviour is an aspect of culture and as such is regularly transmitted from generation to generation, social psychologists and political scientists have been paying increasing attention to political socialisation, that is the means by which individuals acquire motives, habits and values relevant to participation in a political system.

Within a general process, political socialisation is the acquisition by an individual of behavioural dispositions relevant to political groups, political systems, political processes. Examples of the kinds of behavioural dispositions included are: attitudes concerning the allocation of authority, the legitimacy of a regime and political participation. Patterns of decision-making, deference images of leaders and foreign nations, group loyalties, antagonism and stereo types.

It is assumed that the degree of relevance of a kind of behaviour to politics varies with the nature of the political systems under study and theoretical framework used.

Almond and Verba write "Political Socialisation" is the process by which political cultures are maintained and changed. While political culture is a sociological concept, Political Socialisation is a psychological concept. If peoples attitudes, orientations and values change through time they bring about a change in the political culture. Since the individual is continually being influenced in the shaping of his political attitudes, orientations and values, the process of socialisation goes throughout his life. While the process of political socialisation is going on all the time there is a possibility of its getting accelerated through major crisis.

Political Socialisation concern itself with the orientation of individuals towards political objectives, and could be studied in the elite, the mass, the deviant groups and social movements. In the process of political socialisation, the family the school, the peer groups experience during employment, mass media and finally direct contacts with the political systems serve as major agents.

Both latent and manifest influences are exercised upon the mind of the child by the family. Later influences shape his entire attitudes towards authority, while manifest

influences play a direct role in the development of his political opinion.

The attitudes of the child towards the political system is determined to a large extent by the general attitude of the members of the family towards politics as it emerges from casual talks or heated discussions among the family members.

Similarly the school too, exercises both latent and manifest influences. Those educated in a particular school, college or university may develop one kind of frame of mind. Whereas others taking education in a different educational institutions may cultivate different attitudes. A kind of experience that the individual gathers among his friends may bring about a complete change in his mental attitudes from hostility and aggression to cooperation or vice-versa.

A person who is brought up as a child in a family on democratic lines and given to cooperation by nation, may develop a strong sense of resentment.

Mass Media also plays a very effective role in Political Socialisation. A controlled system of mass media may succeed in bringing about the political system. However nothing can be as influential in shaping the attitudes
and orientations of the individual as his direct contact with the Political systems.

Almond and Verba writes\textsuperscript{38} "No matter how positive the views are of the political system which has been inculcated by family and school, when a citizen ignored by his party, cheated by his police, starved in the bread line, and finally conscripted to the army, his views of the political realm are likely to be altered".

If Political Socialisation is homogeneous the individuals may cooperate with each others and of these is an atmosphere of trust in the political culture, the political system can hope to receive a more or less continuous support from Society. On the other hand if citizens develop an attitude of distrust, disloyalty, dis-satisfaction with the state of affairs prevailing in the Society, the entire political life is likely to become restless and turbulent, leading to frustration and demands for radical social change.

Politics is being ruralised today and a bulk of legislators come from the rural areas. It is primarily the concern of the middle classes and India being predominantly agricultural society, agriculturists were bound to dominate

\textsuperscript{(38) Almond and Powell- "Comparative Politics - A development approach" - P:69}
one day the political scene because of their numerical strength in a system of free elections based on the principle of universal adult franchise, and the spread of political consciousness the ruling elite is now dominated by the dominant castes.

So far as social formation are concerned the legislative elite is composed of the persons coming from well-to-do families commanding respect in their respective localities in their respective constituencies. In modern times things changed. Personalisation of politics took place, People and their leaders started giving importance to persons instead of ideologies.

This has ultimately led to the emergence of situation where ideology has become a very weak force. Local notables are recruited by the different parties not because of their hold and influence in their respective areas. Lack of ideological commitment is the main cause of the politics of defection and all parties have faced defections at one time or other.

A process of localisation or indigenisation has taken place. In other words legislators are now more concerned with local issues than with policy matters with wider ramifications.
The result is that traditions are being modernised and traditions and modernity do not remain contradictory poles or exclusive systems but both are complementary and part of the same process.

At the same time the political modernisation is taking place. Moreover socio-economic measures taken in the direction of modernisation also get their support. This shows that they intend to bring modernisation but not at the cost of traditions.

Since political parties and environment are the agents of their socialisation the extent of their socialisation differs according to the influences of the agents of socialisation and the process is not similar in all cases. This causes tension in the system with the result that the system has not gained full legitimacy so far. Still it is in transition. But trend shows and we can hope that in course of time the system will grow strong roots as the substantive values of Democracy, social justice and secularism have been accepted by the legislative elite and if any change comes in the system it will be the result of the process of achieving these values.  

(39) "Legislative elite in India"
Study in Political socialisation P.D. Sharma.
It is in the interest of the stability of a political system that it draws its sustenance. The best of political institutions will break down of the non-political social institutions and the attitudes of the individuals are not congenial to them. Continuity or discontinuity in socialisation plays a very important role in the stability or break-down of political system.

The socialisation process is more of an ideal than reality. The degree to which it is attainable differs from one society to another. All the societies have not only their peculiar political cultures but also a large number of sub-cultures. Cultural divisions may not only be territorial but can also be traditional and modern. People by and large are traditional in their outlook whereas the elite are modern.

The concept of "Political Socialisation" is as thus broad in its empirical referents as those aspects of social behaviour that can be meaningfully related to the Political system. It is the task of the investigator to focus his lens on some particular aspect in the course of political inquiry. It is obvious that authority patterns and intergroups hostility are likely to be significant in any comparative study of political socialisation in new nations.
Political Socialisation is the process by which political cultures are maintained and changed through the performance of this function individuals are inducted into political culture. Their orientations towards political objects changes in the patterns of political culture which also come about through political socialisation.

The study of political socialisation seems to be the most promising approaches to understanding political stability and development. Its special significance in the modern world is a consequence of the great changes which are affecting so many contemporary societies.

CASTE IN POLITICS:

In India caste has been playing a very big role since long time past. It is a well known fact that the Indian society is a caste-ridden society.

Caste system finds its origin in the spanish word "Casta" meaning breed or race. Thus basically caste means people belonging to the same breed.

According to Cooley "When a class is somewhat hereditary we call it caste". According to Max Iver "When status is wholly pre-determined so that men are born to

their lot without any hope of change in it, then the class takes the extreme form of caste". According to Eah Blunt "A caste is a endogamous group of collecting of endogamous groups, bearing a common name, membership of which is hereditary imposing on its members certain restrictions in the matter of social intercourse, either following a common traditional occupation or claiming a common origin and generally regarded as forming a single homogeneous community".

In free India where state was interested in having a casteless society it is amazing that this caste is more and more influencing the politics and elections. The area of elections is being very limited, the castes play a role in influencing the voters. In fact the candidates win and lose on the popularity and strength of the caste. Each election thus strengthens the caste system.

In the words of Prof. Kothari, "the process of politics is one of manipulating and identifying existing structure in order to mobilise support and consolidate positions. When the caste structure provides one of the most important organisational clusters in which population is found to live politics must strive to organize through such structure. The alleged casteism in politics is thus no less than politicisation of caste".\(^{(41)}\)

\(^{(41)}\) Rajini Kothari "Politics in India" - P: 225
Not only this that caste influences politics but politics also affect caste and both its solidarity as well as hierarchy.

To quote Kothari - "It is not politics that gets caste ridden, it is caste that gets politicised, didactical as it might sound, it is precisely because the operation of competitive politics has drawn caste out of its political contest and given it a new status and identify hitherto unknown has begun to disintegrate".42

No amount of propaganda and legal measures and punishments for caste offences have relaxes the hold of caste on politics. In fact day by day the weight of caste on politics is increasing. There is no political party in the country, both at Central and as well as in the state level which can disown caste in any constituency. Every political party is trying to become a champion of "Weaker castes particularly Scheduled caste and Scheduled Tribes who hold a balance in many constituencies.

The caste is an extremely complex phenomenon representing different structures at different levels of analysis. Its influences on behaviour is not at all obvious or straight forward.43

---

42 Rajini Kothari - "Politics in India".
One cannot give an accurate, concise definition of caste since several quite distinct groups, principles and rankings are subsumed under the term. Various authors have at one time or another used the term "Caste" to refer to such disparate group or categories as 'Varna' 'Jaati' (an endogamous group larger than the exogamous group) tribe, sect, race groups and units.

The caste when applied to a concrete situation delineate grossly different groups of individuals and yield very different rankings. Yet no single definition is correct.

**Politics of Defection:**

In an ideal democracy and in a good parliamentary system any switching over from one political party to the other is considered a political suicide of the person concerned who is usually not accepted by any other political party.

Broadly speaking the term "Political deflection" means leaving one's party or leader, under whose symbol or leadership one has found a berth in a legislature not on grounds of principles or due to split in the party but in quest for individual power or personal disillusionment or disgust.
In the words of Dr. Kyshap, "Unless otherwise stated, the term defection" in this study should be understood to mean any change of political label and should include all cases such as (1) that of leaving a particular party after being elected as a legislator on its ticket and joining another party (2) of resigning from the party but remaining independent thereafter (3) of joining a particular political party being elected as an independent".

Kyshap also says "Legislators who vote against their party in the legislature on the basic issue without resigning from the party should none the less deemed to be defectors".

The term defective thus means and includes both an act of disaffection with one party or an independent platform as also of developing a new political allegiance either by outright joining the other party by voting with it and against ones own party.

In India before 1967, there was no serious problem of political defections. It was because at that time Indian National Congress was the only political party which enjoyed confidence of masses. Another reason being that in other political parties there was no dynamic

leadership which could inspire the confidence of the masses and on whom people would pin their hopes for their political career. Defective politics in India started after Fourth General elections held in 1967 and thereafter it continued to draw serious attention of the people. The politics of defection or what was then began to be called as that of "Aya Ram" and "Gaya Ram" seemed playing such a prominent role that in many states, Government survived and went out of power on the activities and attitudes of these political turn coats.

In Indian political system defections have become more or less a regular feature. Before 1967 none talked about this either in India or abroad. Today India's political scene is difficult to be discussed or appreciated without defection politics. The important reasons for defection are (1) allurement for high offices (2) wide gap between the powers and position of an ordinary legislator and that of a minister (3) Indian electorates have less involvement (4) Personality cult in India (5) Long rule of the congress party both at centre and state (6) ideological differences (7) Absence of dynamic leadership (8) Finally generation gap.
In spite of all these difficulties, every political party particularly the opposition parties, were feeling that defection process should be checked. On 17th May, 1973 constitution bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha. It is commonly known as Anti defection Bill. The Bill provided that P.M. and the Chief Minister must belong to the Lower house and if they do not, at the time of their election as the leaders of the majority party, they must become so within a period of 6 months or otherwise they should vacate their offices.

Defection of course is a serious problem and a great threat to successful working of parliamentary system. But the question is whether this evil can be combated. Firstly, the problem may be solved legally and the defection may be punished by the House or by the Court of Law or by the head of the state. Secondly, public opinion should so be created that a defector dare not leave the party for the fear that he will be absolutely disowned. The electorates should be awakened and educated about the problems which defection creates. They should be made to realise that they should not vote for the defector at the time of next election and it should be amply clear to every defector that defection will mean end of their political career.45

(45) Hansraj "Indian Govt. and Politics", Surject Publications 7n, Kolhapur Road, Kamala Nagar, Delhi - 110 007.
The study of "Social Mobility" is important for the study of modern political change for three reasons.

Firstly the concept of mobility is one that has important cultural implications and thus consequences for the ideologies of the political parties, Governments and elections. Secondly, the development of highly differentiated social structures has helped to produce political organisations, in parties and Governmental institutions which have changed the entire pattern of political elite - recruitment and the participation of the mass of populations in political affairs. In part therefore this provides an important area for studying the process of mobility. Thirdly, the increasing differentiation of social structures accompany economical and technological development creates stratification changes. Old occupational categories dies out, new ones are created, some groups become prosperous others decline in status.

Max Weber distinguished within political framework two major categories. 1) Social Mobility through political institutions 2) Political Mobility movements from high to low or low to high levels in political machine itself.46

---

If political science is to assess effectively inter-relationships between ideologies, organisations and systems of stratification it must be able to evolve satisfaction comparative methods of classification and interpretation. Most contemporary political sciences has divided the study of politics into three categories 1) Culture 2) Function and 3) Process. The first deal with the values of Societies as institutionalised in social relations. The second deal to mean the way in which institution within a particular society do different jobs which taken together hold society together. The third category process means and simply the way in which things are done and is most fruitfully developed by explaining action in the context of culture and structure. 47

ELECTIONS:

Elections may be regarded as one procedure for aggregating preferences of a particular kind. Liberal democratic theories attribute special authority to the amalgamation of the expressed preferences of individuals through recognised procedures. Voting is one of these procedures. Voting in a nation wide elections has a position of special importance in Western Democracies. This predominance

(47) International Encyclopedia of Social Science-Vol.5 P: 1-6
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.

"Election might be defined as a form of procedure, recognised by the rules of an organisation, whereby all or some of the members of the organisation choose a smaller number of persons or one person to hold office of authority in the organisation".

**HISTORY:**

Elections first took a central place in politics in the Greek city-states of the Eastern Mediterranean in the 5th and 6th Century B.C.

The tradition of ancient elections preserved in the church rather than in the state. This has been that of the election of superiors (Popes, Bishops, deans and so on) by a relatively small electorate consisting of those next in rank.

Later on as time passed election has become an important one in almost all states of the world. Thus it is possible to speak of elections in general as a "ritual of choice", the binding character of elections derives from the participation of an individual as chosen in a Social Act, and legitimate authority is thus conferred on the person chosen.
ELECTORAL SYSTEMS:

Elections are institutionalised procedures for the choosing of office holders by some or all of the recognised members of an organisation.

ELECTIONS AND THE POLITICAL SYSTEM:

Elections are particularly conspicuous and revealing aspects of most contemporary political systems. They highlight and dramatize a political systems bringing its nature into sharp relief and providing insights into other aspects of the system and the basic nature and actual functioning of the system as a whole.

The study of elections provides an opportunity to study a political system in action. They are complicated political processes which must be analysed within the contest of the total political and social system.

An election itself write V.O. Key Jr. "is a formal act of collective decision that occurs in a stream of connected antecedent and subsequent behaviour".48

Elections obviously have different meanings and play different roles in district political systems. In some they are central in others peripheral in some they have

definitely destabilising, in some they seem clearly to contribute to political development in others to political decay.

The case for considering elections within the framework of political system is therefore a compelling one. Elections provide a central mechanism for dealing with all these "Crisis of development". Moreover the place of elections in a political system may be quite thoroughly analysed in terms of their contribution to a kind of crisis resolution.

Election introduce the important element of accountability into a political system and provide a means by which such accountability is achieved in greater or lesser degree. A John Badgley has reasoned "A Civil polity is one in which the public interest is served by men accountable to their community and accountability is the process by which political development in fact occurs".  

The stabilising effects of free competitive elections are apparent in many kinds of political systems. Without them the legitimacy of the Government and the people's identification with and support of the political system are almost always in question. In countries where elections

(49) John Badgley - "Asian Development" - P: 186
are taken for granted because they are routinised institutions of the political system their stabilising effects may also be taken for granted and receive little notice; but in countries where the political system to still in an early stage of development the stabilising effects may be more evident and more widely appreciated.

As Samuel Huntington has observed "In many, or not most, modernizing countries elections serve only to enhance the power of disruptive and often reactionary social forces and to tear down the structure of public authority".\(^{50}\)

The relationship between election and political parties is close one in almost every type of political system. During elections parties are most prominently in display, or to put it in another way on trial. As David Butler has observed, "an election provides an unrivalled opportunity to examine the organisation the personnel and the policies of the parties".\(^{51}\)

Parties are main agencies for organising and for providing political direction to the electorate and for political choice. Maurice Duverger said, "the electoral system effects the political life of a country mainly through the parties".\(^{52}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Samuel P. Huntington, "Political order in changing societies", New haven, Yale University Press, 1968, P. 7.


"A Critical election according to Prof. V.O. Key "is one in which the depth and intensity of electoral involvement are high, in which more or less profound readjustments occur in the relation of power within the community, and in which new and durable electoral groupings are formed".

There is relation of the electoral system not only to the party system but also to other key aspects and mechanisms of the political systems, as such as interest groups and other associational activities the Governmental apparatus at various levels, embracing the bureaucracy as well as the political representation and leaders, and perhaps also the military and the military-industrial establishment.

"Elections in India provide the occasion for the widest degree of popular participation; they constitute the most important single arena for genuine competition between political groupings they are the principal agency through which recruitment to a significant part of political elite is affected. Elections in India can now be seen not merely as useful indication but actually as the events through which the party system and hence in measure, the Political Systems achieve their evolution".53

(53) W.H. Morris-Jones and Das Gupta, "India's Political areas; Interim report of Ecological investigation, Asian Survey.
Elections are generally thought of as integral feature of most modern political system and they are usually linked with political parties and other nonascriptive organisations and processes. The electoral process is a pervasive one. It extends to the highest levels of political life.

Political leadership and institutions is determined but it also permeates the social order, at almost every level and at least to some extent involves people who are generally outside of the reach of politics in political life at basic levels. Hence elections have proved to be powerful instruments of mass education and of political socialisation.

Thus "the electoral system affects the political life of a country merely through the parties"\(^5\)

"No Democratic country has been able to function without both elections and parties as meaningful institutions in political system"\(^5\)

---


(55) Norman B. Palmer, "The Indian Political System" Ed. Boston Houghton Mifflin Company - P:12
REGIONALISM:

Regionalism in India is a heavy weight on the political system. It is not today but even before independence regionalism was used as a tool by the imperialist to promote their policy of keeping India divided. Regionalism was deliberately encouraged by many with the result that the people of each region thought more in terms of their region rather than India as a whole. But leaders made every attempt to make the people of India realise that they belonged to India as a whole. It was with this idea, India instead of double citizenship only single citizenship was kept along with unified judiciary and All India Services.

Regionalism can be understood to mean as the feelings of the people and their love more for their own region than for the country as a whole. This is of course, narrow and secretarian outlook but definitely more appealing for the people of the region. When touched and exploited it becomes a sensitive issue. It is condemned in many ways in the open, it is encouraged behind the back.

Regionalism so far is means to an end and not an evil in itself, because all at the helm fully well known that it means isolation and sooner or later ultimate destruction.
Regionalism in India has found expression broadly in four forms namely:

1) Secession from Indian Union
2) Demands for separate statehood
3) Demand for full-pledged statehood
4) Inter-state disputes

Regionalism in a big country like India is inevitable. In certain sense, it is even desirable. It is desirable in the sense that Regionalism is the first step towards nation-building.

In the words of Rasheeduddin Khan "National Unity can genuinely flower out of a healthy reconciliation between regionalism and nationalism. However, it is evident that like national chauvinism unhealthy regional or sub-regional patriotism is equally cancerous and disruptive both of creative regionalism as also of syncratic nationalism".

The worst aspect of Regionalism is that this has led to militant native movements. The theory of the "Sons of the soil" has found wide acceptance. This ostensibly stands for the employment of local people but this creates the worst kind of parochialism which is best illustrated by the activities of Shiva Sena at Bombay.56

(56) O.P. Goyal - "Indian Political System" Macmillan India Limited, Delhi - Bombay - Madras - Patna.
Regionalism in India is posing a threat to national unity and territorial integrity which the constitution makers want to achieve at all cost. They were not interest in weakening India. Threat of regionalism becomes still more serious when viewed in the background that some of all the states in the country have already been demanding that powers of the centre should be curtailed and the states should be made more powerful. But it need be studied seriously whether bigger or smaller states have made more and rapid progress but all the more every effective step should be taken to discourage regionalism so that people all over think of India as a whole and not of any region.

Any laxity or latitude on any ground from any corner with whatever motive or intention can do a lot of harm to the nation as a whole.
India is one of the most popular democracies of the world, with a special social structure based on caste, community, religion, language and region. All the above factors are fused into a territorial integration under the general conditions of a participatory democracy. They figure most prominently in general elections right from the district level.

The effort of this researcher hitherto is to study electoral politics and voting behaviour in a big state like Andhra Pradesh. The thesis is consciously related to the socio, economic and political contexts on the one hand and to the political system on the other hand. The universal adult franchise made Indian parliamentary democracy real, complete, meaningful and effective. The increased participation by the millions of masses in the electoral process inevitably resulted in the popular grasp of political power and enhanced the prestige of a common man. This fact is evident not only in parliamentary election but also in state elections. But the important point to be noted in this connection was the impact of national and state politics on district politics and vice-versa. Thus a study of the electoral party politics at the district level as a sub-system of the wider national political
system, through the intermediary stage of state politics, demorals attention. The thesis includes an examination of the relation between party politics and general elections in a specific area and during a particular period.

Andhra Pradesh one of the big states of India is a strong citadel of Congress Party for more than three decades, but gave way to a nine month old regional party called 'Telugu Desam' party. And a regional party became main opposition group even in the Union parliament. Besides the Chairman of the party was mainly responsible to break the long monopoly of Congress power in the centre. It has alerted the Congress (I) with perhaps, the greatest seriousness ever witnessed.

This thesis is an attempt to throw light on the changing political conditions of Andhra Pradesh with a special reference to Kurnool district, one of the important districts of Rayalaseema. There is striking difference between the elections in this faction-ridden district Kurnool. Additional thrust is given to caste factor and arrack business factions in the choice of the candidate of any party. The elector proved on all occasions that they prefer Government of performance not Government of promises.
METHODOLOGY - DISTRICT AS THE UNIT OF ANALYSIS

The district is the most vital administration Sub-division of the State. The administration of every State is carried on with district as its unit. The district is the most significant role in the administration of the affairs of the people. Importance of a district as an administration unit is summarised below:

It is though the district that the Government comes into vivid contact with the citizens.

Centralisation and decentralisation can at this stage be harmoniously blended.

The regional level represents details.

Central power finds each district as its lowest level, and its direct agency terminates there leaving the head of the district as its last agent and man on the spot.

Between state and state, some uniformity can be secured through the standardisation of the unit of Public Administration which at present is a district.

Exceptions apart, between department and department of the state the district represents the maximum and minimum of the area in which they must work together, a sort of Governmental flat rate in the disposal of the State territory for their respective jurisdictions. The short, a "district" is technically the best area for structural and functional aggregation of units and branches of administration and bears a logical relation to total area, wealth and population.

Politicians and political institutions in fact, organise activities only in terms of district coverage. Compared to the district, electoral constituencies are ad hoc artificial political units.

Thus there is a close relationship between the district level power structure and the power-structure of the state and the national levels. In India, the state level leadership is deeply interested in the district level power-groupings and its configurations.

The district of Kurnool as a particular geographic area is specially suited for study of party politics and elected process because of its peculiar political structure and process which contributes to the probability of finding a variety of politics and politicians in the State Politics of Andhra Pradesh. In general, during the period of the present study (1975-85) the district presented to the country elam Sanjeeva Reddy as President of India, Pendekanti Venkata Subbarao as a non-Minister and Governor of Bihar K. Vijaya Bhasker Reddy as Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. The present Prime Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao represents Andyal of Kurnool district as Member of Lok Sabha.

Published documents of political parties, Government records and reports, journals, periodicals and news papers have been consulted. The data includes the responses reactions and attitudes of the leading politicians belong to various political parties in or out of power, collected and analysed by way of Personal reviews and discussions.