CHAPTER - II

CONCEPTS OF NATION BUILDING
Nation building is a process through which a country achieves a mature level of political status so that it becomes a committed state to uphold the welfare of its citizens, an effective government in charge of the integrity of the boundary of the nation and a responsible member of the world community of nations. In fact, this is a process of transformation from the traditional character of a state to the modern personality of a nation. This is, therefore, called the modernisation of state. Since the political change of Western societies during the last two hundred years provides impetus, guidance and framework for moving towards political development, even for the nations which either have recently become independent states or have acquired new aspirations of modernity, there is much to learn from them in the art of nation-building. An understanding of the theories and practices of nation building process, therefore, has particular relevance to all underdeveloped countries, whether they are under the influence of or get help and assistance from the First World or the Second World. It is of special significance to "late comers", like Mongolia, who aspire to progress through industrial development in the image of the West. On the whole, in the process of nation building "We employ concepts that have a
In the past it was the deliberate work of the monarchs to delineate the boundary of the Kingdom and provide security to the subjects. But the interests of all social groups could not be served by the traditional territorial powers. Moreover, the impact of industrial revolution had its political implications. The traditional bonds and loyalties were transformed to contractual relationship. This opened a new political framework for the state. The emergence of modern nation-states provided three things; a framework for universal law of the land, the institutions to uphold the nation-state and a sense of duty of a civilized member in the world community. The nation-state has proved to be an essential prerequisite for progress.

The rise of modern states, with new rights and duties, throughout the world, has paved a new civil and political environment. The function of a nation is no more limited to look after only the law and order situation inside the boundary of a nation but also to protect the boundary from foreign aggression.

The nations, now, have a welfare function otherwise their stability will remain under stress. The world has entered a new phase in its historical development. The potential has increased because of the growth of productive forces. People have become conscious of their citizenship rights and the state has acquired enormous power to suppress its people. All these are the by-products of modernisation. An analysis of nation building process, therefore, is vital for understanding as to how nations are built in right proportions and manners. On the whole, it is the modernity which is responsible for nation states. Though the birth pang and growth pattern have not been blessings in all cases, it has been the harbinger of modern civilization.

Inspite of the overwhelming importance of the political aspect of nation building, it has not yet received adequate attention it deserves. Consequently, the problems and policy issues of nation building have remained neglected for a long time. Both the theoraticians and the policy analysts have paid scant attention to the aspects of nation building which, in many respects, are more important than other issues of human organisations and social relations. The neglect is particularly striking for the emerging
nations of the world since they being the late comers have to cope up the new contemporary world system which now has become much more competitive and complementary both at the same time than any other period of human history. It is particularly striking that the political analysists of the third world have neglected the challenges of such a vital area of the processes of nation building for such a long time. There is, however, a silver lining that a new move has begun to understand and theorise the political aspects of nation building.

1. Economic Factors In Nation Building

Nation building being a process, there is a switch over involved in the life of a nation. The nation transforms itself from a traditional society to a modern one. During this transition a nation develops capabilities to acquire the attributes of a new political community. The nation building, in this sense, is the modernisation of a nation. "Technology, industrial advancement, individualism, nationalism and development cause to stand for modernity. Absence of technology and industry (measured by Western standard), kinship, tribalism (or to avoid its pejorative overtone, ethnicism and communalism) and
under development came to stand for traditionalism". The concepts of tradition and modernity, in so far as they refer to socio-economic and political organisation, are on active agenda of the discussion on nation building. This being a particular stage in the life of a nation, an active movement is presumed in the process. The speed of movement can not be uniform for all the states of the world; there are states which are almost representative of modern nations whereas there are others which have just joined the course. It is, therefore, appropriate to say that the modernisation "process can be guided, delayed or speeded up, but there is little reason to think it can be halted". For our purposes, the process of transformation towards modernity has been analysed here under two sub-heads; industrialisation as a surrogate of modernity and centre-periphery concept of nation building, both of these have roots in the economic process of development.

A. Modernisation Theory Of Nation Building

(i) General Theory: Modernisation connotes none else than the industrialisation of a country. The
process of nation building, therefore, can not be other than the growth of industrialisation. It began with the Industrial Revolution of Great Britain which changed the horizons of mankind. The growth of industrialism changed societies in terms of behaviour pattern and production system. This was made possible because of technological revolution. The industrialisation of the West changed the whole perspective of the nations concerned. In this sense the eighteenth century of Great Britain played a revolutionary role in the history of nation building. The inventions of contract wage labour and of political participation are the twin revolution of eighteenth century.

The industrial economic structure is the yard stick measuring the level of modernity of nations. The transition involved in it brings changes in many spheres of national life, in transport and communication, in the mode of economic activity from agriculture to industry, in the pattern and content of education, in the nature of work and thereby the attitude towards work and in the character of managerial system including bureaucracy. All these together made a powerful impact on the attitude of people and the organisation of society.
Modernisation in the economy initiates the transition from a traditional to a modern state. The condition of "transition from traditional to modern states depends substantially on the degree to which local talent, energy and resources are channelled on to the domestic task of modernisation as opposed to alternative possible objectives of nationalism." 4 Thus, the economic development is an essential procondition of political development for any state. Without economic development, the people would be unable to achieve even a minimum standard of freedom and dignity. The economic growth, therefore, must first break the barrier of traditional society in its forward march to the process of nation building. Even in the communist philosophy, "political institutions are derived from economic institutions, and the first question to be settled is the basis of the future economic order. When this has been decided, the appropriate political institutions to go with it can be readily devised." 5 Thus, irrespective of ideological frame of society the road to nation building passes through industrialism.

The growth of industrialism is dependent on

technological revolution since there is inherent relationship between science, technology and production proper. When the industrialism is in progress, "the science and technology revolution, growth of the productive forces follows a law of higher priority, that is, the precedence of science over technology and of technology over industry". 6 Backward technology impedes economic growth which in turn hampers political development. In the wake of industrialisation, a drastic change takes place in society. The diversification of activities leads to different type of economic role to the workers which prepares them for a different set of political system in the society. Agriculture develops, no doubt, but its share in the national income and its importance as primary agency of creating employment continuously goes down in the economy. Agriculture develops to meet the demand of the market rather than to maintain people at subsistence level. Large scale industry and capital intensive mode of production dominate the manufacturing sector of the economy. Transport and communication systems develop rapidly which, in turn, extend the radius of market in the economy and of information in society. Goods and ideas travel long distance at fastest speed. The

transport and information revolution destroys the veil of isolation and ignorance. These together make significant impact on the behaviour pattern and attitude of people. All these together break the traditional mode of life and usher modernity in society.

Urbanisation is another facet of modernisation. The rise of urbanism helps modernisation in two ways. First, the migration of people from rural to urban area helps in changing the national perspective of people. Generally the more intelligent people move to cities because of the comparative advantages of the opportunity for economic and social mobility. The "migration is, in some measure, a substitute for rural revolution" though initially migration creates political instability. This is because "the middle class goes through a process of conservatization, with each addition to that class shifting the balance from revolution toward stability". In the West one of the traditional accompaniments of industrialisation has been a rise in the relative importance of urban centres, not only with regard to population but also in terms of output. But, contrary to this, in the countries of South Asia, "most cities are growing correspondingly faster than the growth of

8. Ibid, p. 301.
the entire population, and this movement cityward is not related to any vigorous increase in urban employment opportunities". And second, the urban centres are powerful transmitters of modern values to the rural areas. They make powerful impact on removing the traditional values of life and in cultivating a new behaviour pattern and life style. It is because of such attributes that urbanisation is considered to be "an index of social mobilization which in itself is referred to as a key concomitant of political development." 10

The industrialisation and urbanisation together make drastic changes in the attitude and the consciousness of people. The lower classes improve their economic status and thereby their mobilisation for political rights. In England the gradual change in economic status of lower classes made it possible, in course of time, for the grant of civil rights in society. The American Revolution (1776) and the French Revolution (1789) made it possible for the rise of bourgeoisie, while the industrial revolution in England led to "the political mobilization of an emerging industrial work force". The experience of England suggests that "the changing position of the lower

classes and the emergence of national citizenship were the by-product of industrialization". Though this pattern may not be universal, since political mobilization occurred as a prelude to industrialization in England and in the United States and as a result of revolution in the USSR, it can not be denied that without economic development the political consciousness of people can not develop. Improvement in economic status provides impetus for the creation of political rights and duties of people.

The economic development by altering the political and social consciousness of people prepare, in return, a congenial ground for further economic development. The political landscape of a country may accelerate or impede economic development of a country. The adherents of economism are of the opinion that "political and social conditions could play a decisive role in impeding or facilitating advance in per capital income, and thus it was appropriate to conceive of political development, as the state of the polity which might facilitate economic growth". The relationship, therefore, between economic development and political development is mutually reinforcing. As such, "to link


political development solely to economic events would be to ignore much that is of dramatic importance in the development countries". 13

(ii) Industrialisation in Communist Countries: The experience of modernisation through industrialisation is universal. The economies of open societies and of communist societies both have opted for rapid industrialisation. Both the systems are similar in this respect: that they are goods producing societies where manufacturing is central in determining the size of national income and in shaping the character of its labour force. "Along the axis of production and technology, both the Soviet Union and the United States are industrial societies and thus somewhat congruent. In this respect, when one looks at the Soviet Union and the United States one need not depend, exclusively on a principle of convergence or of inherent conflict, but one can specify the rotating axes along which the distinctions are made. 14 There is no difference in these two types of societies so far the scheme of modernisation and industrialisation is concerned. Socialist societies aim at rapid industrialisation of

13. Ibid, p. 34.
their economies for two reasons. First, for a high degree of national defence a rapid industrialisation is necessary. Since these societies, being surrounded by open societies, it is thought necessary that the socialist societies must industrialise which is "a political requirement of national defence." And second, socialist societies have to tackle the problems generated by the backwardness of people. Before and at the time of revolution, a promise is made by the revolutionaries that the standard of life of people would be raised. For these reasons, a very rapid industrialisation is envisaged as a solution to "all kinds of political and social problems due to backwardness." Nation building through socialist mode of transformation requires that it must do away with its technical and economic backwardness. Lenin emphasised that only a large scale machine industry which could also reorganise agriculture could be the material basis of socialism. Industrialisation, therefore, is the foundation of building a socialist nation.

The industrialisation of a socialist economy

requires two pre-requisites during the transition period. First, the feudalism must be abolished. The feudal system rests on the exploitation of peasants by land owners in the form of corvee and rent. Under corvee system the peasants work part of the week with his own means of production on his plot and the rest of the week with the same means on his masters estate. And second, the transformation has to be brought by a vanguard group. This is the Communist Party. The Party being "armed with the advanced revolutionary theory of Marxism and Leninism" fulfills the complex task of nation building in "the transition period and in the subsequent development of socialist society along the road to communism." 17

The industrialisation of a country, which opts for socialist path of nation building, in a historically short space of time adopts two fundamental changes in economic development. First, the ownership of the means of production is socialised. "The socialist ownership of the means of production implies: the use of means of production in the interest of society as a whole, and the effective

17. L. Leontyev, Political economy (Moscow,1972) p. 142.
democratic participation of the producers and other workers in the administration of the means of production." 18 And when the means of production are socialised, in a socialist society, "there are two corresponding types of socialist enterprises. These are, first, state enterprises and second, enterprises which are cooperative and collective farm property." 19

And second, "Socialist industrialisation requires centralised disposal of resources. Thus the need for rapid industrialisation imposes the necessity of high centralisation of planning and management." 20 This is necessary for balanced industrialisation and for the modernisation of agriculture. The basic "tasks of economic planning have the aim of securing a substantial rise in production efficiency so as to bring about a rapid rise in the living standards of the working people". 21

18. Lange, op. cit., p. 12
19. Leontyev, op. cit. p. 157
20. Lange, op. cit., p. 17
The programme of modernisation through industrialisation adopts a different course by more backward societies like Mongolia. There are scientific reasons for it. "Under condition when world technique has reached the current high level, there is no longer any reason for underdeveloped countries to repeat all the progressive stages of development. There are, on the contrary, more important factors which enable the industrialisation of underdeveloped countries by omitting certain stages." 22 The precise formula to cut short industrial development has been provided by Lenin. He propounded a theory called by-passing capitalism. This was achieved by the experience of Soviet Union where Central Asian republics arrived at socialism without going through the capitalist stage. "With the fraternal help of the more advanced peoples of the Soviet Union, they built a powerful material and technical base for socialism and established the appropriate production relations." 23 Many socialist countries have adopted the strategy of by passing capitalism for their nation building. It is through


the modernisation of economy, after revolution, that political, economic and cultural systems of a country make drastic moves towards building a new socialist nation.

(iii) Pitfalls of the Modernisation Theory: The modernisation theory of nation building, operating through industrialisation and urbanisation suffers from a number of limitations. Whether we examine it through structural-functional method or through mobilization theory, it exhibits serious drawbacks. There are at least three criticisms which are levelled against the modernisation theory of nation building. First, it lacks explanatory capacity and predictive power to deal with the aspect of nation building. There is a general lack of, in the theory of modernisation, "clear definition of the inter-relationship among systems, institutions and processes". The modernisation theory deals with superficial manifestations without diagnosing the essential social phenomenon of society. Since it lacks parameters to great historical realities, it is inadequate "to describe and analyse historical phenomena except by minimising and often suppressing

the structural constraints operating in the political process". 25

Second, the process of transition from traditional to modern society is essentially a multilinear phenomenon. The modernisation theory of nation building, on the contrary, presumes a unilinear trend of transformation exactly a prototype of the European modernisation experience. It is obvious that there are enormous amount of contrasts in the objective conditions of Europe and North America, on the one hand, and of Asian, African and Latin American under developed countries, on the other. These contrasts are related to "the initial conditions and cultural contexts, the timing and sequence, the impingement by the international system and the role of ideology, and, above all, the arenas of decision making and government-populace relationships". 26 The modernisation theory, thus, suffers from an ethnocentric bias while interpreting the transitional societies of latecomers. This theory overlooks "history prior to the

25. Ibid., p. 100
26. Ibid., p. 324
18th century, and history outside of the Western World" and thus imposes "Western values on the rest of the world."  

And third, the modernisation theory of nation building assumes that all states have acquired full autonomy in their external and internal behaviour. This is not appropriate. Our "common knowledge and experience tell us that most under developed societies of the world were until very recently colonies and their gaining of political independence has, in most cases, not ended their economic, cultural and military dependence on the hegemonic great powers."  

The modernisation theory is unable to provide a viable theory of nation building. The generalisation of modernisation and political development does not contain sound theoretical concept. On the whole, this theory is an empty concept, "empty of socio-economic content, not informed with any historical points of reference, and always underplaying the structural constraints


operating on the political process - social class structure, agrarian and industrial relationships, and, above all, the international structure of dominance and dependence". 29

B. Centre - Periphery Theory of Nation Building

There is an alternative way to analyse the processes of nation building. This is different from the modernisation theory. In a way, the modernisation theory is based on the internal economic variables of a state whereas the centre - periphery theory places greater emphasis on the external aspect of nation building. One can say that modernisation theory is growth oriented whereas centre - periphery is liberty oriented; liberty which can not be achieved without equality.

The Centre-Periphery theory begins with the assumption that there are external factors affecting the processes of nation building. The contemporary international environment have been exerting increasingly powerful influence on the nation states to which they have to respond. The external

behaviour of a nation-state has to correspond to the standards of world political system. Even the internal behaviour, like the issue of human rights, is also under active scrutiny of the world community. Moreover, the nation states have become so much dependent on the external economic aid from the developed economics in general and the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund in particular that its development and political behaviour are not free from influence. In true sense of the term the world have become a global village of formally independent units though not equal. Now, the contemporary nations, in the process of development, can not develop in vacuum, they have to develop in international context. This is a relatively new phenomenon since this type of international environment did not exist in this manner during the developmental stages of those first nations which underwent the process of nation building. But the contemporary nation-building of the new nation has to be conceived in the context of "the autonomy of the nation state against the encroaching dominance of the economic and political structure of the world".


The international pressure, therefore, is powerful factor determining the forces behind nation building. The state has increasingly become a vehicle for the transformation of civil society dictated by international requirement. 32

International environment in the context of nation building has relevance from other aspects also. The process of nation building can alternatively be analysed in terms of the relationship of under developed countries with that of the developed nations. Even in the past when imperialism was in its hayday, the colonies were put on the road to modernisation. But the purpose was to exploit it since the industries of the colonies were never allowed to be developed as competitors to the industrial expansion of the metropoles. Marx in 1853 had remarked that the ruling classes of Great Britain had "exceptional interest in the progress of India" to transform it "into a reproductive country" so that the English milliocracy could extract" at diminished expenses" the cotton and other raw materials for their manufactures". Britain, therefore, had to demolish "the entire framework of

Indian Society" and uproot it "from all its ancient traditions and from whole of its past history". The colonial powers modernised their colonies for increasing their profits and protect their home industries.

In the post colonial period, the world capitalist system has forged the same relationship with the under developed nations. Gunder Frank developed a theory that the world capitalist system has created a sort of planetary system in which there is a metropolitan sun around which the peripheral societies revolve. This has given rise to the centre-periphery theory of nation building. It states that the capitalist world order makes conditions for the exploitation of the peripheral nation states through low wages and unequal exchange. This issue is handled when "the dominant - dependent stratification of politics" is set "with the developed-developing stratification of rich and poor nations". This "framework should be of linkages between national and international levels of state and nation building, on the one hand, and between

33. Marx (Karl), 'The British Rule in India' from _On Colonialism_ (Moscow, 1968), pp 35 & 83.
political and economic factors, on the other". The international environment is, thus, in many cases, much more important in the nation building process than the indigenous factors. There are many cases of countries whose governments are shaky and weak and whose existence and survival are affected by international conditions. In such cases the nations are tied in a dependent economic and political relationship with a "centre" that lay outside the territory.

The recent world events have further consolidated the impact of foreign influence in the nation building process. The collapse of communism in the Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union is an example in hand. These communist countries in a very advanced stage of abandoning the command method of political and economic systems. These countries have moved away from one party management to democracy in political field. They are advancing towards a free market system in the economic field. The new process is almost irreversable. Similarly, the Iraq war has also offered an example of external factor as an important factor in political development. Now the world is a unipolar world in the sense that the

34. Kothari, op. cit., p. II.
United States has acquired the status of the "most central of all centres". Thus the centre - periphery aspect of political development has brought into sharp focus. In the emerging new world order, "the centre - periphery framework of the theory of nation building appears to offer a good way of distinguishing between the varieties of nation and state building experience, ranging from the typical European experiments to there going on right now in the Third World." 35

The centre - periphery theory of nation building, however, is equally handicapped as that of the modernisation theory. Its weakest point is that it concentrates on the concept of autonomy of a state without capturing the parameters of economic development of a nation. In other words, the centre - periphery theory being deeply rooted to nationalism and anticolonialism ignores the Western achievement of science and technology in the process of nation building through industrial advancement. According to this theory, in the existing World Order "the world was fast dividing along lines that could only spell disaster for the mass of the people in the

35. Ibid, p. 322.
third world countries; that the domination of the north over the south world rob the latter of their dignity and autonomy; and that the only hopeful signs of the horizon were those pointing away from the centres of hegemony and power in the western imperialist and neocolonialist nations as well as third world states in which their clients constituted the ruling classes".  

In such a world order the true nation building process rests on the framework of self reliant, pluralist, decentralised polity with a humane technology and mass politics in which people are more important than the state. Though there is enough substance in this approach, the theory of centre - periphery suffer from the fact that it concentrates on "the consideration of international relations among nations by considering them as units, without systematically linking the international relations with the internal developments of the socio-economic structures". Without taking into account the socio-economic structures of multisectoral sets of developed and underdeveloped countries, the nation building process can not be properly understood in a multisectoral world.


Mongolia declared itself a Republic and claimed to "establish their own independent, sovereign people's democratic state". The Mongolian People's Republic set itself the aim of completing socialist construction and of building in the future, Communist Society. It should therefore be presumed that it is an autonomous state; autonomous both in terms of free from the vested internal interests and from any foreign power. But the experience of Mongolia suggests a different scenario. During the revolutionary phase it acquired Soviet assistance both strategically and militarily (Chapter III). Since the very beginning Mongolia has been receiving economic assistance and military aid from the Soviet Union. There are also evidences that Mongolia's external relations, economic and diplomatic, have been guided by the Soviet Union. It has, therefore, been claimed that Mongolia has behaved like a satellite of the Soviet Union.

C. Need For A New Theory

The modernisation theory and the Centre-periphery theory of nation building are both inadequate to capture the entire gamut of principles
governing the building of nations. The world has been changing so fast, both structurally and ideologically that neither of these two is a complete theory to explain the processes of nation building. There are some distinct forces in operation in the contemporary world geared to enter into the 21st century. The collapse of communism has made the world system unipolar. More than the American victory in the gulf war, the events in the Soviet Union have set a totally new agenda for the world. The new World Order is a structure of system in which "the United States as the undisputed leader in the world has a rare opportunity to shape the universe, in a great measure, to its liking. Its goals remain the assertion of American leadership, the protection of strategic and geopolitical interests and compelling the new nation states not only to accept the norms of a market economy but also to forswear weapons of mass destruction and the means of delivering them". 38 This agenda of the new world order has attested the validity of dominance-dependence theory of nation building. The Iraq war has consolidated this situation. The emergence of new centres of economic powers, like Germany and

Japan, on the world horizon, it can not be denied that the position of new and weak nations would be coming as becoming more and more dependent on powerful nations. It is becoming increasingly difficult for weak nations to counteract the dominance of single polar structure of world system and retain sovereignty as equal member states.

There is another set of directions the world is moving in. There have been two new political forces of the 1980's, "Thatcherism and the Greens". Thatcherism stands for larger production in an environment of non-intervening state. The Greens, on the other hand, stand for a political organisation against "the disparities in peoples social position, the threats to the environment of life" in addition to ecology. There is a world wide aspiration for equal citizenship status based on equality as well as liberty. American President looks at it as a victory of free enterprise (capitalism) over command system (communism). He feels that communism had held history hostage for years. "Now citizens throughout the world have chosen enterprise over envy, personal responsibilities over the enticements of the State,  

prosperity over the poverty of central planning". 40

This is a claim for modernity and industrialism. But the task of autonomy of weak and poor nations is still to be resolved. For all these reasons there is a need that the two dominant theories of nation building should be combined one way or the other so that a consolidated new theory is more equipped to explain and predict the processes of nation making.

2. **Political Dimension of Nation Building**

Nation building, as a political concept, is a process through which a state acquires new level of authority relationships. When a state moves towards a fixed identity, stable authority and equal participatory citizenship of people, it is on the path of political development aimed at building a nation. This is a process of transforming a traditional state into a modern nation. The modernisation, therefore, is the hallmark of nation building which is a "special kind of hope" and "is the burden of this age". 41


The approach to the contemporary principles of nation building makes special emphasis on the issues of political development of nation states. A new approach recognises the essentiality of a legitimate authority and a stable civic order as preconditions for building a nation. In addition, it perceives two other dimensions: "the autonomy of the nation state against the encroaching dominance of the economic and political structure in the world and the internal integrity of the nation state in the face of an all pervasive ideology of a participatory polity". 42

Political development has remained a neglected area both for the political analyst and also for the nation builders. This has been because of the misplaced priorities in the process of nation building. In the 50s great emphasis was placed on the economic development of the underdeveloped countries so that in course of time nations may achieve a balance of political forces. The entire attention, therefore, was placed on the rapid growth of the economies of under developed countries. The international aid was massively given to these countries through the World Bank and other

42. Kothari, op. cit., p. 7.
multinational agencies for economic growth. The idea was that internally it would improve the political climate of the countries concerned and externally it would reduce the economic disparities among nation states of the world. But, contrary to the assumption, the disparity between developed and underdeveloped countries has gone on widening.

In the 60s the emphasis, the world over, shifted from economic to social sphere "With the Alliance for Progress in 1961, social reform - that is, the more equitable distribution of material and symbolic resources - joined economic development as a conscious and explicit goal of American policy toward modernising countries".\(^{43}\) It was presumed that policies related to equitable distribution of income in society and to various welfare programmes for the less fortunate citizens, would reduce tension in society which ultimately would help achieve a rapid political development.

The perception of development was that economic, social and political growth are sequential. "The conventional wisdom among

\(^{43}\) Huntington, op. cit., p 6.
industrial countries as well as policy makers in developing countries has been that things ought to be done one at a time: first, economic growth; second, social equity; third, civil and political liberties". 44 These preceptions of development neglected the emphasis on political development as an essential and independent area of conscious effort. It presumed that political stability and development had to be the by-product of economic development and social reform. All through it has been undermined that economic development and political development are two separate goals and success in one may not lead to a success in the other. The rapid mobilization of new groups into politics, however, has continued unabated since the "social and economic change - urbanisation, increases in literacy and education, industrialisation, mass media expansion - extend political consciousness, multiply political demands broaden political participation". 45 As a consequence of unbalanced development between economic and social arena, on the one hand, and political consciousness, on the other, the political instability and disorder has continued. A precise


45. Huntington, op. cit., p. 5.
estimate of civil disorders and uprisings is not readily available. There are, however, some figures presented below on the civil wars in the world since 1950 which speak about the magnitude of disruption in civil society. The table indicating the political

Table: 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Death in thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950 - 59</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 - 69</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 - 79</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 - 89</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


disorder suggests that though political participation has expanded, the political institutionalisation has been lacking. The rates of social mobilization and the expansion of political participation are high; the rates of political organisation and institutionalisation are low. The result is political instability and disorder. The primary
problem of politics is the lag in the development of political institutions behind social and economic change". 46

The process of political modernisation begins with the transformation of traditional state into modern nations. The political development requires a drastic change in the governance of a nation. "The process of political modernisation has three major characteristics:

1. an increased centralisation of power in the State, coupled with the weakening of traditional sources of authority;

2. the differentiation and specialisation of political institutions;

3. increased popular participation in politics, and greater identification of individuals with the political system as a whole". 47

46. Huntington, op. cit. p. 5.

These three characteristics have been discussed here to identify the properties of nation-building process. It will be examined as to what type of authority, institution and participation make for the modern nation.

A. **Authority**

Political modernisation involves a drastic shift in the locus of authority. The authority is the essence of government. "One of the striking political features of modernisation is the immense broadening of the scope of public functions undertaken by governmental authority". In the twentieth century, the prominent function of the nation state is developmental in addition to the maintenance of law and order. For discharging its functions the authority of a nation state must establish "public institutions that constitute the necessary infra-structure of a nation state" and translate the "diffused the unorganised sentiments of nationalism into the spirit of citizenship". When a nation state succeeds in it, the traditional form

49. Pye, op. cit., p. 38.
of authority and narrow attributes of allegiance are transformed into a single secular, national political authority. Political modernisation requires that in each state multilevel authorities are destroyed and replaced by a central source of political authority. One of the features of the modern state is the concentration of authority.

Political development for nation building moves in stages. Europe is the best example for understanding these stages. In the sixteenth century, law was the authority; "law is the true sovereign, and they are not under the necessity of considering whether King or Lords or Commons or all three together are the ultimate authority in the state".\(^50\) This changed into the new concept of sovereignty. It was established that there is some "supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by law".\(^51\) This led to the legitimisation of concentration of authority which overshadowed the pluralistic political authority of the medieval period. The mass participation of masses in politics was still in the womb of future.

---


51. This is the expression of Bodin who wrote *Republic*, published in 1576, as quoted by S.P. Huntington p. 101.
the rationalisation of authority transformed in concentration of power in the absolute monarch. "In the twentieth century, the broadening of participation and the rationalisation of authority occur simultaneously, and hence authority must be concentrated in either a political party or in a popular charismatic leader, both of which are capable of arousing the masses as well as challenging traditional sources of authority". 52 The process of political development was completed when law was replaced by sovereignty and to centralisation of authority. The supremacy of Parliament was established since the parliament not only become above all positive law but also could make or unmake law of the land. The European experience suggests that there developed a differentiation of functions and along with a centralisation of power. The US, however, moved differently. There power was separated and functions were combined.

The contemporary third world, of Asia, Africa and Latin America faces a different scenario. Its political system needs concentration of authority, differentiation of structure, and broadening of
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participation all at the same time. This is because in the Third World countries political modernisation came late and by way of imitation of more advanced countries of the West. For nation-building processes, three features must be mobilised. First, the rationalisation of authority must be created for political modernisation. This requires a number of changes to occur in the political life of a nation state. First of all the internal sovereignty of the national government is not overpowered by local authorities. In other words, the traditional political authorities like religious, racial and ethnical must be replaced by a single secular, national political authority. Two, it has to be presumed that government is not a super human phenomenon. People must realise that authority is an institution, presided over by human agent. And three, the autonomy of national authority must not be encroached by the dominance of economic and political power of the advanced nations. The last one is becoming increasingly important since the cold war is over. The impact of dominance may increase.

Second, the differentiation of political
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functions and the creation of specialised structures to perform those functions are equally important for political modernisation. Areas like law, army, bureaucracy and technology require specialised discharge of functions. They need to be made autonomous organs free from political and administration interference in their day to day affairs. The bureaucracy becomes more hierarchical and complex. The location of personnel for these specialised jobs must be distributed in society on the basis of achievement performance rather than on some ascriptive criteria.

And third, political modernisation requires larger participation of the mass of people in politics. In pre-modern societies political participation is limited to a small social stratum because of "uneven distribution of political power, of economic wealth and of social status". Modernisation requires to challenge these various forms of inequality. The participation, however, differs in different political organisation. "Broader participation in politics may enhance control of the people by the government, as in
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totalitarian states, or it may enhance control of the
government by the people, as in some democratic
ones".55 These are the distinguishing features of
modern politics.

The modernised locus of authority, with all
the conditions attached to it, can not be found in
all political systems. From the point of view of
political authority there are alternative types of
political system that approach the problem of
modernisation. There is "the secular - liberation
model" emphasising a political framework that
prevents coercion and allows maximum opportunity for
the exercise of the persuit of free political
choice. Alternatively, there is "the sacred - collectivity model" stressing "the unity of the
people not their diversity" and "depends less on the
free flow of ideas than on the disciplined
concentration upon certain political and economic
objectives". The former is "a perfect information
model" whereas the latter is "a perfect coercion
model". "Between these two extremes the other types
have proved to be accomodated or mixed systems of
choice".56
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The most appropriate political organisation in "open societies", which can provide authority for a modern state, is democracy. There are several reasons for it. First, "in democracy every citizen has a right to play a part in deciding how society can best be organised in the cause of human happiness, and also because democracy is itself one of the fundamental exercises of free creative activity". 57 Second, the authority and participation can go together in a democratic setup. There is a "practical advantage of expanding democratic participation through strengthening the role of the popular politician". 58 Since it resolves various problems which crop up in any political system. And third, it was long ago realised "that Yugoslavia represents a system in which a regulated market determines resource allocation - a regulated market, but a market nevertheless, and not a command economy. 59 Now almost the entire communist countries are rapidly trying to adopt democratic political system and are restructuring their command economy to switch over to a market economy. It is advocated

that Soviet Union would not have faced the crises had it first adopted Perestroika and Glasnost subsequently. This is due to the fact that "the correct sequence is to pursue the creation of a free market first, because only from the experience of a free market can a complex society capable of practicing democracy emerge". What has been emphasised here is that a democratic political framework offers appropriate rationalisation of authority in the process of modern nation building.

The authority in Mongolia is the government of the MPR. The authority of the government is derived from the Constitution. But the government in Mongolia has a dependent status. The rule making and policy making are carried out by the Party which is outside the structure of government institutions. The peculiarity of Mongolian authority is that it is more powerful in dealing with the citizenery since there is no popular control over it which bureaucracies in Western countries are subjected. But, at the same time, as the hired lands of the sovereign party, Mongolian administration receive policies and guidelines from the political command above them. In this way, the authority of Mongolia

is self appointed government service not responsible directly to the people. It was due to the "centralism" in authority in Mongolia that the "dictatorship of leaders" flourished there. The authority of Mongolia being considered as main instrument in building a new society, it emphasises more on "the economic and cultural development of the country". Mongolia does not believe in Western type of democracy, it opted for democratic centralism for the formation of government and executing the powers of government.

B. **Institutionalisation**

Institutionalisation of political system is another characteristic of the process of political modernisation. A process through which organisations and procedures acquire value and stability is defined as institutionalisation. Political organisation acquires value and stability through institutionalisation. How far a political system is institutionalised can be measured by the factors

like "adoptibility, complexity, autonomy and coherence of organisations and procedures". All political institutions work in certain environment and face certain challenges. If it proves capable of facing challenges it is highly institutionalised. During its life time, if an organisation has successfully managed succession and replacement of leaders, it is highly institutionalised. A more complex organisation is considered to be matured since it has to deal with various sub-units, hierarchically and functionally, in handling the affairs of politics. A political system with parties of "social integration" has less institutional flexibility than one with parties of "individual representation". A political organisation needs to be independent of other social groups so that it can maintain its integrity. It is for this reason that a political organisation should not be an instrument of certain family, clan or class. Since the political organisation needs to accommodate new members into the fold of politics, it is necessary that it must change according to the change in social forces. And above all, a coherent political organisation is more

---
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institutionalised. If there is no unity of organisation, the consensus required for resolving disputes would be lacking. "The relationship of efficient social organisation in the arts of peace and in the arts of group conflict is almost absolute, whether one is speaking of civilisation or sub-civilization". 66 "A government with a low level of institutionalisation is not just a weak government; it is also a bad government. The function of government is to govern. A weak government, a government which lacks authority, fails to perform its function and is immoral in the same sense in which a corrupt judge, a cowardly soldier, or an innocent teacher is immoral. The moral basis of political institutions is rooted in the needs of men in complex societies". 67 The problems of political development and modernisation are rooted in the need to create more adaptive and more rationalised organisation. "The ultimate test of development is the capacity of people to establish and maintain large, complex and flexible organisational forms". 68

---
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The political organisation which can become a source of authority and which can be institutionalised in the political process of a nation, is the political party. The existence of political party is the super most distinguishing feature of modern political system since in the traditional polity the political conciousness and political involvement of population are undeveloped. In the ordinary sense, political party system connotes a democratic climate since in a dictatorship political choices and dissent are absent. "A definition of "party" might as well begin with its simplest word derivation. To become a "party to something always means identification with one group and differentiation from another. Every party in its very essence signifies partnership in a particular organisation and seperation from others by a specific program". 69

Political parties in modernised societies have, three main features. First, this is the first and the foremost organ of organising public openion in society. Modern societies are generally plural in structure; there are many religious, racial, ethnic,

caste and linguistic groupings. The political parties mobilise people in politics and thereby integrate the nation. Parties provide political consciousness even among those social and economic groups of traditional societies which did not participate in political activities before. During election, the party functions as mobilising people for taking part in elections. The level of involvement in and identification with the political system exhibit the extent of stability of the system. The political party needs organisation so that it can mobilise people in the political system because parties are instruments of mobilization. However, political "participation without organisation degenerates into mass movements; organisation lacking participation degenerates into personalistic cliques".\textsuperscript{70} Parties make the programmes and issues understandable to the people in general. It distinguishes important from irrelevant and identifies current issues for emphasis. By doing so parties arouse interests and passions in the political parties, the political leaders and the political process.\textsuperscript{71} In a democratic setup, parties
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make representation and succession peacefully possible whereas in the totalitarian system parties become instrument of mobilizing and disciplining population. But all these are the process of modernisation of political system.

"A second significant characteristic of political parties is that their form is determined by the entire socio-political framework of society". 72 This refers to not only to political parties but also the entire political system and process. Since political parties have to operate in the concerned society, they can not be unconcerned and unconnected with the historical and social background of a nation. Politics has to necessarily base itself on the foundation of society itself and its various components. In India, for instance, in the process of political modernisation the "caste system made available to leadership structural and ideological bases for political mobilization, providing it with both a segmental organisation and an identification system on which support could be crystallised". 73 The differences in the experience of political
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development in American, European and Russian context can be explained through the socio political framework of society. "In countries where there is no accepted concept of national identity, parties may form on linguistic or ethnic basis with the purpose of redrawing the state's boundaries." 74

The third characteristic of political parties is that they serve media between the mass of people and the state power. In all democratic setup, and particularly in new nations, the party is often the microcosm of the future society, the party can be identified as an independent power generating system. "Society and government become dependent on party organisation, the decision of party leaders, and the framework the party imposes on society". 75 In modern political system, parties rarely are passive agents, simply transmitting public opinion to the makers of public policies. "Quite on the contrary, the political parties of a modernising society play an active entrepreneurial role in the formation of new ideas, and in the linking of the public and the leadership in such a way that power is generated, mobilized and directed". 76
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The party system takes various forms: one party system, two party system and multiparty system. In modernising states one party system have demonstrated to be more stable than the multiparty system. The stability of one party system derives from the fact that it generally originates from revolutionary struggle and once revolution is over it removes all obstacles in its way and remain single party to govern. The multiparty system generates exaggerated hopes in the people and none of them command the respect of majority of people. It is for this reason that the modern states with multiparty system are more prone to coup, overthrow and subversion. The multi party system is not composed of broad based parties. "On this issue the evidence suggests that two party systems and dominant party systems, because they have more effective party competition, are likely to produce greater long run political stability than either one party systems or multi party systems". 77

The character of political party in "open societies", on the one hand, and in socialist societies, on the other, differs dramatically. In every modern democracy conflict between different
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groups is expressed through political parties which basically represent a "democratic translation of the class struggle". On the world scale the principle generalisation which can be made is that parties are primarily based on either the lower classes and the middle and upper classes". In every society there are social cleavages which give rise to social and political conflicts among the contending groups. This conflict does not get erupted in political disruption and breakdown if there is a political party to capture the imagination of masses and work to translate them in action programme for ameliorating the grievances. The grievances "far from becoming increasingly violent and disruptive" get domesticated by institutions, and find an "orderly constitutional expression". Political parties, elections and parliaments provide for conflict without revolution.

In a communist political set up, political party governs. It performs the role of a vanguard party. The party like the Mongolian Peoples Revolutionary Party of Mongolia demolishes the traditional sources of power, wealth and status and replaces them with the political party structure. It maintains contact with

the masses through a system of transmission belts: unions, cooperatives, youth groups etc. The state apparatus becomes subordinate to the party. In such system the main characteristic is that it provides stability in government. The party is not composed of masses rather of committed persons. It is in this sense, the party is not of masses rather over the masses.

There has been a section of opinion that political parties, either of free society or of communist society, are no different in their nature and function. According to this opinion the socialist parties are not very different from the other parties and organisations. Both these are oligarchy for two reasons. First, that the masses can not lead themselves. They have to be led by a minority whether it is party or trade union. And second, that the proletariat are generally without structure and culture. It is an atomized mass of people. In every political set up representative rule over their electors, delegates over those who gave them their mandate. Essentially, the political organisation is inherently against the proletariat. The political party organisation "forces the proletariat back into its immediate existence where it is merely a component of
capitalist society and not at the same time the motor that drives it to its doom and destruction". 80

Political institutionalisation in Mongolia is done by the political party, i.e. MPRP. The political party in Mongolia is vanguard to operationalise the system of democratic centralism. Its political functions are performed by the MPRP and determines the basic policies and defines the goals of society. The MPRP organises and reorganises the government, the administration, the entire life of the society. In Mongolia all government authority is derived from the MPRP. It is the MPRP which rules the country. It is the political institutionalisation through the MPRP that as a result of "such measure as systematizing the political apparatus of the People's Democracy, constantly improving its work, implementing the principles of collective leadership, and tightening the links between the government and the masses, great success was achieved in hastening the development and progress of this country and in building socialism; governmental democracy also deepened and developed." 81


C. Participation

Mass participation is an essential ingredient of political modernisation. It "involves primarily the role of the citizenry and new standards of loyalty and involvement". In modern states the citizens become directly involved in and affected by the affairs of the government. It is here that a distinction exists between the traditional state in which people have nothing to interfere in the governance of the nation whereas in the modern state people participate in politics and are affected by politics in large-scale political units. "The most fundamental aspect of political modernisation is the participation in politics beyond the village and town level by social groups throughout the society and the development of new political institutions, such as political parties, to organise that participation".

There are certain preconditions of political participation. The traditional value system must change. In a modernised political system there has to be a fundamental shift in values, attitudes and

---
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expectations. The traditional values must be eroded and new values be replaced in their place. The inclusion of new values requires two steps; first, the weakening of long standing norms of social conduct through the uprooting of old settings, habits and commitments; and second, the inclusion of individuals into relatively stable new patterns of group membership, organisation and commitment. 84 Under new value system the loyalty and identification changes from the primacy of immediate association like the village and the clan to the commitment for larger unit like the class and the nation. The traditional loyalties towards caste, clan and ethnic association change so that people can identify themselves with the nation as their supreme allegiance. In addition, there has to be changes at intellectual, social and economic levels. On the whole, the entire bases of previous social, economic and psychological commitments are eroded and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behaviour.

The process of nation building is complete when the members of community are committed to abide by the obligations of a nation-state and also are endowed with

the rights of equality of citizenship status. Obligations should include not just compliance, but also civility, activity and competence. The common obligations of citizenship encompass both political and social duties, and the work is the most important of all social obligations. There is, however, an operational aspect of obligations to citizens. Law abiding, learning and work, all have intricate meanings when applied in society by different types of states. For instance, taking compulsory work from the citizens would be conscription though some form of service to the community is duty. The obligations, thus, must have civic sense that people are treated as citizens rather than subjects.

The citizens must also have certain rights without which they can not acquire the citizenship status as equal partners in society. Such a right moves in stages from traditional state to the modern one. These are four in number. "There is first a legal dimension, concerned with the rule of law without respect to persons; second, a political, concerned with means of controlling those who make the law; the third is economic, and at this stage some means is provided

of ensuring that men get a fair return for their labour; fourth, and most difficult of all, is the social dimension, and here the hope is for some minimum of mutual respect, and some opportunity for a man to realise the maximum of which he is capable and to win stem of doing it". This framework of society provides entitlements which are rights, such as the right to conclude a free contract, or the right to vote, or the right to livelihood. These rights together with obligations constitute symptoms of a civil society, a society different from the traditionally unequal society. When a nation achieves modernity there is a contract of association rather than the contract of domination. These obligations and rights of citizens "are enforced by sanctions and protected by institutions. This is effective only if there are structures of power to back them up. The search for a civil society, and ultimately a world civil society, is one for equal rights in a constitutional framework which domesticates power so that all can enjoy citizenship as a foundation of their life chances".

There are two tests of assessing participation
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in modernised politics; first, the extensiveness of participation; and second, the degree of competitiveness. These two together constitute a good guide to adjudicate whether a state is politically developed. The best way to assess the extensiveness of participation is the universal suffrage. There are however, certain features which limit this test of modernised politics. "Should Switzerland, often otherwise cited a model of democracy, be considered less democratic or developed because one half of its position - namely, its women - are disqualified from voting"? 88 Similarly, if the percentage of qualified voters is high, should the political system be reckoned as more developed. But then, "by this criterion, without such conditions the communist countries would surely surpass the democratic countries in the degree of development." 89 Or alternatively, the quite often unrepresentative manner in which delegates are selected for the national party conventions which nominate such executive in America, the validity of the universal suffrage criteria stands open to question. Furthermore, in many underdeveloped countries the
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illiterate population turns out in larger proportion than the conscious population of the developed countries. Unless "the relationship between motivation, awareness and coercion, on the one hand, and the act of voting, on the other", are taken into account the test of universal suffrage has very little relevance.\(^{90}\) The massive turn out of people below poverty line in rural India and the poverty in order Americans in urban areas, is a reflection of some form of coercion, rather than willingness and free choice of voters, in going to the polling stations for exercising their franchise. The non-voting, therefore, is not necessarily a criterion of less developed political consciousness and commitment. Even so, this, can not be rejected as a guiding criterion of political participation.

A competitive atmosphere in politics is another feature of participation. For any test of modernised states, the nations can be classified whether they are competitive, semi-competitive or authoritarian. In the democratic world, particularly, this is most reliable basis of categorising nations into developed or under developed. This is because the participation can be only in terms of content rather than spirit if the
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political landscapes prevents choice of politics. The critical test of political development is "the degree of competitiveness permitted to all who would be legitimate participants in defining and executing the society's business". This, however, is not free from shortcoming. It has been observed that where norms of participation, ability to participate and actual participation are high the effectiveness of democracy is also high. In practice, a successful government depends on two factors; first, whether citizens assume the role of faithful subject; and second, whether a careful distinction exists between consensus and cleavage within a given electorate. "In fact, the reconciliation of participation with stability in the process of development forms one of the most important problems in the analysis of political development".

There are two distinct frames of reference for getting the participation operationalised in the actual

91. Max Millikan and Donald Blackmer (edited), The Emerging Nations (Boston, 1961), p. 89.
practice of politics; the Western democratic countries and the communist countries. The expansion of participation, in electoral process, in Europe took a long route of extension of the suffrage from top to the bottom; from aristocracy to upper bourgeoisie, lower bourgeoisie, peasants and urban workers. The French Revolution (1789) brought about a fundamental change in the conception of participation of people in the governance of society: "the basic unit was no longer the household, the property, or the occupation, but the individual citizen, and the representation was no longer channelled through separate functional bodies but through a unified national assembly of legislators". "A new phase in the development opened up with the revolution of 1848 and the rapid spread of movements for representative monarchy through most of Europe".94

The English reform acts of 1832, 1867, 1884 and 1918 are evidence to the gradual process of political participation. "In Europe the expansion of participation was linked to the centralisation of power; the democratic movement has to be unitary and centralising, because it had to destroy before it could
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construct. In America, on the other hand, the expansion of participation was linked with the dispersal of power and the maintenance of the established units of government. While comparing between the medieval and the modern political structure it is apparent that there were "simultaneous trends towards equality, and a nationwide, governmental authority. The constitution of a modern nation state is typically the fountain head of the rights of citizenship and these rights are a token of nationwide equality. Politics itself has become nationwide, and the "lower Classes" now have "the opportunity of active participation".

The distinguishing features of participation in the communist political system is that organisationally and ideologically it does not tolerate any breaches in the plebiscitarian principle. In principle, the individuals are identical in "sharing the over riding obligation to the cause of the proletarian revolution and the national community which emodies that cause".
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As conceived in the Critique of the Gotha Program, Marx had the imagination that the contemporary society and the state are basically identical and therefore, the basis of participation in a socialist society must be different than found in the bourgeoisie state. For Marx - "Freedom consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinate to it, and today, too, the forms of state are more or less free to the extent that they restrict the freedom of the state". 98 But in practice a communist society is embodied by the party and therefore, political participation must be conceived in the context of party organising political affairs of the people.

The political participation under communism is always encouraged. But the participation has to be within the framework of the official ideology and of the regime. The ideology being egalitarian, communism appeals to workers and toilers; Its ultimate vision is that of a stateless society, far from any type of exploitation. The nature of participation in socialist societies has always been under criticism. These critics associate Stalinist mass murder with Marx's
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social theory which is basically wrong. The action of Soviet bureaucracy need to be evaluated "in terms of individuals rather than institutions or society and of the personality weaknesses of the countless 'Little Stalins' who had contributed to Stalinism's despotism".\textsuperscript{99} The participation of people in politics, however, in socialist societies is distinct in content and spirit than in open societies. Though in all communist countries some amount of public discussion and criticism of details of policy and administration have gradually been allowed, but the nature of people's participation in political affairs did not change. It was only during Perestroika and Glasnost that the communist societies got exposed to public participation in the affairs of the state. In the wake of openness the East European and Soviet regimes collapsed under the pressure of public upsurge. This led to the collapse of the Mongolian system. Now, all these communist countries are aspiring for democracy and free forces of market to get established in place of regimented society.

The participation of people in Mongolia is conducted through the only political party, since no other political party is tolerated in Mongolia. The

guiding political principle of politics in Mongolia is democratic centralism. In Mongolia the participation of people has only one channel. Since the Mongolian political system does not allow free formation and exchange of opinion on political matters, the MPRP has an exclusive rights over the affairs of political participation. There is a system of regular general election for the Great People's Hural, the highest political elected representative body of the MPR. For instance, in the general election of June 1989 after "the results came out it was claimed that out of 929,403 votes, 929,393 had actuall voted - only 10 persons did not vote, then giving a total turnout of 99.9 percent". 100

There is a particular feature of political participation in Mongolia. For Mongolian people, those who wish to participate in politics, they do through organisations and activities. In fact, the Mongolian "political system is formed by the instructions of the various classes and social groups and their representative bodies". 101 Citizen's participation

in public affairs does not get reflected through free political choice of individuals or groups. Political participation in Mongolia has a socialising rather than politicalising function, to introduce people to the political system, its values and priorities.

3. Mongolian Concept of Nation-Building

Mongolia opted for Marxism as the concept of nation building. But this must be seen in the special background of Mongolian geopolitics. First, Mongolia was surrounded by two giant powers of Russia and China. It had no opportunity to come in contact with the West where democratic path of nation building took its birth. And second, the impact of Bolshevik Revolution and the assistance got during Mongolian Revolution put Mongolia in close contact with the Soviet Union. The Leninist frame of nation building was an expedient course to adopt for its nation building. Moreover, the Mongolian revolutionaries were interested in radical transformation of society, a society which was ravaged through the wars of nobles, exploited through the reign of Manchu. Marxist-Leninist approach offered them all those possibilities of becoming a modern nation where state could be organised on the
basis of people's power. It was realised "that during a period of proletarian revolution a backward country can develop along the non-capitalist path, that the struggle for the peoples of the colonial dependencies for national independence and freedom is part of the proletarian revolution, that the only correct path of the Mongolian people's struggle for political and economic independence was for the Mongolian working people to establish solid links with the workers and peasants of the Soviet Union:. Only Marxism-Leninism could provide "the main theoretical basis" of Mongolian nation building."

The concept of Mongolian nation building is rooted in the theory of modernisation. A rapid industrialisation is the first requirement of the modernisation of a socialist economy without which a nation would be unable to overcome the contradictions of capitalism and to create a new cultural revolution. "In the course of socialist construction the peoples of these countries have had to complete the work that was left undone by capitalism - create modern industries, overcome survivals of pre-
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capitalist formations in economy and culture, and in peoples minds."103 Industrialisation of Mongolia adopted two established socialist courses; one, public ownership of the means of production after feudalism was abolished during 1921-39; and the other, planned development of the economy. The ownership, however, had a difficult route since Mongolia was a nomadic society and the wealth consisted largely of livestock. Mongolia accomplished it in its own way and laid solid foundation of the economy. The planning of Mongolian economy was finally executed in the form of Five Year Plan since 1948. State enterprises and negdels were created as economic institutions for a rapid advance of the economy. The period of 1940-65 proved to be very fruitful. Through non-capitalist path of modernisation, Mongolia moved forward and its production relations were changed alongwith the material and technical levels of the economy.

The politics in Mongolia adopted different course than Western countries and opted for the model of Soviet Union for its nation building. The state in Mongolia is a socialist state, a government of the

working class and thus a dictatorship of workers and arats. In the textbook definition: "The state ceases to be class state in as much as it becomes the expression of all the will and interests of the whole people".\textsuperscript{104} And within the state, the Party, MPRP, commanded the interests of the people. It was assigned the role of a vanguard for the task of nation building. No other party was allowed to exist because no other ideology was considered more advanced than Marxism. The state, however, was supposed to be transitory because ultimately it would wither away. Lenin was of the opinion in "The State and Revolution" that the withering away of the state would be a lengthy process and it would remain until communism is achieved. As a result of the socialist path of nation building "the Revolutionary Democratic government of the Mongolian working classes, which was one form of proletarian and peasant revolutionary democratic dictatorship, gradually changed into a dictatorship of the worker's class".\textsuperscript{105}

For the institutionalisation of politics and the participation of people in it, Mongolia adopted
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'democratic centralism'. It rejected parliamentarianism because it rejected Western democracy. It opted for a socialist democracy which moves towards communism. It was not equal political right rather equal economic condition which guided Mongolian democracy. There is universal participation of people in Mongolia. The mass participation of people in Mongolia, and thereby democracy, is practiced through public debate of policy proposals, through popular involvement in administration, through social organisations like Trade Unions, and through socialist competition. Thus, Mongolian adopted socialist political method for building a nation for Mongolia.