**Approaches of Political Theory**

**Meaning of Political Theory** - David Held defines political theory as “a network of concepts and generalizations about political life involving ideas, assumptions and statements about the nature, purpose and key features of government, state and society and about the political capabilities of human beings.” A very elaborate definition of political theory has been given in *Political Science Dictionary*, describing it as “a body of thought that seeks to evaluate, explain and predict political phenomena. As a sub-field of Political Science, it is concerned with political ideas, values and concepts, and the explanation of prediction of political behaviour. In its broad sense, it has two main branches: one is political philosophy or normative theory, with its value, analytic, historical and speculative concerns. The other is empirical theory, with its efforts to explain, predict, guide, research and organize knowledge through the formulation of abstract model and scientifically testable propositions.” Political theory is all about politics. It is an overview of what the political order is about. It is a symbolic representation of what is “political”. In its nature, it is a formal, logical and systematic analysis of processes and consequences of political activity. It is, in its method, analytical, expository, and explanatory. It is, in its objective an attempt to give order, coherence and meaning to what may be referred to as “political”.

**Political Theory: Implications** - To understand theory when applied to politics would mean understanding politics as a theory, as a science and also as a philosophy. Bluhen would, thus, explain political theory as “an explanation of what politics is all about, a general understanding of the political world, a frame of reference. Without one we should be unable to recognize an event as political, decide anything about why it happened, judge whether it was good or bad or decide what was likely to happen next. A theory helps us identify what is happening in a particular case of politics. It helps us to explain why an event occurred and to predict future events. Theory also is a tool for evaluating what is happening and for guiding our political choices.” The job of the political theorist is really important. Brecht makes a note of it saying, “It is the function of the political theorist to see, sooner than others, and to analyze, more profoundly than others, the immediate and the potential problems of the political life of society; to supply the practical politicians, well in advance, with alternative courses of action, the foreseeable consequences of which have been fully thought through; and to supply him not only with brilliant ideas, but with a solid block of knowledge on which to build.” When political theory performs its function well, he continues, “It is one of the most important weapons in our struggle for the advance of humanity.”

The discussion on what a theory is or what political theory is would help us identify the characteristic implications or the major aspects of political theory. Some of these can be stated as under:

i) The area in which political theory works extends to the realms of politics only political life of the citizen, his political behaviour, his political ideas, the government that he seeks to establish, and the tasks expected from such a government.

ii) The methods, which political theory adopts, include description, explanation and investigation of the political phenomenon.

iii) Though political theory is all about what is ‘political’, yet it attempts to understand ‘political’ in relation to social, economic, psychological, ecological, moral, and the like.

iv) The objective which political theory seeks to achieve is to build a good state in a good society, and in the process, create processes, procedures, institutions and structures historically tested and rationally attained.
v) As a body of thought, political theory attempts to explain, evaluate and predict political phenomena, and in the process builds not only scientifically testable models, but suggests values as rules of human conduct.
vii) Political theory is both prescriptive and explanatory.

Political theory, as a disciplined investigation of political phenomena is closely related to why and what of the institutions of the government, and the whole political system in which the government operates. To study political theory is to study the context in which it exists. We need to understand political theory within the realm of the political system, the political system within the realm of the social system, the social system within the realm of the period it exists, and in the environment it breeds.

The contents of political theory include understanding of what is really ‘political’, to link ‘political’ with what is ‘non-political’, and to integrate and coordinate the results of the numerous social sciences for knowing its own nature. Its scope is not limited to what it constitutes, but to what exists in the periphery and beyond. Suggesting that the task of defining what is political is a continual one, Sheldon Wolin (Politics and Vision 1960) includes the following in the contents of political theory:

(i) A form of activity centring on the quest for competitive advantage between groups, individuals, or societies;
(ii) A form of activity conditioned by the fact that it occurs within a situation of change and relative scarcity;
(iii) A form of activity in which the pursuits of advantage produce consequences of such magnitude that they affect in a significant way the whole society or a substantial portion of it.

**Philosophical Approach** - In the classical or normative period the study of politics reflected a normative concern and deductive method of explanation. It argued from a general premise to more specific conclusions. It speculated on the proper form of government and on the nature of political obligation. Philosophical approach is generally identified with value preferences. The emphasis is on moral and rational premises. This approach is based on the view that values are inevitable and essential for evaluating political phenomena. The classical political philosophers were concerned with the justification of values and reconciliation of liberty and obligation. Plato, for example dealt with the question of ‘justice’ in the Republic through the ideal state. The ethical basis and the moral purpose of the political community was analysed in detail by political philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Bentham and Hegel. Thus the philosophical period is noted for its general trend of setting standards based on values like justice, freedom and happiness.

Philosophical approach aims at evolving “standards of right and wrong” for the purpose of critical evaluations of the existing institutions, laws and policies. It may denote efforts to arrive at truth through the use of reason. According to Vernon Van Dyke, the object of philosophical enquiry in this sense is to establish standards of the good, the right, and the just, and to appraise or prescribe political institutions and practices in the light of these standards. In this sense most of the classical political theory represents philosophical approach. Its themes are generally concerned with moral reasoning which cannot be subjected to scientific test.
Philosophical approach was renewed by Leo Strauss. Philosophy, as an abstract study encompassing the whole universe in general, and morals, norms, and values in particular, is the sum-total of general laws governing the whole world. It has served political theory well through the ages as its valuation factor, as Sabine has said. Without philosophy, no political theory can ever hope to exist; without an eye on future, no present can ever afford to stay as no present stands without its past.

Political theory is a philosophy, for it not only seeks to know the nature of things but also attempts to explain as to why things really exist. One understands an action or a thought only by evaluating it. Evaluation is a part of understanding. Philosophy as distinct from theory is a ‘quest for wisdom’ or as Strauss holds the view, “quest for universal knowledge, for knowledge of the whole”. Political theory as philosophy is “the attempt truly to know both the nature of political things and the right, or the good, political order”. (Strauss). Politics is not what one assumes or opines. In fact, a political theorist is expected to possess more than an assumption or an opinion; he has to have knowledge. Philosophy emerges when opinion/assumption attains the heights of knowledge, and that is what exactly the task of political theory is. Political theory as philosophy is an “attempt to replace opinion/assumption about the nature of political things by knowledge of the nature of political things”. (Strauss).

Values, Strauss believes are an indispensable part of political theory as they are of philosophy. Every political philosopher has to be a teacher in his own right: he must profess; he must teach; he must persuade. Professor Verma, therefore, writes that the object of persuasion is always there before the political theorist. What some of the modern writers have described as “the folklore of political philosophy or mere ideology is vital for the understanding of political theory.” Political theory not only explains, but also affects, favourably or adversely. Evaluation aspects of a political activity are as important as its factual aspects. It is, in this sense, that values and facts form an integral part of any political theory.

Historical approach- Historical approach denotes the process of arriving at the laws governing politics through an analysis of historical events, as exemplified by the theories propounded by Hegel and Marx. It also stands for an attempt at understanding political process through a historical account of political thought of yester years. The best example for historical approach in political science is George H. Sabine’s ‘A History of Political Theory’. Leading examples of the questions raised by political philosophers like Plato, Aristotle, Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, Bentham, Mill, Hegel or Marx are what ideals are sought to be realized through the state; what is the meaning of freedom and equality; what are the grounds and limits of political obligation etc.?

Historical approach has been emphatically advocated by scholars like George Sabine, but all history is not political theory just as all political theory is not history. Political theory without history is a structure without a base. In studying and analysing politics, what we learn to understand is a political tradition, and a concrete way of behaviour. It is, therefore, proper that the study of politics should essentially be a historical study. History, we should know, is more than the tale of the dead and the buried; it is a storehouse of experience and wisdom; successes and failures of what has been achieved and what has been lost. It is the sum-total and simultaneously the formation head of a new development, something, as Professor L.S. Rathore says, “Eternally significant and instructive,
inseparably linked with contemporaneity in the perpetual progress of mankind.” Ignore history, he
warns, and the delight of political theory is never to be retrieved.

Historical approach defies what has lost its value. No one cries now that the state has been a
divine creation or the result of a contract in the state of nature. As history, political theory conserves
what has significance and helps posterity to cherish it for a long time to come. Concepts such as
justice, liberty, equality, obligation, as evolved through the annals of time are being held high by
political theory today and shall continue to be so in future. Indeed, history never repeats, but it can
hardly be ignored. In the attempt to divorce itself from history, political theory loses its own
significance, for there can be no fruits without roots as Seeley had said long ago. It is through history
that political theory explains what is what. One can never understand a text without its context.
Plato’s communism was significantly different from what is claimed to be Marx’s communism
and one can understand communism of each by understanding the history of their respective times. It is
one’s age that prompts and propels one’s political theory: history shapes and reshapes political
theory. How can, then, political theory ignore its one aspect, the historical aspect? Sabine writes that
great political theory excels both in “an analysis of a present situation and in suggestiveness for
other situations”.

According to Sabine, historical approach, political theory has three kind of substance.
Political theory is history in the sense that it seeks to understand the time, the place and the
circumstances in which it evolves. If it ignores its historical context, it loses its strength, its focus and
its message. Any political theory has to have facts as the basis (the factual-historical factor as Sabine
would say), circumstances in which it develops (the causal factor as Sabine describes it), and the
message, i.e., political theory (the valuation factor, as Sabine would insist). Political theory is not
merely or only history (the statement of facts on which it works and has worked in the past, i.e.,
history), it is a science in so far as it is not understood in isolation, and also a philosophy in so far as it
motivates.

Karl Popper has described this approach as ‘historicism’. Popper has criticized historicism
especially Marxism because it insists on discovering what is inevitable, and then advocates
‘totalitarian’ methods for its realization. Further critics of historical approach point out that it is not
possible to understand ideas of the past ages in terms of the contemporary ideas and concepts.
Moreover, ideas of the past are hardly any guide for resolving the crises of the present day world
which are beyond comprehension of the past thinkers. This criticism to historical approach
encouraged the development of the Behavioural Approach. However, the recent revival of interest
in the rich heritage of political thought for evolving guiding principles for our own age emphasizes
the importance of historical approach in political science.

Legal Approach- Legal approach stands for an attempt to understand politics in terms of law. It
focuses its attention on the legal and constitutional framework in which different organs of
government have to function and their powers and procedure which makes their actions legally
valid. For instance, legal approach to Indian politics will proceed to analyse legal implications of
various provisions of the Indian constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court of India, procedure
of formation and legal position of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha and the State Legislative Assemblies,
procedure of elections, powers and position of the President, Prime Minister, Governors Etc. The
Legal approach may prove inadequate in understanding the complex political forces, processes,
behaviours which might operate outside legal formal framework, yet it is not entirely insignificant.
Thus the study of constitutional law and international law etc. in spite of its limited use in
understanding politics continues to play a pivotal role in the social and political life of almost every country.

Institutional Approach- As the name suggests, a thorough investigation of political institutions in order to study the discipline of political science is called the institutional approach. The approach is almost as old as the discipline of politics and most political scientists since the times of Aristotle have defined and restricted the scope of the discipline only to the study of state and government. In this respect a particular feature of the approach is that it does not usually make use of other social sciences such as philosophy, history or law to analyse political phenomena. It, therefore, assigns an independent individuality to the organized inquiry of political science.

Institutional approach allocates the fundamental status to the institution of state in the study of politics and its agency, the government along with its various organs such as legislature, executive, judiciary and bureaucracy are also identified for close scrutiny as important political institutions. There are also many other institutions such as political parties, trade unions, nongovernmental organisations, educational institutions, religious and cultural organisations etc. which may interest a scholar who is employing institutional approach if they directly or indirectly have some bearing on political processes. In this context it is necessary to know what an institution really is. An institution by and large, can be defined as an established or organised society, an organisation, corporation or an establishment especially of a public nature or whose working affects a community. An institution may be a foundation, a charitable institution, a sports club or a literary body. In the words of Vernon Van Dyke: “An Institution is any persistent system of activities and expectations, or any stable pattern of group behaviour.”

A typical feature of an institution is its offices, agencies and the personnel associated with it are arranged in hierarchy that means each office, agency or personal attached to it is assigned specific powers and functions. It also implies that the people or the community that are likely to be affected by the working of an institution expect that its offices, agencies or personnel should function in accordance with the respective powers and functions assigned to them. If we particularly look for the definition of a political institution then we get to know that a political institution is an organisation that creates, enforces and makes governmental policies pertaining to economy and social system. It also provides for people’s representation. The examples of such political institution include government and its various organs, political parties, trade unions and the courts. The term political institution may also denote the recognised structure of rules and principles within which it operates.

Thus, institutional approach in the study of political science implies a detailed study of the government, its structures, and the body of rules within which it is required to operate and also a thorough examination of its various organs. Besides, the study of political parties, their structures, ideologies and functioning that have linkages with political processes forms a significant segment of institutional approach. Similar studies of other political institutions such as trade unions and civil society institutions are also part of the institutional approach. Aristotle who is also considered the father of traditional school of politics was the first who classified the governments as per the numerical strength of the rulers and the qualitative worth of their governance. Accordingly, he identified forms of governments as monarchy, aristocracy and polity applying the numerical as well as better governance criteria; also as tyranny, oligarchy and democracy using numerical as well as erosion of legitimacy of governance criteria. Though Aristotle’s classification is no more valid, its study is imperative to comprehend the historical background of political theory. The modern classification of governments such as democracy or dictatorship, parliamentary or presidential and unitary or federal is not the sudden growth of our times. These forms of government owe a lot to archetypal kinds of government that had emerged in ancient Greece, Rome and some other ancient
societies. The institutional approach includes the study of all forms of governments. Additionally, the institutional approach also emphasizes on the inquiry of levels of government which means whether the levels of governance pertain to federal, state or local institutions. The approach also prescribes the analysis of the powers and functioning of the organs of government such as legislature, executive and judiciary.

The institutional approach is more or less value free in the sense that it is mainly concerned with the consideration of facts in relation to political institutions. This is a feature that is usually ascribed to a modern approach. In this respect, despite being a traditional approach, the institutional approach not only radically differs from the normative and historical approaches but appears more like a modern approach. Nevertheless, political scientists refrain from including it in the category of modern approaches because it is exceedingly concerned about description rather than analysis of political phenomena. The experts have also enlisted some other shortcomings of this approach. They are as under:

i) It is exclusively focused on political institutions. As a result, the individual, the primary actor in the political process has been totally discounted in the institutional approach. It led to a situation that the study of voting behaviour and political preferences of an individual was ignored by those political scientists who advocated institutional approach in the study of politics;

ii) In the area of international politics the adherents of institutional approach restrict their studies only to the investigation of international political institutions such as the United Nations and its allied agencies and completely ignore the subject matter of international politics such as foreign policy, diplomacy, international law and so on;

iii) Since it is concerned with the study of only established political institutions, it totally ignores the consideration of other phenomena like violence, political movements and agitations, wars, revolution and the scourge of our times, terrorism, which certainly influence politics;

iv) Finally, it also overlooks the position and influence of informal groups that have an effect on the politics of almost all states.

Nevertheless, it must be underlined that institutional approach is very significant because political institutions constitute the core segment of the scope of political science. It is unimaginable to ignore the study of political institutions in any meaningful inquiry of political phenomena. It should also be made clear that no single approach is adequate in itself for the study of any social science. It is true about institutional approach as well. It is only the combination of a few significant approaches that helps in a dispassionate study of political science and institutional is certainly one of the significant approaches.

**Behavioural Approach (Empirical approach)** - Behavioralism is regarded as a turning point in the history of political science, thought and analysis. It has been widely acclaimed as a great revolution which has transformed the goals, nature, scope, methodology, and theoretical formulations of political science. Emergence of behavioural studies reflects the determination of new scholars to derive their findings on the basis of direction or indirect observation of human behaviour. It is to be regarded as a first real attempt to make political studies as a ‘science of politics’.

Behavioralism is an intellectual tendency and academic movement. It has so many facets: a revolution, a reform movement, a mood, an approach and an attitude. It has been adopted because of its objectivity, observability, value neutrality and verifiability. Behavioralism maintains that there are certain fundamental units of analysis relating to human behaviour out of which generalizations can be formed. These generalizations offer a common base on which a ‘science of man’ can be appropriately built.

Behavioralism in political science not only concerned with behaviour but also concerned with its perpetual, motivational, and attitudinal components making for man’s political beliefs.
values and goals. In sum, it involves external aspects of behaviour and the affective, contiguous and evaluative processes engrossed through it.

Behavioralism, as an academic movement in political science first began in the United States after the Second World War. Growth of behavioralism is the outcome of varied reasons marked mainly by dissatisfaction with prevailing historical descriptive, legal formal and normative perspectives. In 1908, Graham Walls (Human nature in politics) and Arthur F. Bentley (The process of government) advocated psychological and group oriented approaches Walter Lippmann (public Opinion) in 1922 took up the study of public opinion and political attitude formation.

In 1951, David B. Truman revived Bentley’s neglected orientation in his (The governmental process). But the pioneering efforts were made by Charles E. Merriam (New Aspects of Politics in 1925) His efforts came out in the form of famous ‘Chicago School’ which produced a host of political scientists, such as Harold F. Gosnell, Harold D. Laswell, V.O. Key, Herbert A. Simon, Gabriel Almond, etc.

So far behavioralism remained only a ‘movement of protest’ against traditional methods of analysis. After the Second World War, the movement came out in the form of an academic revolution. Evaluation of behavioralism has witnessed certain trends also. In its first phase (1920-30), it paid more attention to qualitative aspects and less on substantive and theoretical problems.

In its second phase, up to 1950, behavioralists moved in both substantive and non-substantive areas. After that, they began to specialise in various directions: multi-methodologism, behavioural theories, behavioural positivism and Watsonian Behaviorism. Behavioralism can be also being broadly divided as: (a) Pure behavioralism, and (b) Applied behavioralism.

Pure behavioralism aims at contributing to theory and techniques of the discipline and remains ready to study any problem. It purpose is ‘pure research’ or knowledge for the sake of knowledge, seeking generalisations on the basis of technical judgments. Applied behavioralists take up problems of important social consequences and collaborate with several disciplines to solve them. Often they behave like social reformers, administrators or engineers and have some consideration towards persons and situations.

In the field of political Science, the origins of this approach can be traced to this approach can be traced to the writings of Graham Walls and Arthur Bentley. These two writers in the early Twentieth Century, laid emphasis on the importance to political process in the analysis of politics. Charles E. Merriam and G.E.G Catlin in the 1920’s and Harold D. Lasswell in the 1930’s stressed this approach. It gained popularity with the work of American Political Scientists after the Second World War. David Easton laid the foundation of the behavioural movement with certain assumptions and objectives.

Easton’s concept of behavioralism is regarded as the intellectual foundation stone of behavioralism. It contains principles is known; (1) Regularities- These are certain discoverable uniformities in political behaviour of human beings that can be expressed in generalisations or theories capable of explaining and predicing social phenomena. (2) Verification- The validity of such generalisation must be tested and verified in principle by reference to relevance to relevant behaviour. (3) Techniques- Appropriate techniques should be used for observing, recording, acquiring, analyzing or testing and interpreting the data. (4) Quantification- Ample care should be taken by a researcher not merely to collect data but also to measure and quantify the same. Quantification and measurement are the essential ingredients that determine the scientific method. (5) Values- Facts and values may be studied separately. Ethical evaluation and empirical explanation should be kept analytically distinct and it should be value free or value neutral. (6) Systematization- It means that research in the field of political science should be systematic. Attempts should be made to build systematic theories on the basis of logically interrelated body of concepts and propositions. (7) Pure Science- The behaviour lists contented that both theory and its application are parts of scientific method and must be closely linked. (8) Integration- The study of
political Science should be integrated with other social sciences and inter disciplinary approach should be adopted. It will facilitate cross fertilization of ideas and results in more generality and validity of political studies.

The behavioural approach originated due to dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches. It was opined that the traditional approaches laid emphasis on organized formal institutional structures which made political Science functionally irrelevant as it lacked an insight into operational dimensions. Many developments in other social sciences like sociology, psychology and anthropology influenced the behavioralist to restructure the study of political science. The behavioural approach focuses on political behaviour. It calls on political behaviour. It calls for the study of acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of man in the political context. It lays emphasis on the collection and examination of facts relating to actual behaviour of man as a social and political being. Thus, behavioralism shifts its focus from study of politics from formalism and normative orientations of the legalistic and philosophical schools to political behaviour, i.e., the behaviour of actual actors in the political field like power holders and power seekers as well as voters.

Characteristics of behavioural approach -

Movement of protest - Behavioralism primarily sort of protest movements against the inadequacies of conventional political science mainly led by the American political scientists. They are highly dissatisfied with the achievements of conventional political science because of its inadequacies. The conventional political science confined its study only to the state and government and he did not take into account the political phenomena and the behaviour of men.

Therefore, behaviouralism has shifted its emphasis from the ideal state, government and political institutions to the day today political problems of the citizens. Consequently new methods of study and research have developed in political science.

(1) Focus on behaviour - Behaviouralism is a sort of protest movement against traditional approaches in political science; therefore, behaviouralism has made the individual as centre of attention in the study of political phenomena. Behaviouralists are concerned with the individual's political behaviour as a member of group and institutions.

(2) Scientific outlook and objectivity - Behaviouralism stress the special importance of the scientific outlook and objectivity. Behaviouralists overlook the ethical values because they cannot be studied scientifically and objectively. Instead they advocate value free science of politics. They emphasize empirical values which are arrived at after a lot objective study and scientific investigation.

(3) Methodological revolution- Behaviouralism brought about altogether a new approach in the study of political research. Consequently, some scholars regard behaviouralism as nothing but a methodological revolution in political science. Whereas the traditional political scientist employed philosophical, historical or comparative methods for thief study, the behaviouralists emphasis such techniques are observation, interviews, survey, research, case studies, data collection, statistical analysis, quantification etc. the behaviour lists have drawn frequently from natural sciences such as Mathematics, Statistics, Physics, Biology etc.

(4) Inter-disciplinary study- The political behaviour of an individual is a part of the total social behaviour of all the individuals. In order to get a proper understanding a modern researcher in political science has to take the help of various social sciences or different disciplines like Sociology, History, Economics and Anthropology and so on. Great anthropologists and sociologist like Malinowski and Durkheim, Talcott Parsons, Edward A. Shils, Alex have made unique contribution to systems theory and the structural Functional approach. The modern political scientists have also started studying the works of the above famous sociologists and anthropologists because the
behavioural method cannot be understood fully without studying deeply other disciplines (social sciences).

(5) Invention of scientific theory- The main aim of the behaviouralists is to build a scientific theory with the help of observation and experimentation, which may be able to predict things and be applied universally.

Achievements of Behaviouralism - The behavioural approach has widened the scope of political and came to dominate the political science for its higher degree of reliability instead of a higher degree of generality. Thus it focused on micro-level situations rather than attempting macro-level generalizations.

The achievements of behaviouralism can be traced two fields, theory building and techniques of research or research methodology. (1) Research methodology- the behaviour lists made significant achievements in the development and refinement to the tools and techniques of research. Developments in the fields of; (i) content-analysis, (ii) case-analysis, (iii) interviewing and observation, and (iv) statistics are particularly remarkable. They also use the most sophisticated quantifications and measurement techniques in their empirical research projects. (2) Theory Building- the contribution of the behaviouralists towards the theory building is not laudable because they are mainly concerned with the individual's and group behaviour. They focus their less and less on state. The behavioural science developed a good deal more revolutionary in the realm of technique than in that of validated and expanded theory. The greatest contribution of the behaviour lists in regard to theory has been in the field of voting behaviour.

Criticism of behavioural approach- Though behaviouralism made a breakthrough in the field of political Science, it has been criticized on many fronts. Some of its weaknesses have been identified as follows:

(1) Behaviouralism concerns more with Techniques than Results- Behaviour list attach too much importance to the techniques and methods and do not worry at all about the theoretical importance of the subject. While doing the research, the behaviour lists have chosen only such topics for research in which better techniques are an available and they have ignored the rest. Besides that they have not bothered about the results.

(2) Behaviouralism emphasise the importance of behavioural effect at the cost of institutional effects- it should be noted particularly that American behaviour lists have altogether neglected the effects of the institutions upon the society and concentrated their efforts only at the behavioural aspect of the individuals and groups confined mainly in America.

(3) Study of politics can never be value-free- the critics of behaviouralism contend that politics can never be value free as held by the behaviour lists. In politics very selection of subjects for investigation is determined by values.

(4) Behaviouralism emphasis static rather than current situation- Behaviour lists has been concentrating their study mainly on the static subjects rather on the current problems. In the beginning behaviour lists justified they were filling the gap left by the institutionalism but now it cannot be justified as the burning problems such as threat of nuclear war, hunger, famine, undernourishment etc. The behaviour lists have so far ignored all these urgent problems because that does not suit their study.

(5) Difficulties in studying ever changing behaviour- it is very difficult to study the ever changing behaviour of man because the emotions, ideas and thinking go on changing continuously. Therefore, absolutely no correct predictions can be made about the behaviour of man. Moreover, it is very difficult to measure the role of various factors governing the behaviour of man.
**Behavioural research depends too much on other sciences** - Political science is depending upon other social sciences particularly sociology and anthropology and borrowing so much from them that it is apprehended that the very identity, integrity and autonomy of political science may be lost. Inter-disciplinary approach can be helpful in understanding many political problems but it cannot solve all the complexities about human behaviour. Despite the criticism, the contribution of behaviour revolution to political science needs to be acknowledged. Certain specific areas in political science for example study of voting behaviour, enquiry into political process etc, have been benefited greatly by the new approach. The salutary results of behavioural movement may be summed up as new awareness about the needs of scientific research greater degree of empiricism and an increasing use of new analytical technique.

**Post-Behaviouralism** - Post-Behaviouralism is the next step or reform movement of behavioural revolution. Like behaviouralism, it was again propounded by David Easton in his presidential address to the American Political Science Association in 1969 which relied on relevance and action? It lay new emphasis on ‘values’, on issues of justice, freedom and equality. David Easton pointed out that post-behaviouralism was future oriented, seeking to propel political science in new directions, and to add rather than deny its past heritage. It was both a movement and an intellectual tendency. Post-behaviouralism emphasis on the facts as well as values. It is a reform movement within the discipline of political science. The two basic motivation of post-behaviouralism is relevance and action. Relevance means the development of such theories which can be utilized for the good of the society. The research techniques are good but emphasis should be on using these research techniques to make theories which will answer the problem of the society.

While behaviouralism was a movement against traditionalism, the post-behaviouralism was also a movement against behaviouralism itself but instead of condemning either of the two methods of thought, it was synthesis between the two contending schools of thought. Behaviouralism was not a new discipline; rather it was just a new technique, a new approach with a new focus in view for the study of political science.

The behavioral approach was trying to convert the study of politics into a discipline based on the methodology of natural sciences. Mathematics was making its way in political science to the extent that it began to look more of mathematics than a science related to the realities of social life. In their efforts at research and application of scientific methods. The behaviouralists had gone for away from the realities of social behaviour. In this way political science again lost touch with the current and contemporary world.

The behaviouralism which failed to solve any practical problem of the world even after spending cores of rupees on research in regard to developing new methodology and techniques. Therefore post-behaviouralism arose as a protest-movement against behaviouralism.

The action part involves bringing about changes in the society by social action. David Easton who had once enumerated eight main characteristics of behaviouralism and call them the ‘the intellectual foundation stones of the movement, now came out with seven major traits of post-behaviouralism and described them as the ‘credo of Relevance’ or ‘a distillation of maximal image’ they can be summarized as follows:

1. Substance must have precedence over the technique - it may be good to have sophisticated tools of investigation, but the more important point was the purpose for which these tools were to be applied. Unless the scientific research was relevant and meaningful for the contemporary urgent social problems, it was not worth being undertaken. To the slogan raised by the behaviouralist that it was to be wrong than vague, the post-behaviouralist raised the counter-slogan that it was better to be vague than no relevantly precise.

2. Political science should not lose touch with brute realities of politics - political science, during the behavioural movement, had broken itself from the brute realities of politics. With its
enormous wealth and technical resources, and a fantastic rate of increase in man’s material comforts, the western world was, at the same time, moving towards increasing social conflicts and deepening fears and anxieties about the future. If it was not the responsibility of the political scientists to reach out to the real needs of the humanity of what use political science was to society.

3. Political science must not be value force- behaviour lists had put much emphasis on scientism and value-free approaches. This was a very unhappy situation. It was on value premises that all knowledge stood and unless values were regarded as the propelling force behind knowledge, there was a danger that the knowledge was to be used for wrong purposes. Values played an important role in politics and research. They should not be thrown out from political science in the name of science.

4. Political Science should aim for social change and not for social preservation- Contemporary political science should place its main emphasis on social change and not on social preservation as the behaviour lists seemed to be doing.

5. Political science should preserve the human values of civilization- The post behaviour lists wanted to remind the political scientists that, being intellectuals, they had a role to play in the society. It was responsibility to do the best to protect the humane values of civilization.

6. There is a need for action in place of contemplative science- if the intellectuals understood the social problems and felt themselves involved in them they could not keep themselves away from action. Knowledge must be put to work. As Easton point out, “To know is to bear the responsibility for acting and to act is to engage in reshaping society”. Contemplative science might have been all right in the nineteenth century, when there was a broader moral agreement among the nations, but it was completely out of place in the contemporary society which was sharply divided over ideals and ideologies. The post-behaviour lists ask for action science in place of contemplative science.

7. There is an urgent need to politicise the profession- once it was recognized that the intellectuals had a positive role to play in the society and this role was to try to determine proper goals for society and make society move in the direction of these goals, it became inevitable to draw the conclusion that the polarization of the profession of all professional associations as well as universities became not only inescapable but highly desirable.

The post-behaviour lists reply to the argument that science had some ideal commitments of science and that behaviourism shared these ideal commitments of science is that if science led its votaries to close their eyes in the face of urgent social problems the very image of sciences should change. The post-behaviour lists did not deny the importance of technical technician proficiency, but they did not agree that the search for basic understanding and reliable knowledge necessarily implied that the scientists should not cut him adrift from the practical concerns of society, nor did they believe that values could be kept out of all scientific pursuits. Research according to the post-behaviour lists was to be related to urgent social problems and was to be purposive. If the present crisis in society arose out of deep social conflicts, these conflicts had to be resolved. If the resolution of the conflicts needed breaking up of the existing political order, the political scientists should fairly and boldly ask for that, and he must not only rest content with suggesting reforms or if need be revolution, but also contribute his best to the reshaping of society in the direction in which it could serve the desired goal more effectively.

To conclude, post–behavioural approach does not mean a new wave of methodological innovations. It signifies stock taking and re-appraisal. There is a noticeable trend back to the vital aspect concerning value-preferences, identified with the normative approach. The post-behaviour lists did not deny the importance of technical proficiency, but they did not agree that the search for basic understanding and reliable knowledge necessarily implied that the scientist should not cut himself adrift from the practical concerns of the society, nor did they believe that values could be kept out of all scientific pursuits. It was the duty of the political scientists to find out solutions to contemporary problems. If the present crisis in society arose out of deep social conflicts, these
conflicts had to be resolved. If the resolution of the conflicts needs breaking up of the existing political order, the political scientists should fairly and boldly ask for that and he must not only rest being content with suggesting reforms but also contribute his best to the reshaping of society in the direction in which it could serve the desired goals more effectively. Thus it can be concluded that from the traditional approaches to the post-behavioural approach, there is not only change but also continuity.

**Marxian Approach**- The Marxist political theory also known as scientific socialism, Marx pointed out a scientific philosophy of the working class and an ideology for social change. Marx subjected the capitalist system to scientific analysis. He laid bare its exploitative character. The Marxist approach has unique place in the study of politics as it is different from both rational and modern approach. The analysis is based up on economic orientation up on social and political issues. Marxian analysis is rooted in dialectical and historical materialism. According to which history progress through a conflict between two classes in which society is perpetually divided. According to Marx ‘All Past history’ with the exception of its primitive stages, was the history of class struggles. These working classes are the products of the modes of production and of exchange. History is the record of class conflict between those who own the means of production and other who do not and this class conflict is the central theme and motive power in politics.

Marx identified five broad stages through which society has evolved. Marx presented in detail five stages of historical development. Primitive communism is the first stage where the modes of production involve hunting, fishing and food gathering. At this point, the classes have not yet emerged. The second stage is the slave system where the modes of production are animal husbandry along with domestic agriculture and small industry with masters and slaves as the classes in society. Feudal system is the third stage where agriculture on a large scale is the mode of production. The dominant classes are the landlords and the serfs. This stage is succeeded by the capitalist system where the modes of production are large industry. The class structure has capitalist system where the mode of production is large industry. The class structure has capitalist and workers. Finally, there is the socialist system where though the modes of production are the large industry, there are no classes; all the citizens belong to one class known as workers.

According to Marx, ‘the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle’. A Marx believes that, class is determined by the modes of production. In the capitalist society there are two classes, the ‘haves’ and ‘have not’s. Marx holds that the struggle between classes with antagonistic interests such as of the workers and the capitalist under capitalism is inevitable. It is oblivious that change is always sought by the oppressed and the exploited, class which has nothing to close except its chains in contrast, the classes which are dominant, have a definite interest in preserving the existing order or the statuesque. Marxism holds that the interest of the antagonistic classes cannot be reconciled, nor change possible by reconciling class interests. Class struggle is an inevitable product of the contradiction of the productive forces and relations of productions. It is indeed the driving force of social and historical change.

When the contradiction between the prediction relations and forces of productions reaches a climax is defeated and new class takes over. Thus a revolutionary or qualitative change comes about when one modes of production is replaced by another mode of production. Consequently, the process of transformation of one mode of production of one mode of production into another involves social change. Such change is revolutionary rather than evolutionary. It indicates change not within the system, but of one system into another. Class struggle is the driving force of such change and revolution the midwife.

Marxian social theory is based on class struggle, which according to Marx, is the driving force of social and political change. Classes are the fundamental categories of social organization. The concept of Marxian concept of class has a specific meaning. It is defined in terms of the relations. It
has with the prevailing modes of production. Marxian concept of class, Marxism does not define class in terms of work functions, income or consumption, caste or religion etc., it defines class in terms of the class structure of the society and their relations with the means of production.

**Criticisms of Marxian approach** Karl Marx is undoubtedly one of the most influential philosophers of modern times. His ideas and doctrines have acquired the status of a powerful ideology and a programme of action. His ideas on Dialectical Materialism, Historical Materialism, Surplus Value, Class Struggle, Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Alienation, communism etc have been extensively discussed, debated, modified and sometimes even rejected and criticized by his followers and adversaries.

Marxism has been subjected to severe criticisms from various corners. Along with Plato and Hegel, Marx was seen as an enemy of the open society. Marxism claimed to have studied the laws of history on the basis of which it advocated total sweeping and radical changes. Not only was it impossible to have firsthand knowledge based on some set of laws that governed society and human individuals, but Karl Popper also rejected Marx’s social engineering as dangerous for it treated individuals as subservient to the interests of the whole. Popper rejected the historicism, holism and utopian social engineering of Marxism. In contrast, he advocated piecemeal social engineering, where change would be gradual and modest, and allowing rectification of lapses and errors for it was not possible to conceive of everything.

Popper claimed that Marx’s scientific socialism was wrong not only about society but also about science. He claimed that the capitalism that Marx described never existed. He wrote thus: “Marx misled cores of intelligent people by saying that the historic method is the scientific way of approaching social problems” Further Marx made the economy all important, ignoring factors like nationality, friendship, religion, sex etc. Society was far more complex that what Marx described. As Popper has rightly mentioned “Marx brought into the social science and historical science the very important idea that economic conditions are of great importance in the life of society. There was nothing like serious economic history before Marx.”

Marx did not foresee the rise of Fascism, totalitarianism and the welfare state. His analysis of capitalism was at best applicable to early 19th century capitalism, though his criticisms of capitalism as being wasteful unequal and exploitative was true. However, his alternative to genuine democracy and communism seemed more official to realize in practice, for they did not accommodate a world which was becoming increasingly differentiated, stratified and functionally specialized. Popper’s critique of Marxism on the basis of falsification was equally true and difficult to refute, for Marxism constantly adjusted theory in the light of reality. Marx’s vision of a new social order in which there will be neither alienation nor exploitation no classes, no class antagonism, no state is highly fascinating and because of this attraction Prof. Sabine called Marxism a ‘Utopia but a generous and humane one’. Harrington portrayed the contemporary radical view of Marx as being an excellent critic of capitalism but unable to provide a detailed alternative to it. A democratic system was totally alien to his temperament in spite of his plea for democratization of social forces. Marx dismissed liberty as a purely bourgeois ideal and was openly scornful of democracy as a bourgeois invention designed to deceive the people. As a prophet of revolution, Marx failed to analyze human nature correctly. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that the true and the false together in him constitute one of the most tremendously compelling forces that modern history has seen.

The collapse of communism proved the serious shortcomings of Marxism both in theory and practice. It, at best, remained a critique rather than providing a serious alternative to liberal democracy. In spite of Marx’s utopia being truly generous, it displayed a potential for being tyrannical despotic and arbitrary. Centralization of power and absence of checks and balances on absolute power were themselves inimical to human freedom and liberation. Marxist approach claims to be scientific and progressive. It also assumes normative character. But the weakness in this
approach lies in conforming to an ideology with utmost rigidity. It has been criticized for culminating in the ‘pseudo scientific of generated Marxism’.

Marx placed too much emphasis given to the economic factor in explaining social and order change culture seemed to be explained solely as derived from the economic “substructure”. However it has a degree of “autonomy” for example it is difficult, to explain the advent of gay liberation in terms of productive or economic relations. Marx theory of history contradicted by the fact that industrialized countries have not moved closer to revolution. But on country the recent revolutions have been in peasant’s societies- such as china, Russia. Capitalist societies seem to have become more secure from threat of revolution throughout the 20th century. In other words, no socialist revolution of 20th century has occurred according to the Marxist model, all successful revolutions have occurred in relatively backward, non-industrialized nations.

Anarchist criticized Marx, according to them Marx fails to grasp the unacceptable dangers in their readiness to taken an authoritarian-centalist approach. Marxist is willing to use the authoritarian state to run society after the revolutions and to be ruthless in this. This is extremely dangerous; those in control can’t be trusted and are very likely to become an entrenched dictatorship.

Marx placed undue emphasis on the progress of history through class antagonism, and conceived of no moral or political values independent of the class interest. Interests or ideas not conforming to his logic of dialectical materialism became matters of false consciousness. The Marxist approach is based on a logical view of economic determinism, but it ignores non-economic and culture movements in the development of history. Orthodox Marxism also ignored the forces of nationalism and of national; polity as the dominant factor in modern politics.

Marxism not only reduces politics to the dependent status of epiphenomenon, but by ignoring religion, language, ethnicity and above all, nationalism, it fails to provide an understanding of political developments, whether in the first, second and third world. Whatever may the shortcomings and limitations of Marxian principles, it is beyond dispute that Marx would be remembered as a critique of 19th century capitalism and politics. He was the first socialist who stressed the importance and increasing role of the proletariat. Marx was the first political thinker to offer a systematic exposition of scientific socialism or communism. He made unique contribution in political analysis.

Post-modern Approach- The latest among the contemporary approaches, postmodernism appeared in the closing decades of the twentieth century. Some scholars call it anti-foundation list research approach. The most significant principles of postmodernism are: No solitary, basic political truth exists there is any single and absolutely certain line of research to gain knowledge and there are no such rules that can guarantee the rationality of knowledge. Many scholars are of the opinion that postmodernism is the offshoot of the drastic changes, rather upheavals, that came about in the Western world in the aftermath of World War II. Some of these changes include the emergence of a global economy, the collapse of the Soviet Union as a counterforce to American imperialist designs, a widespread sense of disappointment and despair because of the failure of rationality to usher in the era of freedom, the rapid spread of technology, emergence and acceptance of popular culture and the bearing these changes register on human behaviour.

The post-modern approach is opted for by many political scientists and other social scientists that are sceptical about the feasibility of modern civilization. They proclaim that the positivist endeavour to discover a comprehensive ‘true’ explanation of a social event is ludicrous and worthless. Instead the postmodern approach suggest that each event should be studied separately without losing sight of the objectives of the actors, the experience of the researchers and the external event such as time and space of the event concerned. They further insist that there cannot be a solitary method that can be called as ‘the best’ to explain a social or political occurrence. In
view of this, the postmodernist scholars recommend that a researcher must unravel the phenomenon concerned before undertaking the research. The researcher should also enclose the event within a broader framework that should take cognizance of the objectives of the actors and should also take note of the kind of circumstances that existed at the time of the event.

An important point of postmodernism is that it does not attach any value to any acknowledged basis of a primary assumption. For instance a post-modernist researcher does not take for granted ‘worth of democracy’, ‘sovereignty of nature’, ‘honesty’ or ‘moral behaviour’ because he holds that they are human constructs and the popular or widely acknowledged interpretations of these concepts are merely one of the various possible connotations. Postmodernists assert that the widespread ideas associated with concepts such as nature or ethical values are not real but human intelligence is responsible for their construction.

Their argument is that in different societies, different people espouse different interpretations of nature and all of them are equally legitimate. Same is true about ethical values. According to Paul Wapner, “Post-modern critics have shown that nature is not simply a given, physical object but a social construction an entity that assumes meaning within various cultural contexts and is fundamentally unknowable outside of human categories of understanding. This criticism raises significant challenges for global environmental politicians.”

In order to come to terms with the implication of the post-modern approach to political science, Ian Hodder recognized four strands of postmodern social science. The first one, in his words is ‘the sense of disillusion’ by which he means that the social scientists as well as common people in general have developed a sense of disappointment towards the output of science and scientific research. Science has failed to help humanity get rid of scourges such as war, poverty, exploitation and inequality. The second element is about the iniquities of ‘modernism’. Instead of fulfilling its promise of ushering in an era of freedom, equality and better quality of life for all, modernism has brought in detachment, alienation and cynicism. Thirdly, because of rapid and unbridled advances in technology and also because of all pervading, rapid socio-political and economic changes, there remains no significant difference between ‘high’ and ‘low’ culture or for that matter between ‘fine art’ and ‘kitsch’. The fourth significant strand of postmodern social science, according to Hodder, is about the manipulative means the interest groups employ to manage international media, fashion and art to project the required images of political events, economic issues or social structures. Within the framework of these four strands, the postmodern research in social sciences is usually carried out.
Pluralistic and Neo-Pluralistic Theories of State

Democracy as a rule believes in pluralism. Pluralism exists not only in the world of abstract ideas and thought but even in the day to day life. People speak different languages, follow different religions, their culture and upbringings are different. All these divergent views on social matters are the manifestation of different social factors. Democracy is duty bound to honour and preserves this Pluralistic structure of the Society.

Basically state is a power structure controlling and regulating the activities of its members. Pluralists view the state as one of the association in the society. We have primary and secondary associations; state is a secondary association with larger share of power than other associations. It is not the result of a contract. It has evolved along with other social groups. It is neither above the society nor outside the society. It is in the society. The need of a powerful organization to control the diverse and often contradictory interest pursued by different associations made the institution of the state a necessary. Some political thinkers call state ‘as a necessary evil’ implying the minimum role this association should performs. Basically it is an impartial observer trying to settle the differences within the society.

Take for example the case of dangers to public health through smokings. There might be “Tobaccos growers” association which demands subsidy for farmers. Similarly many cigarette manufacturing companies encouraging the smoking habits. In the same society there might be a citizen’s active group educating the people against the dangers of smoking and threatening the cigarette companies with legal damages. Democratic polities allow free action for all these associations. State would be asked to play the role of a neutral umpire. It may impose more taxes on manufacturers, insists on statutory warning being printed on packets, and also may provide subsidy and offer export incentives to tobacco growers. The Cancer Research Foundation may also get grants. The capacity of the state is judged by the fact that how best it satisfies different, varied interests and allows the game to continue. It is often said politics is ‘who gets, what and how’. It means providing scope for different associations to play their part, to pull their strength with the state operates and to get things done.

State as super association- In this process some associations may be more powerful and effective than others. The fact is political life is a game played by different associations to achieve their goals and state though, a super association, is only an observer. There is no ethical basis for state. Nor it is the ancient one. There were associations like family, community before state came into existence. State is just one of the associations not the association, nor the sole association of great importance. There were and are many associations which have larger aims and greater scope of operations. This pluralistic view of the state developed around the First World War period. During the war the state demanded everything from its citizens. Even the lives of citizens were asked to protect the state. But Right to life is a ‘natural right’. It is not given by state. In fact, state came into existence to protect it. Even absolutist thinker like Hobbes denied this right to state. After all wars are results of certain policies followed by the policy makers, nobody can vouch for the ‘perfectness’ or ‘purity’ of these policies. Many a time hasty decisions, misreading of events, personality problems of leaders push the nations to war. Why should people be made scapegoats for misdeeds of rulers? The anti-Vietnam War that shook U.S.A. around 60’s is a reflection of pluralist thought viz. state has no monopoly of obedience from its members. It is just one of the associations in the society.

Pluralism is basically an attack on the absolutist theory of state. Austin in his Monistic theory or legal theory of sovereignty provided a legal basis for his absolutism. According to him sovereignty
of the state is absolute, unlimited, inalienable, and indivisible and can be clearly located. Pluralist theory is a direct attack on all these issues. Power or sovereignty can never be absolute. There are many limitations on its exercise and effective use. No state can prohibit the natural forces from operating. There are customs, traditions cultural believes which would act as natural limitations on the exercise of state’s power. The believes were there among the people before the state as an institution of legal power took the shape. The sovereignty of state is certainly limited by these believes. Once again philosophically speaking state can at most control the outward behaviour of the individual. It is powerless to control the internal feelings of an individual. The principle of “Satyagraha” asks the citizens to obey to the “inner voice” not be afraid of state’s brutal power. Satyagraha gives legitimacy to disobey the state if the person is convinced that the action of the state is in contrary with his inner voice. In a way Satyagraha-moral anger or anger based on truth limits the sovereignty of the state.

According to pluralist the sovereignty of the state should be limited. It is divisible and cannot be clearly located. Pluralism is a movement of labour, economic, religious and professional associations and unions for the fulfilment of their demands against state’s supreme power. Sovereignty does not belong to state alone. Each association is sovereign within the area it operates. While the Anarchists want the institution of state to be abolished, the pluralists want the state but with in limited powers. Prof. H.J. Laski argued that with the growth of federalism the idea of absolute sovereignty has become irrelevant. Because constitutionally the powers of union and the state are clearly divided and earmarked, making the assumption of absoluteness of state power is a wrong notion. Under the theory of checks and balances, the power of state is divided into three important wings of the government viz. Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. Each of these wings is sovereign within the area of their operation. So the plurality of power centres exists in a system based on Constitutional democracy. The powers of the state are also limited by the factors like international law, conventions and organizations, human rights activism and NGOs. K.C. Hsiao argues “the pluralist state is simply a state in which there exists no single source of authority, no united system of law, no centralized organ of administration, no generalization of political will: on the contrary it is a multiplicity in essence, it is divisible in parts.”

New-Pluralism- The American pluralists give importance to the “interest group”. The pressure groups which prop up in response to a particular policy is more effective in influencing the policy of the state. Most of the studies in America, concentrate on the role of interested groups and pressure groups. These groups differ slightly from association pattern of British type. The associations have a long history of existence and wide range of interrelated interests and continue to cater to guard the freedom against state encroachment. Whereas the pressure groups are issues oriented, have limited area of operation and narrow interest. They are more concerned to get things done in their way, by applying pressure, than to bother long term consequences. Basically both British and American pluralists distrust state. Alexis de Tocqueville, Democracy in America clearly explains the notions of pluralism in the American society. According to him democracy depends on a plurality of secondary associations outside the state. They prevent democracy which is based on the rule by the majority being converted into a tyrannical rule of the majority.

A prominent pluralist Nelson Woolf Polsby, describes the American Society in 1980 “as a collection of hundreds of small specific interest groups, with in completely overlapping members ship widely differing power bases and a multitude of techniques for exercising influence on decisions salient to them.” American writer Robert A. Dahl used a term “Polyarchy” to describe the American political system. It is a system where plural centres of interest exist. Each of these centres has some influence on policy making, with no single group enjoying monopoly.

There is a difference between plurality of identity and plurality of interests. The plurality of identity refers to factors like religion, language, culture, race by which different ethnic groups are
identified in a society. The members of each ethnic group would like to guard their identity from being encroached by other group. While plurality of interest refers to factors like business, labour, health and such issue oriented groups. It has been argued that the plurality of identity is the character of less developed democratic societies, while plurality of interests indicates the character of more advanced democracy. We should also make a difference between pluralistic character and corporate character of a society. In dictatorship, the authorities may sometime create certain institutions of associations and allot to them specific functions. We had “Guild” systems. But this is not pluralism. Because in pluralistic society the formation of associations is voluntary the membership is not compulsory they function free of state control. Where as in corporate polities the groups are more organized centrally controlled, and a compulsory membership with uniform pattern operates. Here the “associations” are created by government to assist its functioning. Whereas in pluralism associations are formed for people’s interest.

The Cipher Model- In the fifties of the last century the American political scientists who belonged the pluralist school depicted the state as a cipher institution or coding machine or a cash register. All this indicates to the fact that the state only responds to or mirrors the balance of pressure groups in the society. It merely receives the pressures from the interest groups of the society and its decisions are shaped in accordance with the strongest pressures exerted by the interest groups. As if it is the ‘pawn’ at the hands of the pressure groups. The function of the state is merely to mediate between conflicting pressure groups. Like the weather cock which moves in different directions according to the force of the wind the state in the pluralist view, represents constant flux and changes in the balance of ‘dispersed inequalities’. In liberal democratic systems different groups are active in the political arena and are differently successful in each policy area. The structure of state organization mirrors to quote from Dunleavy and O'Leary's, this process of ‘dynamic disequilibrium’. R. Dahl has defined this situation as ‘polyarchy.’ ‘Polyarchy’ means ‘rule by Many.’ A polyarchy operates through institutions which force rulers to take account of the interests and wishes of the electorate. In pluralist parlance the cipher model explains the reality of the post war liberal democratic states. It is thought that the post. Second World War period has given birth to free play of polyarchy pressures. The pluralists think that the cipher state translates citizen’s demands into public programmes,

The Neutral State Model- A good many pluralists do not agree with the view that the state is a cipher which mirrors changing equilibrium in the civil society. On the contrary they propose a neutralist view of the state. Pluralists with functionalist persuasion propound this view. Neutrality on the part of the state may mean three things:

(i) The state may be a passive on looker of events,
(ii) It may play the role of an umpire who just follow the rules or
(iii) It may also take an actively neutral position which ensures substantive fairness.

A. Birch and the pluralists of his ilk maintain that the state does not always represent the dominant pressure groups. It may equally represent the unorganised and can act in the ‘public interest’. This is a must for preserving the stability legitimacy of the government. To be returned to power after a short interval of four or five years politicians they argue, are forced, Willy-nilly to obey public opinion. Electoral coalitions by political parties dictate them to act in the public interest apart from the interests of the organised pressure groups. Thus D. Truman in his book---“The process of
Government (1951)” argues that Roosevelt’s New Deal Policy in the U. S. A. signifies an attempt to mobilise the support of the minorities. The civil service in U. K., it is argued, after weighing the messages received from different pressure groups may actually tilt the balance in favour of the unorganised consumers. Thus the state is viewed as a mediator, blanker and harmoniser of varied interests. Compared to the first model, the neutral state model does not mechanically mirror the interests in society, but on the contrary, adopt a neutral stance, weigh different policy options. (As proposed by the interest groups) and may take policy decisions of its own. It is obvious that this position is quite opposite of the Marxist position which views the state as partisan or ‘the executive committee of bourgeoisie?

The Broker State Model- A broker is an agent or middleman who buys and sells for others. But he is not an innocent person; and he has her/his own interests. According to the broker state model, State officials, agencies and elected officials all have partisan interests of their own. Some pluralists, especially the group theorists, nullify the notion of both the ‘Cipher’ and ‘Neutral State’ view. According to them, policy decisions are the outcome of self interested contests within the state apparatuses as it is of contests outside. The broker is constrained by clients, but is more autonomous man a cipher or mere functionary and more partisan or self seeking than an ‘honest’ broker. It does not mechanically mirror civil society; nor does it serve public interest. The bureaucracy manipulates the conflicting interests of the pressure groups in civil society. It divides and rules and to fulfil its own goals and it exploits crosscutting cleavages. According to Dunleavy and O’Leary’s: “The broker state is not passive, neutral or indeed a ‘black box’. It consists of multiple formal and informal pressure group activities of coalitions and bargains struck, dishonoured and reconstituted and extends in to the interactions which take place amidst the equally multiple activities, coalitions and bargains amongst non-state pressure groups.”

Critics of pluralism and Neo-Pluralist thought- Many critics feel that the pluralist theory of state is unsuitable to the developing nations, where the state is required to play a major role in transforming the socio-economic conditions of its people. Leaving these things to some associations would only worsen the lives of the unorganized sections of the society. C. Wright Mill argued how even in a developed democracy like America all group are not on equal footing. It is like social Darwinism the survival of the fittest. In such a system there would be no social Justice. When issues are not equal, the pluralist theory of state does not hold. Around 1970’s the Western democracies faced sever crises. There were economic discontentment, unemployment, and racial prejudices. What was required was a uniform policy. Excessive use of technology and Centralized planning was the need of the hour. It is obvious the formation of such an institution would ring death bells to pluralistic model. The whole talk off multiple voluntary associations operating outside state control, yet showing some influence on state, would remain meaningless.

There were other thinkers who insist that in the days of Market Economy, the economic policies be left to the market forces. The state has no role to play now. In fact the welfare activities undertaken by the state are an obstacle to the effective operation of market forces. The Market Economy with its own inbuilt mechanism will adjust the pulls and pressures. The state has no role to play. two extremes are Centralized state and another minimum state. In both cases pluralism suffers. The fate of small associations would be at the mercy of technocrats or market forces. It looked as though pluralism has ended. But around this time anew school of thought emerged. This is known as Neo-pluralism. According to neo-pluralists, pluralism is essential in multi cultural, multi
social societies in the market Economy. The role of the state is for more important. While free Economy and marker oriented policies are needed to tide over international Economic crisis, the supervisory role of the state cannot be minimized. The international financial institutions, though operate freely, are ultimately accountable to the state. The welfare of its people is the priority of any state. No state can give up that responsibility to please some outside Economic forces. The existence of smaller associations like the consumer forum, Human Right watch, and Green Peace movement is a reflection of the neo-pluralist trends in modern democracies. They are acting against the encroachment of international, multinational corporations and guarding the rights of consumers, farmers, children and other unorganized sections. While technology is the most important factor to solve modern day’s problems, it should not lead to ‘Technocracy’ or centralized state administration, where citizen’s privacy could be violated. So the media should take up the case of protection of citizen’s right. The constitutional safeguards like PIL (Public Interest Litigation) Right to Information can play a crucial role in strengthening the pluralistic fabric of the society.

Post Colonial State- the questions will be raised primarily with reference to the classical Marxist theories of the state. What Miliband calls the primary Marxist view of the state find its most explicit expression in the famous aphorism of the Communist manifesto: The executive to the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole bourgeoisie Miliband further adds. This is the classical Marxist view on the subject of the state and it is the only one which is to be found in Marxism-Leninism. In regard to Marx himself, however, it only constitutes what may be called a primary view of the state for there is to be found another view of the state in his work. This secondary view is that of the state as independent of all social classes, as being the dominant force in society rather than the instrument of the dominant class. This secondary view of the state Marx’s work arises from his analysis of the Bonaparte’s state, ever independent it may have been politically from any given remains and cannot in a class society but remain, the protector an economically and socially dominant class. In the postcolonial society the problem of the relationship between the state and the underlying economic structure is more complex than the context in which it was posed even in the Bonaparte’s state or in other examples the arose in the context of the development of European society. It is structured by yet another historical experience and requires fresh theoretical insights.

The military and the bureaucracy in postcolonial society cannot be looked upon, in terms of the classical Marxist view, simply as instrument of a single ruling class. The specific natures of structural alignment created by the colonial relationship and realignments that have developed in the postcolonial situation have rendered the relationship between the state and the social classes more complex. the two patterns of historical development are quite deferent in western societies we witness the creation of nation state by indigenous bourgeoisies in the wake of their ascendant power, to provide a framework of law and various institutions that are essential for the development of capitalist production relations. In colonial society the process is significantly different. The bourgeois revolution in the colony in so far as it involves the establishment of a bourgeois state and the attendant legal and intuitional framework is characterised by the imposition of colonial rule by the metropolitan bourgeoisie. In carrying out the task of the bourgeois revolution in the colony, however, the metropolitan bourgeoisie has to accomplish an additional task that was specific to the colonial situation. Its task is not merely to replicate and the superstructure of the state which it has
established in the metropolitan country itself; it must be create a spate apparatus through which it can exercise dominion over all the indigenous social classes in the colony.

The Colonial state is, therefore, equipped with a powerful bureaucratic military apparatus and with governmental mechanisms that enable it, through routine operations to subordinate the native social classes. The postcolonial state, inherits that overdeveloped state apparatus and its institutionalised practices through which the operations of the indigenous social classes are regulated and controlled. At the moment of independence, weak indigenous bourgeoisie find themselves enmeshed in bureaucratic controls by which those at the top of the hierarchy of the bureaucratic military apparatus of the state are able to maintain and even extend their dominant power in society, having been freed from direct metropolitan control. The multi class relationship of the state in the postcolonial societies calls for specific explanations of its implications. In this situation the military bureaucratic oligarchies, the apparatus of the state, also assume a new and relatively autonomous economic role, which is not parallel in the classical bourgeois state, because the state in the postcolonial society directly appropriate a very large part of the economic surplus and it is bureaucratically directed economic activity in the name of promoting economic development.

The state apparatus does not, however, consist only of the bureaucratic military oligarchy. Where democratic form of government operates, politician and political parties also form a port of it. Where political leader occupy the highest office in the state, formally invested with authority over the bureaucracy and the military, the role of the bureaucratic military oligarchy cannot be evaluated without a clear understanding of the precise role of politician and political parties in the state, as well as the extent of their powers and limitations. Politicians and political parties stand at the centre of a complex set relationship. On the one hand they are accepted to articulate the demand of those from whom they seek support; they are supposed to attempt to realise those by their participation in the workings of government. On other hand, they also play a key role in manipulating public issues and thereby diminish potential opposition.

The essential of the state in postcolonial, societies stems from the fact that it is not establishment by an ascendant native bourgeoisie but rather than foreign imperialist, bourgeoisie. At independence, however, the direct command of the latter over the colonial state is ended; yet, by the same token, its influence over the state is by no means brought to an end. The state in the postcolonial society is not the instrument of a single class. It is relatively autonomous and it mediates the competing interest of the three propertied classes the metropolitan bourgeoisie, the indigenous bourgeoisie, and the landed class, while it the same time acting on behalf of all them in order to preserve the social order in which their interests are embedded, namely the institution of private property and the capitalist mode as the dominant mode of production.

There are many variants of the distribution of power between political leadership and bureaucratic-military oligarchies in postcolonial societies. Political parties at the vanguard of the movement for national independence inherit the mantle of legitimacy and the trappings of political power. Never the less in a large number of postcolonial countries there has been in evidence a progressive intuition of their power and, correspondingly an expansion in the power of bureaucratic
military oligarchies, which has often nominated in an overt "seizure" of power by the latter. In general, however, there has been both accommodation and tension between political leadership and bureaucratic military oligarchies. The role Tikal parties does not necessarily mile out the relative autonomy ucratic military oligarchies. The essential issue is that of the relative autonomy of the state apparatus as a whole and its mediatory role as between the competing interests of the three propertied classes, the domestic bourgeoisie, the metropolitan bourgeoisie and the landowning classes.

We have yet to see a clear case of unambiguous control of state power by a political party in a capitalist postcolonial society. The case of India comes closest to that. But even in India the situation is ambiguous. The ruling Congress Party was by no means party of a single class; it participates with the bureaucracy in mediating the demands of competing propertied classes, while at the same time participating with it in using state power to uphold the social order that permits the continued existence of those classes, despite the socialist rhetoric of the Congress Party. Even with regard to foreign capital, the actual performance of the government of India is not very different from the rhetoric of the whether the Congress, the NDA or the UPA politicians.

As against theories emphasizing the domination of state in relation to society, there are approaches in the reverse direction to the state is seen as relatively weaker in relation to society. The social and cultural force of pre-capitalist form is much greater in the political sphere than in the sphere of production. Such an observation should apply equally to the rest of South Asia. Indeed, it is in the political domain that pre-capitalist notions have acquired the greatest salience in the recent decades, particularly in terms of determining national consciousness.

The state should not be thought of as a single entity, because it is essentially an ensemble of institutions consisting of the government, the legislature or legislative bodies and the legal bodies, the bureaucracy and a variety of enforcement agencies and institutions. Thus, in any modern capitalist society, the state is an agent with some initial endowments which it uses as the basis of the market operations. The state is a participant in the market process as it buys and sells, it hires and dismisses, and it lends and borrows. In many capitalist countries, advanced as well as developing, the state has acquired the role of the single largest market agent in terms of its endowments and the volume of its transactions. The state also has market powers and responsibilities which not other agent participating in the market place has or can have.

Secondly, the state also represents power, and this power is derived from its social base, that is, form the variety of interests in society reflecting mostly the initial endowments of those interest groups. Thus, state power is also the reflection of class power, because if a certain class interest tends to dominate society the same class interest will also tend to be dominant politically and be the dominant force behind the state. In capitalist societies, social power is not uniformly spread as its market theory and political theory purport. The effective base for power in such societies is the ownership of resources which are essentially private and the interests of the owners of resources are to accumulate more resources. The market is the means of such accumulation and the state is its principal guarantor. Therefore, the state cannot be studied in isolation of the class structure and class relations as delineated by the economic development of particular society.
In developing capitalist societies, as it is in all other capitalist societies, state structures and the exercise of state power occur within particular class contexts and also under constraints of international capital. The degree to which the state in the Third World can obtain a relative autonomy is also largely, though not entirely determined by the class and world system conditions. However, what specific policies a postcolonial state will adopt and how it will implement these policies cannot be simply derived from the interests of the dominant classes, or from those of foreign capitalist organisations.

The growing role of the state is seen as a profound historical trend at the very centre of the world’s dominant political and economic processes, because beyond its traditional functions of internal and external security, justice and sovereignty, the state has come to make itself felt in all societal spheres, in economic, social, ecological and cultural processes and even private lives of citizens. His postcolonial state was created during the colonial rule, the basic purpose of which was to secure the obedience of an alien people.

In Third World social formations state constitutes a site for struggle among bourgeoisie for the control for the state power wherein the groups contend for control of opportunities produced within the very heart of traditional society by different mechanisms. And the struggle grows so intense that the division of the fruits of power itself becomes a central issue in politics. Moreover, as Alavi has pointed out, the postcolonial state dispenses with the mediation of politics because the state is overloaded and cannot be controlled by the indigenous capitalist class. This allows the other actors of the state like bureaucracy and the military to play a dominant role in the state and above social classes. Again, the state is also seen as an arena by all social classes where class contradictions can be resolved.

In the postcolonial situation, due to its inherent weakness and contradictions, the Indian bourgeoisie had no one to look forward to for their development except the state. The state came to be a repository of all basic tasks of capitalist development such as mobilising recourses, transforming productive relations by establishing conditions for the development of science and technology and by homogenising the multiple groups under the ideology of capitalism. In this way the Indian capitalist class looked towards the state for all major economic decisions and agreed to a situation in which according to Indian political scientist Bhambri, politics started determining economics. The Indian state legitimised its position through democracy, multiparty system, elections and adult franchise.