SOME CONTEMPORARY MODELS OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS

SOME CONTEMPORARY MODELS OF COMPARATIVE POLITICS: CRITIQUE, ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION TO CHANGE

By

KULBUSHAN ROSHANLAL GUPTA, B.Sc. Econ.(Hons.)

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Master of Arts

McMaster University

May, 1970

MASTER OF ARTS (1970)
(Political Science)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario.

TITLE: Some Contemporary Models of Comparative Politics: Critique, Analysis and Application to Change

AUTHOR: Kulbushan Roshanlal Gupta, B.Sc. Econ.(Hons.)
(University of London)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Jerry Silverman

NUMBER OF PAGES: iv, 189

SCOPE AND CONTENTS:

It is the object of this study to investigate how some contemporary models of comparative politics deal with the problem of change over time. In addition, an analysis of the models qua models facilitating comparative political analysis will be provided.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My special thanks must go to my supervisor, Dr. Jerry Silverman, for his stimulating and demanding guidance throughout this study. Without his inspiration this piece of research would not have been possible. I would also like to acknowledge Dr. Robert Cunningham's valuable comments on the methodological aspects of the study and the comments and criticisms of Dr. George Breckenridge.

The author wishes to thank the Interlibrary Loan Service at McMaster University for their invaluable assistance in providing the materials essential for this study.

In addition, I would like to express my gratitude to Messrs. Paul Bailey, Rhys Phillips, David Rubinstein and Christopher Kelk, graduate students at McMaster, for their lively discussions, constant questioning, and kind assistance without which this study would have been far more difficult.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

THE SCOPE AND DEFINITION OF THE PROBLEM

For last year's words belong to last year's language
And next year's words await another voice.
T.S.Eliot,Little Gidding,II.

A. INTRODUCTION.

The study of politics by the comparative method enjoys both the antiquity and respectability of an Aristotelian precedent. However, during the last two decades, the discipline of politics has undergone dramatic developments and has witnessed a surge exceeding the total progress of the previous centuries. This is true in terms of four crucial dimensions: the problems to which it addresses itself, the methodologies it employs,[1] the theoretical and methodological sophistication by which its research work is guided,[2] and the number of analysts involved in it.[3] An abundance of new models,

---

1. Arnold Brecht writes, "It is not saying too much, that ours has become the methodological century in the social sciences." Arnold Brecht, Political Theory, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1959), p.5.

2. Albert Somit and Joseph Tanenhaus found that between 1953 and 1961, for example, there had "been a substantial growth of interest only in political theory." A Profile of a Discipline: American Political Science, (New York: Atherton Press, 1965), p.52, table 6.

Speaking of the contemporary trend in politics, Waldo writes, "the evidence indicated that the majority of political scientists, whether or not they are 'theorists' as a matter of conventional label, regard theory as the 'core' of political science. Dwight Waldo, Political Science in the U.S.A.: A Trend Report, (Paris: U.N.E.S.C.O., 1956), p.32.

3. The change in the number of articles written in selected journals on comparative government may reflect the new emphasis. Waldo shows that between 1925-29, the percentage of such articles was 31%, by 1952, the percentage had increased to 43%. - Ibid., p.38, table1.

conceptual approaches, theoretical frameworks and analytical constructs have been proposed and/or experimented with in an effort to complement some earlier intellectual efforts or to supplant them with allegedly improved and superior proposals.

The intellectual ferment that this reflects is partly a response to the widespread feeling of disappointment and dissatisfaction with the "traditional" approach to comparative government.

This critical mood was aired at a seminar organized by the American Social Science Research Council in 1952 held at Evanston, Illinois.[1] Subsequently, these views were elaborated in a book written by Roy C. Macridis.[2] Thus, the numerous and divergent proposals in the comparative politics field can be viewed as attempts to fill an intellectual vacuum left by the rejection of the "traditional" approach to the study of comparative government. In a sense, the discipline is still groping for a broad measure of aggreement with respect to directions and methods.

In their attempts to deal with politics , many students are increasingly having to deal with the age-old problem of defining their subject matter; i.e. what is politics ? What concepts of the discipline indicate its focus of attention and the direction of its observations ? However, for the study of politics there does exist some measure of agreement among scholars that the study of the executive, judicial and legislat-

---

1. The proceedings were summarized by Roy C. Macridis and Richard Cox (rapporteurs), - "Research in Comparative Politics," American Political Science Review, September 1963, pp.641-55.

2. Roy C. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government, (New York: Random House, 1955).

ive branches of government and their comparisons does not wholly constitute the comparative study of politics. There the agreement ends. Hence, if this traditional triad fails to promote our comprehension of politics, especially when "comprehension" is used in its widest sense, what ought to be our focus instead ? In their attempts to comprehend politics, some analysts study governments with criteria of relevance, intuitively derived, that remain implicitly embedded in their data. Others state their framework of reference in order to (a) make their work coherent and (b) to make it relevant to comparative analyses. Works of such a nature have been presented in the form of conceptual frameworks, mental constructs, analytical schemes, abstract formulations and theoretical approaches. For our purposes these will be called models.

Models will be the focus of this study. Like any other process that initiates an inquiry, this focus is necessarily arbitrary.[1] Further, it is conceded that model-building is neither the sole pre-occupation nor necessarily the most productive occupation of the students of comparative politics. It is only an aspect of comparative politics, though an important one. According to Gunnar Heckscher, a "conceptual framework" is a minimum requirement for facilitating comparison.[2] In pursuing this study as in any other, we are reminded by Gabriel Almond, that, "There are many ways of laboring in the vineyard of the Lord," and we hope that the efforts of this dissertation will be viewed as one of them.[3]

---

1. The arbitrariness does not undermine the value or the scientific nature of such an inquiry. See, Arnold Brecht, op.cit., p.30; Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry, (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1964); F.S.C. Northrop, The Logic of the Sciences and Humanities, (New York: Macmillan and Company, 1947).

2. Gunnar Hecksher, The Study of Comparative Government and Politics, (London: George, Allen and Unwin, 1957), pp.73-4.

3. Gabriel A. Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," Journal of Politics, August 1956, p.391.

In simple terms, this dissertation seeks to investigate how some contemporary models that purport to facilitate comparative political analysis deal with the problem of change. A detailed consideration of the objectives of this study, its boundaries and the manner in which it will be pursued are presented below.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY.

The major objective of this dissertation is to examine how the models that meet our requirements[1] deal with the problem of change. The authors of the models under examination do not all consider the concept of change as a problem. Where it is dealt with, it may be done implicitly or explicitly. The manner in which the problem of change is included by any particular model is a matter for the predilection of the author of such a model. It is an objective of this dissertation to investigate and offer an analysis of how the authors, whose works fulfil our requirements, deal with the problem of change.

Traditionally, the study of change has been a much neglected aspect of the discipline. Macridis, indicting the traditional approach writes, "the traditional approach has ignored the dynamic factors that account for change."[2] This is not surprising, for the questions political scientists adressed themselves to did not involve the understanding of change over time. Instead, they adressed themselves to questions which needed answers in terms of the political anatomy of systems. To quote Macridis again, " It [i.e. the traditional approach] has concentrated on what we have called political anatomy."[3]

---

1. The criteria used in the selection of specific models for analysis in this study are discussed below. See pp. 6-10.

2. Roy C. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government, p.11. (emphasis provided.)

3. Ibid., p.11.

The study of change, insofar as it was dealt with at all, was mostly of a cross-sectional type: dealing with the collectivities or aggregates under analysis at one point in time or over a relatively short period of time. The justification for this ahistorical approach was often that the discovery of factual rather than causal relations were the objective of the inquiry.

By contrast, the study of change through time is a major pre-occupation of large numbers of contemporary scholars within the field. Indeed, the astronomical growth of contemporary studies under the genus of "development" and "modernization" may be seen as evidence of this concern. However, it should be noted that the contemporary concern with change is distinct from the cross-sectional study of change: The former seeks to study change through time in terms of cause and effect, whereas the latter seeks to understand change in terms of factual descriptions. The study of change over time in terms of cause and effect in turn attempts to answer some of the questions contemporary research has adressed itself to; i.e., the description of the direction, rate, degree and characteristics of political change.

Answers to the above questions with respect to change over time can only be satisfactorily obtained through longitudinal studies[1] in terms of cause and effect. In suggesting that only longitudinal analysis in terms of cause and effect can satisfactorily solve our questions with respect to change over time, we do not deny the possibility of examining or comparing the behavior of cross-sections of political systems through time and venturing inferences about change from such

---

1. Longitudinal research on political behavior can use the individual, the group, the political system, or one or more of its components as the unit of analysis and seek to understand change through time in terms of cause and effect.

examinations or comparisons. However, this method is clearly less satisfactory. Changes may be in opposite directions, but compensatory. The result then would make for marginal results only, indicating little or no change. Furthermore, if the time span between the examined cross-sections is short, it is likely to reflect a sequence of possibly "unique" events and thus offer spurious inferences about causation. Hence, when examining the models, we will seek an understanding of how they deal with the problem of change in terms of causes and effects.

In the course of pursuing the above objective, we shall also examine the specific purposes for which the models that meet our criteria were erected[1], their orientations and their methodologies.[2]

C. METHODOLOGY.

For the pursuit of our objectives it is necessary that (i) criteria of relevance for this dissertation be established, and (ii) the manner in which the study will be pursued be identified. The first are essential in setting the limits or

---

1. In general terms, formally stated models are introduced because there is a presumed need for them, at least among the scholars proposing them. This need stems basically from the concern felt by them for better and rigorous scholarship in comparative politics. This may be facilitated by explicitly stating the rationale as well as the purpose of the criteria of relevance. By so doing, some clarity of thought is likely to be introduced insofar as extraneous and irrelevant variables and criteria are eliminated. In short, the stress on logical consistency in the organization, collection and explanation of data are likely to avoid lacunae that may otherwise be overlooked. If the general purposes of a model are the latter, the specific purposes help focus the area of study more sharply.

2. Model-building is not an end in itself, though it may at times seem so. Kaplan writes, "The model itself...becomes the object of interest as means so often usurp the importance of the ends they are meant to serve. The failing I am speaking of is the tendency to engage in model-building for its own sake." -op.cit., p.280. See also Ann Ruth Willner, "The Underdeveloped Study of Political Development," World Politics, April 1964, p.479; Leonard Binder, Iran: Political Development in a Changing Society, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962), esp. p.7.

parameters of the study while the second indicates the approach being adopted here for the study of the problem. In specifying the criteria of relevance, attention has been given to the attainment of the most comprehensive level of generality obtainable within the context of model-building activity and the concentration on the more recent literature in the field.

As models are the focus of this dissertation, they will be briefly discussed here. According to Karl Deutsch," A model is ... a structure of symbols and operating rules which is supposed to match a set of relevant points in an existing structure or process."[1] In conjunction with this definition, we are informed that,"We are using models, willingly or not, whenever we are trying to think systematically about anything at all."[2] Clearly, if systematic thought is so related to model-building, very little scholarship would be left outside of its province and the self-conscious attempts at model-building that are the focus of this study would be indistinguishable from the rest of the large body of scholarship.

Thus, we have decided to adopt Dwight Waldo's definition of a model. He states that a model is

> "simply the conscious attempt to develop and refine concepts, or clusters of related concepts, useful in classifying data, describing reality and (or) hypothesizing about it." 3.

Although we have adopted Waldo's definition, it merits some additional comment. The definition it will be noted, is so inclusive as to leave little theoretical thinking outside of its purview. Further, the definition does not

---

1. Karl Deutsch,"On Communication Models in the Social Sciences," Public Opinion Quaterly, 1952, No.3, p.357.

2. Ibid., p.356.

3. Dwight Waldo, Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Problems and Promise, (Chicago, Illinois: American Society for Public Administration, 1964), p.15.

attempt to differentiate the models with reference to their scope.[1]

Models may be distinguished according to their level of generality. Establishing correlations among a small number of variables within the polity is generally thought of as narrow-gauge theory. A model which concentrates on one or more aspects of a polity may be conceived of as middle-range theory.[2] As indicated earlier the focus of this dissertation is upon models that seek to facilitate comparison at the highest level of generality; i.e. concentrating on the polity as a whole or its interaction with other polities.

However, even when operating at such a level of generality, a model may fall short of certain other desirable characteristics. Furthering the ends of political analysis of a single polity, it may be argued, is a minimum concern for a model in any branch of political science. However, if it does not facilitate comparisons between polities, its relevance to comparative politics must be called in question. Hence, the models considered in this study are limited to those that consciously provide a framework for the study of a polity in terms of inter-polity comparisons.

---

1. As a matter of intellectual interest, some other views about models may be noted. Some scholars have considered "model" and "theory" as interchangeable terms. For example, H. Simon and A. Newell state, "In contemporary usage the term 'model' is, I think, simply a synonym for 'theory'" in "Models: Their Uses and Limitatings," Leonard D. White, ed., The State of the Social Sciences, (Chicago, Illinois: Chicago University Press, 1956), p.66. May Brodbeck has very forcefully argued that such a usage is unnecessary, and that it stems from the confusion resulting from falsely perceiving characteristics of the two terms. Refer to "Models, Meanings, and Theories," in Llewellyn Gross, ed., Symposium on Sociological Theory, (Evanston, Illinois: Row, Patterson and Company, 1959). Reprinted in The Logic of Political Inquiry, (McMaster University.). Arnold Brecht agrees with May Brodbeck and feels that Simon and Newell "go too far" in holding their above mentioned view. See Arnold Brecht, Political Inquiry, p.524.

2. See above, p.7.

As has been indicated earlier, the period after the Second World War experienced a renewed interest in comparative politics and at the same time it marked the beginning of a new orientation and methodology. Earlier approaches and theories were criticized for their failure to answer the questions that were beginning to be raised, in an attempt to obtain a broader understanding of political phenomena in different polities. To be more specific, such changes can be said to have begun with the holding of the Evanston Seminar in 1952, and this date will be used here as the beginning of the time dimension for the purposes of investigating contemporary models. The other end of our time dimension will be the end of 1968. Whilst the rationale for employing such a time dimension is open to question, as is any other time dimension, it has been adopted here for the purposes of brevity and for keeping the scope of this dissertation within manageable and meaningful limits.

Guided by the above consideration - to keep the scope of this dissertation within manageable and meaningful limits, we have introduced another limitation: only the works of American authors will be considered. In so doing, it is not presumed that the contributions of non-Americans are insignificant or not worthy of our attention. However, the decision to consider only American authors is to an extent meaningful, given that over 90% of the practicing political scientists in the world are working in American universities, and that the United States is in effect, for various reasons, predominant within the field.[1] Our familiarity with their works was an additional factor.

---

1. An American correspondent of the London Times explains this by referring to the "general American approach to most difficult situations," i.e. they feel basically that the application of larger resources, superior techniques and unrelenting effort will wear any problem down in the end. Refer to The Times,(London,26th August 1966).

The criteria posited above are necessarily arbitrary, as is the subject matter of the study. As such, no special virtue inhere within them. However, as a group, they afford a meaningful and manageable scope for this study. No claim can be made that the models chosen for this study are representative, better, nor more deserving than any other group.

Briefly re-iterated, the models that are examined fulfil the following criteria:

(a) They possess the characteristics postulated by Waldo.
(b) They explicitly propose a method for facilitating inter-polity comparisons.
(c) They explicitly propose a framework for the study of a polity at the highest level of generalization.
(d) They have been published between 1952 and 1968.
(e) They have been authored by an American.

As the nature of the problem and its scope has already been outlined, chapters 2 - 8 will deal with the seven models that meet our postulated criteria. Each model will be examined in an individual chapter. In chapter 9, an evaluation of the models with reference to each other will be presented and it will conclude with some general remarks.

Prior to commencing our examination of the individual models in detail, it will be appropriate to spell out the manner in which the chapters have been organized and the format of each chapter.

With one exception, the models that satisfy the postulated criteria are presented in a chronological order with respect to their dates of publication. The exception arises from our decision to consider the models which have been authored or co-authored by Gabriel A. Almond as a group, presenting them in individual chapter forms, but on the basis of their chronological dates of publication. This would allow the significant contributions of this author to reveal themselves in a systematic and cogent manner.

The above criteria for the presentation of the models was chosen because it would help unfold any apparent theo-

retical and methodological pattern that the models may possess. The criteria of grouping models on the basis of shared attributes presented too many intellectual problems with respect to the selection of attributes. However, any advantages that the latter criteria may offer will reveal themselves in the conclusion of this dissertation, where an over-view of all the models will be presented.

Each model will be presented in two major parts. First, an examination and description of the model qua model for comparative purposes and second, an examination of the model with respect to change. Each major part will in turn be sub-divided in the following manner. The first part will consist of 3 sub-parts: (a) an outline of the model, its concepts and interrelationships, (b) an examination of any methodology proposed, and (c) a critical analysis of the model in terms of its characteristics. The second part will be sub-divided in 2 sub-parts: (a) an outline of how the model deals with the problem of change, and (b) the strengths and weaknesses of the model with respect to its consideration of the problem of change.

We can now turn our attention to an examination of the models that meet our criteria.

CHAPTER II

ROY C. MACRIDIS:

THE STUDY OF COMPARATIVE GOVERNMENT*

One of the earliest models proposed was authored by Roy C. Macridis. Following his participation in the 1952 summer seminar organized by the American Social Science Research Council[1], he published an elaborate indictment of the "traditional approach" to comparative government. He also proposed a model that would overcome the shortcomings of the above approach and at the same time permit comparative analysis, theory-building, the cumulative process of data collection and the interpretation of such data.[2] This was to be accomplished by approaching the study of comparative politics through proposed analytical categories that were universal in scope and related in substance.

The categories of his model are built on two underlying assumptions:

> First, they stem from the theoretical assumption that the essence of politics is to be found in the deliberative or decision-making processes through which power aspirations and conflict - perhaps the most ubiquitous raw material of politics - are reconciled. Second, they suggest the general phenomenon to be found in almost every society and that is channeled through concrete institutions.-3.

Within this context, Macridis proposed 4 analytical categories for his model; i.e. decision-making, power, ideology, and institutions. Under these 4 categories can

---

* - Roy C. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government ...

1. For a summary of its proceedings, see Macridis and Cox, op.cit.
2. The model is outlined in Roy C. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government.
3. Ibid., p.35.

be subsumed the various social and political forces that constitute the political process.[1]

In the political context, decision-making by certain persons or organizations is defined in terms of the legitimate use of force. The expectation is that the decisions would be obeyed.[2] In comparing political systems, the individuals and organizations that make the decisions may be used as a variable. In so doing, not only is it necessary to identify the political elites, it is also necessary to identify those groups, if any, who influence and/or manipulate the elites. The composition of the elites can be explored by inquiring into factors such as their ideological, social, economic or religious bases, and the styles and symbols of their communication. When the formal wielders of power do not possess the real power, then those who do are to be studied together with their modus operandi and the reasons for their refusal to be formally recognized. Further, the reasons for such discrepency are to be sought together with their significance for the dynamics of the system; change, adjustment and the achievement of goals. Finally, comparisons should involve identifying the patterns of recruitment to decision-making roles. The degree to which ascriptive/achievement criteria are operational would be relevant here.

For analytical purposes, decisions can be viewed as being of three different kinds and as such they may be compared by distinguishing them from each other. The types of decisions are:

(a) fundamental decisions that affect the positionsof the decision-makers themselves as well as the whole pattern of decision-making in a given system;(b) legislative enactments which affect the status and rights of many persons in a community and ... establish new techniques and procedures for the making of decisions in a community;(c) administrative or judicial decisions which correspond to techniques through which decisions of the above type are made applicable to specific cases. 3.

---

1. Ibid.,p.24. 2. Ibid.,p.23 3. Ibid.,p.40.

Related to the comparison of the contents of decisions is the deliberative process, or how decisions are made. This can be seen as a twofold step;the formulation of the problem (who articulates it and on whose behalf ?) and the clarification of the problem (who deliberates upon the formulated problem and with what effect ?). Problems emanate from diverse sources and their articulation can either challenge or reinforce the legitimacy of the decision-makers. Either they broaden the base of participation and articulation or alienation and those factors resulting therefrom may follow.

In employing decision-making as a category,[1] it is important to note that Macridis emphasizes the actual political structures and procedures involved in decision-making rather than the limited focus on formally constituted agencies or personnel.

Macridis defines political power as "that segment of social power which is exercized by recognized and accepted organs to achieve certain commonly shared objectives and purposes of the society."[2] But since other power-motivated groups attempt to influence political authority within a polity, they too should be subjected to comparative study with respect to their modus operandi; i.e. their organizational structures, ideologies and performance.

For comparative purposes, 2 broad theories that relate social groups to decision-making may be employed. The first, Group theory, suggests that society is organized in numerous small organized groups, which interact with each other at the decision-making level. Within political

---

1. Herbert Simon has also shown the theoretical and empirical potency of "decision-making" as an analytical unit. See his Research Frontiers in Public Administration, Washington, D.C., 1955.

2. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government, p.45.

systems we can investigate the nature of these groups, their activities, methods, ideology, structure, membership, leadership, resources, and their relation to political parties and/or quasi-judicial, quasi-governmental organizations. The second, referred to as Class theory is proposed only as a "variant of the group theory."[1] This theory argues that groups coalesce in a broad center-based class. This phenomena, it is alleged, is more prevalent in societies not possessing the attributes of a democratic system. Classes polarize in societies lacking institutionalized forms of peaceful change, with one class advocating "change" and the others reacting to it. Generally, the seekers of change are also the "have-nots," whilst the power wielders who are the "haves" are for preserving the status-quo. Although the class concept is important, it is obviously limited to those countries where conflict is viewed in such a perspective; i.e. societies undergoing rapid "change."

Political ideology is defined as "the patterns of thought and belief related to the state and the government that constitute at one and the same time a source of obedience and consent and a mechanism of control." The role of political ideology is "to legitimize the organized force of the state."[2]

For comparative purposes , four aspects of ideology are salient: (a) identification of the sources of the ideology prevalent in a given society, its orientations and effectiveness; (b) identification of the conditions that facilitate or hinder the diffusion of "alien" ideologies in a given society; (c) identification of the formal and informal institutions or groups that propogate and maintain an

1. Macridis, ibid., p.47. With respect to the concept of Group, it is interesting to note its elevation to a new level of refinement and sophistication making it eminently more usable for theoretical purposes. Refer to David Truman, The Governmental Process, (New York: A. Knopf & Co., 1951).

2. Macridis, op.cit., p.50.

ideology and those who seek to challenge it; and (d) identification of the relationships between ideology and the organization of political authority in a given society.

Given that political ideology determines a number of characteristics of a political system, it is possible to develop a typology of ideologies following Karl Lowenstein's suggestions.[1] From such a typology, variables associated under one group may be compared with the same group elsewhere. Also, the integrative and control functions of an ideology in different political systems may be subjected to comparative analysis.

Political institutions are seen as "social instrumentalities for the attainment of certain kinds of community goals."[2] Further, the relationship between the political institutions and its functions constitute the political process.

Borrowing from Max Weber, systems can be compared on the basis of the organization of political authority.[3] Alternatively, institutions can be compared with reference to functions, or we can compare specific institutions as part of a process: example, legislative, administrative or judicial. In short, structures may be compared with respect to their functions, or functions may be compared independently of the structures.

For comparative purposes, we can also employ over time the classificatory criteria proposed by political scientists.[4] Such criteria are related to (a) The organization of political authority; (b) The relationship between established political authority and the individual; and

---

1. Karl Lowenstein, "Political Systems, Ideologies, and Institutions: The Problem of Their Circulation," Western Political Quaterly, December 1953, p.695.

2. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government, p.56.

3. Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), p.324-392.

4. Many of these criteria have "stood the test of time," Macridis, op.cit., p.57.

(c) the position of the individual. With respect to decision-making, we can employ Weber's three types of authority. Using his classification again we can study the enforcement of decisions in different political systems. The performance of a system can be compared by employing indices that measure the degree of compliance with respect to decision-making. The enforcement of decisions is in turn dependent on factors such as the sources of leadership and its orientation: persuasion or coercion. Against such matrixes, political systems can be studied comparatively.

Relationship between established political authority and the Individual can be studied comparatively by identifying the patterns of recruitment to political leadership (example by ascription or achievement): this can be done by focusing on such factors as cleavages within race, class, linguistic and/or cultural patterns of recruitment that promote either the apathy or zeal of individuals towards established political authority; the degree of citizen participation in the decision-making processes and through the factors that promote or inhibit such participation. The latter can be discerned by focusing on the right to form associations, to stand for elective offices, voting, and access to information. Configurations of specific variables can be typologized and against such configurations, comparison is possible. With reference to the position of the individual, every society has goal values, many of which are of an intangible nature such as liberty, equality, justice, the good life, and so forth. It is possible to study the degree of achievement or non-achievement of such goals in various systems through the employment of specially prepared indices. This is, of course, a difficult task, though not impossible. Macridis suggests the development of a continuum with the democratic and authoritarian systems as the polar ends. He then attributes to each numerous variables,

ranging from educational opportunity to legal entitlements that are rightly enforced, and suggests that against such typologies systems can be studied comparatively.

It is clear that, within the context of his 1955 publication, he has not employed his model empirically, nor has he offered any systematic approach for empirical purposes. The question whether it is susceptible to empirical work remains unanswered.

Macridis's contribution is due to his articulation of the criticism of the "traditional" approach to comparative politics on a comprehensive scale. He characterized it rightly as being essentially parochial in its vision, descriptive rather than comparative in content, and as being insensitive to change. Yet, it is ironical that one of his proposed categories involves the descriptive study of "political institutions," especially since the traditional approach was partly indicted because it accorded an undue emphasis upon the institutional aspects of the polity. He writes:

> The student may proceed to describe an institution without a detailed analysis of its function. From this point of view, meticulous description of an institutional structure is extremely important. 1.

Certainly then, his work was not a clean break with the past. The change was one of emphasis. He proposed that the study of politics ought not to be limited to a concern with formal institutions. He did not suggest that a study of political phenomena ought to exclude the study of formal institutions. It was recognized that a detailed study of formal structures could contribute towards an an appreciation of their functions and their role within the larger systemic context. As such, the model lent itself to a functionalist orientation and thus reflected the new mood.

---

1. Macridis, ibid., p. 56-7.

Macridis claims that his model is "comprehensive and universal in scope." The proposed categories are said to be broad enough to help us study any political system.[1] That his categories facilitate comparative political analysis is undeniable, yet one cannot but conclude that they do not form an integrated whole. Thus the relationships between categories and within the components of each category are not explored and any cogency that they seem to possess is tenuous. It would have been preferable to isolate key variables and explore the logical relationships between the categories and thus afford an understanding of the dynamics of the political process. Instead, numerable focii for study purposes have been suggested with respect to facilitating political and comparative analysis of systems, and often the relationships between a variable and other aspects of a system remain blurred. Further, the model lacks a central focus to which the other concepts could be related and systematically studied.

That the model has not been employed for empirical purposes is not surprising. Indeed, the possibility of doing so are remote, given that (a) it is difficult to discern within the model a testable focus that would lend itself to empirical purposes and at the same time facilitate the understanding of the political process in a comparative manner; (b) no methodology is proposed; and (c) the effort involved in developing an operational methodology and then testing the numerable and unconnected hypothetical relationships proposed, would, in our opinion, far exceed the potential benefits of such an exercise. There is, after all, no point in employing a model merely because it exists.[2]

---

1. Macridis, ibid., p.36.

2. Macridis did not apply the model explicitly in his own subsequent work. Example, Roy C. Macridis, "France," in Macridis and Robert E. Ward, (eds.), Modern Political Systems: Europe, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1963), pp. 137-262.

A further problem arises from the fact that the terminology employed by Macridis leaves wide gaps in his model. For example, he talks in terms of "system" and "political system" though he does not define them. In addition, he does not elaborate the implications which follow from subscribing to a functional mode of analysis.

For the purposes of this study, the objective is to examine how the model deals with the problem of change in political systems. Though the model does not address itself to the problem explicitly, the problem of change has been recognized. Indeed, the categories that comprise the model have been offered as capable of dealing with the problem.[1] Hence, we shall pursue our above-mentioned objective by examining the four analytical categories that constitute the model in terms of two specific questions:
(a) What factors cause changes in the political system, and
(b) What effects do such changes have upon the political system ?

Before examining the categories it may be noted that they have already been elaborated in our outline of the model above, and no additional purpose would be served by their repetition here. Further, it was noted that the analytical categories are mutually interdependent and that under their collective aegis can be subsumed the interrealtionships of the social and political forces that constitute the political process. This has been defined as "the translation of conflict among interest groups into authoritative decisions."[2] Thus viewed, the power configuration and the ideology of a society then constitute the forces that shape the particular

---

1. Referring to his 4 categories, Macridis writes, "In addition to the opportunity they offer for the study of problems and the comparative analysis of variables, the categories suggested help us ... get an analytical picture of the differences between systems and of the way in which these differences affect profoundly such problems as political consensus, stability, and change." - Macridis, The Comparative Study of Government, p.36.

2. Ibid., p.24.

conditions under which deliberation and decision-making take place, and political institutions are organized.

Given the interrelatedness of the 4 categories, it follows that changes within any one or more of them will lead to changes in the political system as a whole.[1] To refine this further, each analytical category in turn has multiple foci for the purposes of study. Changes in any one focus of the category has implications for changes in the category itself. Hence, in pursuing our objective we shall examine each of the four categories and see how changes to them may occur.

Given that political decision-makers represent a power configuration in society and that they exhibit certain ideological orientations, it follows that a different criterion of selecting decision-makers will lead to the recruitment of a different set of decision-makers. These represent a new power configuration within society and will exhibit different ideological traits. In an attempt to institutionalize the ideology upon which their power rests, institutions may be changed and/or new ones added. Further, the new set of decision-makers may possess different styles of decision-making. In addition, one must consider the deliberative process that takes place prior to the making of decisions. This consists of two analytical parts: i.e. the formulation of the problem and the clarification of the problem. The manner and style in which it is clarified[2] and articulated[3] are partly determinants of the contents of the decision that will be made. This in turn helps

---

1. This follows from the statement that "the operation of a system" can be studied in terms of the 4 categories. -ibid.,p.35.

2. Clarification involves setting the problem in its perspective, vis-a-vis the other articulated problems. The manner and styles of their performance are the same as those of below.

3. The articulation of a problem can be done by individuals, political parties, interest groups, media of communication, bureaucrats and so forth. The styles can be open discussion, secret sessions, violent meetings, demonstrations, marches, and so forth.

determine the other problems that may be presented for decision-making, their contents, and the styles of future decision-making.

The changes in the composition of decision-makers, the criteria of their recruitment, the styles and modes of problem formulation and clarification, and so forth, ultimately affect the whole pattern of activity entitled decision-making. Changes in decision-making as an activity in turn affect the other 3 categories and thus cause changes in the political system.

In examining, the concept of power in terms of changes in the political system, it may be noted that power is defined in terms of authority.[1] Insofar as political power is deemed to be held by those in authority, then changes in authority relationships can come about by the recruitment to, infighting within, and retirement from, positions of authority. In addition, attempts by those not in positions of authority to supplant those that are in such postions, or attempts by those in positions of authority to maintain themselves in such positions, provide an additional dynamic aspect to political life.

At another level of analysis we may note that there are two concepts of authority: de jure and de facto. It should be noted that de jure authority is not always synonymous with de facto authority. In any event, changesin de facto authority whether synonymous with de jure authority relations or not, can cause changes in political power. relationships.

Every political system has an ideology[2] that refers

---

1. "political power must be defined not in terms of influence or domination of control but interms of authority." - ibid., p45.

2. for example De Tocquville writes, "In order that society should exist ... it is necessary that the minds of all citizens should be rallied and held together by certain predominant ideas." - Democracy in America, (New York: Alfred Knopf Inc., 1945), Vol.II, p. 12.

to the whole complex of motivations and perception of behavior that characterizes the polity. In other words, by political ideology is understood the patterns of thought and belief related to the state and government that constitute at one and the same time a source of obedience and a mechanism of control.

The dominant ideology in a society represents the myths and values that make it possible for the political leadership to govern a given society. The myths and values of a society may have to be changed if sociological factors change (example, education, personal income, industrialization, discovery of new economic resources, and so forth), for with changed sociological factors a leadership may be unable to maintain its leadership. When changed conditions are not accomodated by the dominant ideology, or at least not to the extent that new power configurations necessitate, then competing ideologies may exist simultaneously. Under such circumstances, the possibility of an ideology accomodating at least some changes is enhanced.

Changes in the structure and organization of political institutions can also contribute to changes in an ideology. This follows from the fact that political institutions are the instruments that help to crystallize an ideology within a system. A change in leadership can also cause changes in an ideology, given that a leadership exhibits certain ideological traits.

The above are some of the possible ways in which an ideology can change, but changes in an ideology in turn lead to changes in the political system,[1] especially given that the ideologies are interdependent by nature.

Given that political institutions are "social instrumentalities for the attainment of certain kinds of commun-

---

1. "In a broad sense, political ideology determines a number of the characteristics of a political system, . . ." -Macridis, op.cit., p.54. 2. ibid., p.56.

ity goals,"[1] it follows that a change or changes in the goals of the community would necessitate some change in those political institutions that are instrumental in the attainment of the said goals. But changes in the community goals we have noted earlier can be caused by changes in any one or more of the following: the decision-making procedures, the personnel involved in it, the ideological traits of the decision-makers, the ability of the dominant ideology to accomodate new interests and power relationships, and so forth.

From the above, we note that changes in community goals can cause changes in the political institutions. But since political institutions constitute an integral part of the political system, any changes in the political institutions must lead to changes in other aspects of the political system. If the parts change, the whole must change. Thus, any changes in community goals and/or in political institutions must lead to changes in the political system itself.

However, no explicit classification has been provided for facilitating our understanding of changes resulting from changes in political institutions. Instead, Macridis has suggested three classifications that can promote our understanding of political systems. These relate to (a) the organization of political authority in a political system; (b) the relation between established political authority and the members of the community; and (c) the position of the individual in a political system.[2]

Thus far we have examined how changes in Macridis' four analytical categories can occur, and we have noted how such changes can lead to changes in political systems.

---

1. Ibid., p.56.
2. Ibid., p.57.

However, the model does not offer us any facility with respect to answering our second question; i.e. what effects do such changes have upon the political system ? To do so, it is essential that we have a typology that takes into consideration all the 4 analytical categories and provides us with system-types based on different configurations of the categories. Further, for empirical purposes it would be necessary that the system-types be clearly differentiated so that any changes along the typology may be easily identified. Since we are dealing with changes in political systems, it would also be necessary to have some discussion or a category capable of subsuming the total disintegration of a political system. Rare as this eventuality may be, the possibility remains.[1]

Within Macridis' four analytical categories we have found it possible to identify the factors that can cause changes to political systems. However, such changes could be studied only along one dimension, viz, Systemic Change. In other words, the model, insofar as it facilitates analysis of political systems with respect to the problem of change, only furthers our understanding of the factors that cause political systems qua systems to change. To the question, what are the forms that a given political system can change into, no answer has been provided. But given that Macridis did not propose an explicit scheme for facilitating the longitudinal analysis of political systems with respect to change, the absence of a typology facilitating analysis of System Change (as a system changes from form to another along a typology) is not a shortcoming of the model.

---

1 David Easton gives examples of systems that have failed to persist . These include Scotland, the Baltic States, and so forth. See David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965), pp.82-83.

In using the designation "political system" as the generalized concept for his model, Macridis has failed to spell out the implications from subscribing to a functional-systems analysis. As he does not recognize, at least explicitly, the possibility of a political system disintegrating, it seems that he is assuming an "equilibrium" for his model. To be more precise, he is assuming what seems to be a "dynamic equilibrium" for his system. This permits the system to persist over time. If our assumption is correct, then the "equilibrium analysis"[1] of a system, derived from biological and mechanical analogies has been erroneously imputed to political systems. However, in justice to Macridis, two mitigating pleas must be entered. Firstly, he was not attempting to deal with the effects of political system component changes upon the political system itself. If he were, perhaps, he might have recognized the possibility of system disintegration. Clearly, we do not know. Secondly and lastly, the functionalist-system approach was yet a novelty at the time of the publication of the model, and even Easton, to whom credit is due for introducing this form of analysis in political science, did not fully spell out the implications of functional-systems analysis until 1965.[2]

Macridis' interest in the problem of change was specifically geared to explaining changes in political systems at the comparative level. Such explanations were to be obtained through the testing of hypotheses concerning changes between systems. For example, given two systems

---

1. To use Easton's terminology, "equilibrium" may be viewed as the belief that "political systems through their own responding actions are capable of persisting in a world of rapid change." The persistence of systems over time is analytically distinct from the maintenance of a given form over time. David Easton, ibid., p.78.

2. Refer to David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life, (New York: J.Wiley, 1965).

that are similar in structure, say A and B, and system A changes in some respect, then an explanation of this change may be obtained by hypothesising in terms of the 4 categories and then empirically testing systems for the conditioning factors that led to the change. Ultimately, some theory explaining changes could emerge, either at the middle-range level or broad-gauge level.

In conclusion, Macridis' categories , in so far as they sought to provide for a dynamic analysis of political systems, was an improvement on earlier models. Whatever the shortcomings of the model from our perspective, it can nonetheless be useful for the study of change over time because it offers some explanation of the relationships between events within the political system in terms of their development and their operation. Thus, the chief merit of Macridis' work lies in its cognizance of the problems raised by students of comparative politics. He did not set out to provide a panacea for all the shortcomings . Rather, he sought to provide a fresh approach and he must be judged accordingly.

CHAPTER III

DAVID E. APTER

A COMPARATIVE METHOD FOR THE STUDY OF POLITICS*

Following his research on political development in Africa[1] and his participation on the West African Comparative Analysis Project[2], Apter has developed an intricate model that affords a comparative study of politics. However, in proposing the model he is ambiguous to the point of contradiction about the purposes for which it was specifically created. This may be noted by examining the alleged purposes for which the model was proposed. At one stage he writes, "its purpose is to create a framework for the treatment of governments in diverse social settings in order to make possible some generalization about how the presence, absence or clustering of certain combinations of variables affect politics. Implicit in this scheme is a model of politics."[3] A little further on he writes, "The scheme laid out here attempts to delineate sets of useful variables in each of the three main dimensions -social stratification, political groups, and government - in order to produce a manipulative theory out of comparative research."[4] Yet another end is then suggested;

---

* David E. Apter, "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," American Journal of Sociology, November 1958, pp.221-237.

1. David E. Apter, The Gold Coast in Transition, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1955).

2. Held under the auspices of The Carnegie Corporation.

3. David E. Apter, "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," p.221, op.cit.

4. Ibid., p.222.

"The problem for which this scheme was undertaken deals with the development of parliamentary government in Africa."[1] The compatability of the latter objective with the production of a theory that can deal comparatively with governments in diverse social settings is questionable. A theory that deals with parliamentary government only cannot deal with other types of governments. Hence, either Apter is trying to develop a theory for the treatment of parliamentary governments in Africa or he is trying to develop a theory that can deal with all types of governments. Whereas the latter can deal with the former, the reverse is untrue.

In seeking clusters of variables within his three major dimensions - social stratification, political groups and government - Apter recognizes the significant contributions of earlier functionalists and follows in their tradition. This is done by proposing an analysis of politics based on a set of general analytical categories which he calls "structural requisites." Further, such "requisites" are held to be the essential requirements for the existence of the performance of given structures.[2]

The model is based upon two assumptions: (a) that within the social stratification system of each society the dominant motive of social behavior is the striving towards the upper echelons of the stratification hierarchy, and(b) that comparative study will provide typical clusterings of variables with respect to the three proposed dimensions.

Social stratification is connected with governmental activity, societal values and norms, and cultural norms and patterns. Attempts to retain or change any of

---

2. For example refer to,D.F.Aberle,A.K.Davis, Marion J. Levy Jr., and F. X. Sutton, "The Functional Prerequisites of a Society," ETHICS, January 1950.

1.David E. Apter, "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," op.cit.,p.222.

the above implies a wish to modify or protect the given pattern of social stratification in a given society. By the same token, alterations in the pattern of stratification implies or leads to changes in government, social norms and values and cultural patterns - or any one of them.

The degree of differentiation in social stratification and patterns of social norms and values within a society are a function of the degree of Durkheimian division of labor[1] within the same society.

A rapidly changing system of stratification is one whose members are characterized by status-consciousness, role-testing, and future-orientations.[2]

The consequences of changing[3] stratification, in turn, are dependent upon the definition of roles and their hierarchical ranking within a given system, the institutionalized criteria of stratification, and the recruitment patterns of the major groups within the system. This is linked with Parsonian pattern-variables such as ascription/achievement.

It is important to understand the connection of "social stratification" to "government." The "connecting link" between the two is to be found in the political party, association, group or movement. However, due to "lack of space," Apter limits his discussion to political groups only. But since political groups are also related to Apter's dimension of "government," the latter will be elaborated first.

Apter defines government as "the most generalized membership unit possessing, (a) defined responsibilities for the maintenance of the system of which it is a part,

---

1. Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1947).

2. Apter, "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," op.cit., p.223.

3. "Change means the degree of alteration in the basic characteristics of the social stratification system itself, reflecting alteration in the concrete groupings of the unit under observation." Ibid., p.224.

and (b) a practical monopoly of coercive powers."[1]

The manner of participation in government and the degree of representativeness of a government is termed the "format of government." Apter proceeds to outline a typology of political systems with respect to their "formats," indicating that in the ultimate analysis all governments possess some degree of representativeness. Apter outlines four types of governmental "formats": (a) oligarchical, (b) dictatorial, (c) indirectly representational, and (d) directly representational. The "format" of government is important insofar as it affects the performances of "structural requisites" as well as circumscribing the role and scope of political groups within the system.

Of the numerous functions that governments perform, some are essential for the maintenance of the system (i.e. are functional). The means that insure the performance of such functions are called the "structural requisites" of government. A tentative list of these are the structures of authoritative decision-making, accountability and consent, coercion and punishment, resource determination and allocation, and political recruitment and role assignment, and so forth.[2]

Changes in the stratification system are brought about through what may be called entrepreneurial activity. Two types of groups perform such activity; economic groups and political groups. The latter are, "essentially devoted to the recruitment of followers who attempt to modify the system either by participation in government or by directing their action against it."[3] Further three types

---

1. Ibid., p.224. Another exponent of this view is Bertrand de Jouvenal, Sovereignty, (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1957), p.20.

2. Apter," A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," op.cit., p.225.

3. Ibid., p.227.

of such political groups are identified: Political Associations composed of intimates and associates whose objective is to find positions in government for their members; Political Parties which are based upon prescribed rules of membership which is governed through rules rather than by personal association; and Political Movements which require large memberships and are governed by extraordinarily popular leaders.

The activities and scope of each of the groups noted above, with respect to changes in the stratification system, flow from their structures of leadership and membership.

Four types of leadership patterns and their accompanying characteristics are spelled out;bureaucratic and durable; personal and fragile; personal and durable; and bureaucratic and fragile. Each type of political group leadership is a function of the activities of government and the social stratification system within a society. Bureaucratic and durable leadership is oligarchical in nature, though only within the larger compass of a democratic state. Thus, it reinforces the democratic system by facilitating a correspondence between political demands and governmental decisions. Personal and fragile leadership is characterized by personal control by a dominating figure. This can be either the "Weberian "charismatic" type or the "pragmatic" type who is followed because there is a general belief in the individual leader. He has the ability to deliver the goods (i.e., satisfy the followers' mobility aspirations). The following maintained through the medium of recurrent crises, and is pregnant with the leadership-succession problem because of the high degree of personal allegiance to the leader. Personal and durable leadership is one that overcomes the succession problem by differentiating the role incumbent from the role itself.

The latter is invested with intensely symbolic and mystical values and, as such, becomes the object of veneration. This is in contradistinction to the personality of the role incumbent , the primary factor in the personal but fragile leadership system. Bureaucratic and fragile leadership exists where groups of people are accepted as leaders and are recruited on the basis of their membership in significant groups within society. Thus, the kaleidoscope pattern of groups in different positions means new personalities emerge as leaders. The fragile nature of such leadership flows from the fact that it lacks a wide following, since only some groups provide the leaders.

Each structure of leadership will reflect an ideological position with respect to their degree of commitment to the stratification system. These are suggested in the form of a range which is shown diagrammatically. The ideological positions offered are: revolutionary (i.e., requiring complete system change); progressiste (i.e., requiring extensive alterations in the patterns of leadership recruitment and/or in the levels of participation in government); conservative; and revivalist.

The structure of membership is a reflection of political group leadership patterns and its attendant ideology. Basically, the distinction is drawn between "elite" and "mass" organizations. However, for analytical purposes, the organization is further refined, discussed and diagrammatically shown with respect to those who dominate the political groups (urban or rural based); those it seeks to affiliate (territorial or supra-territorial oriented); and the scope of the organization (for example, ethnic, regional, and/or linguistic rights).

Given the interrelationship of leadership, ideology, membership and the degree of membership commitments within political groups, it follows that certain given political group characteristics would necessarily set limiting conditions upon the development of the same group. Different groups will be found to possess different combinations of the above variables and different configurations in turn tend to produce different results.

It is Apter's belief and argument that investigating the numerous suggested variables and seeking their inter-relationships would facilitate the comprehension of the politics of a society and thus afford the prediction of events. It is also Apter's contention that the empirical application of his scheme would generate hypotheses and theories that can be gainfully employed for comparative study. At another level, comparison can be made by employing his classificatory schemes and investigating the relationships between the variables that have been proposed.

Apter does not propose any methodology. However, as if by way of an apology, he points out the difficult nature of performing such a task. He writes;

> the scheme is very inelegant. It does not have precision. Much of it would be difficult, though hopefully not impossible, to operationalize for fine treatment. A wide variety of research techniques would be appropriate to its use. Refinements in comparative criteria would be essential. [1]

Despite Apter's attempt to present a highly intricate and cogent framework for comparative purposes, his work essentially remains "inelegant." However, he does not himself elaborate the reasons for his own charge. In our opinion, the charge flows from the following: (a) the postulated concepts remain essentially ill-defined; (b) the postualted associations between the major(numerous)variables are not fully explored[2]; (c) the influence of any one variable or variables has not been fully explored with respect to the other variables, resulting in an ill-defined set of relationships whose effect upon the other variables has not been investigated; and (d) the mulitplicity of his objectives have clearly caused confusion in the interrelationships that he has so inadequately sought to explore. To put it in other words, it seems that the confusion in his mind as to what he seeking to do has been transferred into his work, and this has detracted the value of his proposals.

---

1. Ibid., p.237. 2. Ibid., p.237.

The major assumption of Apter's model is that motivation for political participation stems from social mobility aspirations. He writes,

> Every society has a social stratification system. The dominant motive of social behavior is assumed (rightly or wrongly) to be the increased mobility toward the higher ends of the stratification hierarchy. Members of the public join in political groups in order to expand mobility opportunities, and, in this respect, make representations to government, or to influence or control government in some manner. 1

It can be argued that the utility of any model or its efficacy with respect to empirical research will stand or fall insofar as the assumptions upon which the model is based are congruent with empirical reality. It is unfortunate that Apter did not explain the reasons for his assumptions, which are Marxist in nature, nor did he consider any alternative. Given that political participation is a much discussed and explored field, and that numerous suggestions have been proposed hypothetically, Apter's uncritical and unqualified acceptance of the Marxist view is questionable, notwithstanding that he deems it to be, "both a traditional and respectable view of politics."2

With reference to the concept of change, our question is; What causes changes to political systems over time, and how do such systems react ? As the model is based upon structural-functional analysis, we can employ structural-functional terminology in our examination of change. This will be done by examining (a) the factors that cause political systems to change, and (b) the effects such changes have upon the given political system.

However, before examining changes to the system, the essential assumption of the model ought to be repeated. Basically, each society is assumed to be socially stratified. Further, within each society there is a constant demand for alteration

---

1. Ibid., p.221.
2. Ibid., p.221.

of the social stratification system by some members of the society. That is, there is a demand for the expansion of mobility opportunities by some members of the society towards the higher ends of the stratification hierarchy.[1] These demands for changes in the social stratification system are channelled through political groups and transmitted to the government. The government, in turn, is viewed as "the maximizer, sending out streams of satisfactions,"[2] to the members of political groups.

We will now examine separately the three dimensions of politics, the variables associated with each, the interdependence of the three dimensions, and their relationship to change.

Within any going social system, the crucial and strategic role is played by the government. For Apter, "government" refers to a concrete group. He writes, "In a system it is the most generalized unit possessing (a) defined responsibility for the maintenance of the system of which it is a part and (b) a practical monopoly of coercive powers."[3] These two broad categories he calls the "structural requisites."[4] Although government is a concrete unit, it is distinct from other units in that it is a "concrete structural requisite for any social system." Indeed, government is the most strategic of all sub-structures for the "maintenance" of society. For purposes of clarification, we will further quote Apter:

> We do not say that, if you set up a government, you automatically create a society. Rather, the minimal requirements for the maintenance of government must be related to society in such a way that both can exist.[5]

---

1. Ibid., p.221.
2. Ibid., p.221.
3. Ibid., p.224.
4. Discussed above, pp.29 and 31.
5. Apter, op.cit., p.225.

The crucial concerns of government are those which threaten the existence of the unit of which it is a part. To be precise, it has an indivisible responsibility for protecting the system through its monopoly of authoritative coercive powers. Further, these responsibilities are handled by the government in terms of certain "minimal structures." If any of these fail to operate, the government must undergo drastic modifications and/or the system itself will undergo drastic modifications. Therefore, important threats to the system are threats to the ability of the government to work in terms of its own structural requisites and they can derive from inadequate performance of government within the structural requisites from the point of view of the system as a whole; i.e., bad political policy, inadequate action, and so forth.

Some of the activities which governments undertake are functional to the system; i.e., are necessary if the unit is to keep going. As mentioned above,[1] some of the means whereby these functions are performed are, broadly, the "structural requisites of government." These have been identified by Apter: (a) the structure of authoritative decision-making;(b) the structure of accountability and consent; (c) the structure of coercion and punishment; (d) the structure of resource allocation and determination; and (e) the structure of political recruitment and role assignment.

The manner in which the above functions are performed affects the demands that will be made on the government. For example, the characteristics of the decision-makers within any system and the nature of the issues posed helps determine the legitimacy of the decisions from the perspective of the members of the system, and the nature of the issues that will be raised. To take another example, the lack of accountability and assent to decisions can lead to unpredictable consequences: a perceived unjust allocation of resources leading to and/or increasing the alienation felt towards the system. This in turn

1. Discussed above, p.31.

conditions the demands made upon the government. Finally, the method of recruitment to, and the definition of the roles of government help determine the functioning of government and the format of government.

As mentioned above,[1] Apter has identified four types of systems with respect to their "format."[2] The differentiating criterion between the above four types is "the degree of representativeness of government."[3] The conceptual differentiation is made because variations involve differences in the performances of structural requisites, and indicate degrees of sensitivity to the social stratification system. As such, the format of a regime is extremely important as an indicator of its formal responsiveness to demands for change. Clearly, a dictatorial format has different implications for the satisfaction of demands for change than does, say, a directly representational format. Further, the format of a regime determines the roles political groups have to play, their potentialities, their limitations with respect to voicing demands, and the nature of the demands. Finally, the format of government in part determines its actions. These actions, as we have noted above, occur within the framework of the five identified structural requisities. The manner in which these five functions are performed determines the changes to the system expressed in terms of an altered social stratification system, and this in turn reflects the alteration in the concrete groupings that comprise the stratification system; i.e., the political groups. Further, since political groups seek changes to the system in

---

1. Discussed above, p. 31.

2. By "format" is meant the degree of representativeness of the regime. In other words, the manner of participation in government of members of a unit determines its format. See, Apter, op.cit., p.

3. As employed by Apter, the concept of "format" recognizes that to an extent every regime is representative, be it totalitarian, authoritarian, or other.

accordance with their own ideologies, any alteration in the stratification system must involve an alteration in the demands sought by political groups.

In addition to the above, we may also note that any changes that have been effected in a system will serve to act as a limiting conditioner to other changes that may be demanded within the framework of a given ideology, and that can be accomodated by the system. A failure to accomodate changes results in a failure to perform one or more of the five structural requisites of the government. This, it may be noted, entails a breakdown of government itself, and in turn leads to further changes. Apter writes, "Insofar as government is regarded as a concrete structural requisite of any social system, the social system itself will be altered."[1]

To Apter, the major variable determining the demands made upon the government is the nature of the social stratification system. A given stratification system can be either maintained or changed, and the stratification pattern is in itself an indicator of the internal flexibility within that system. For example, relatively undifferentiated systems tend to be fragile with respect to adapting to environmental changes and vice-versa. This is parallel to Durkheim's observation about the division of labor in society and its effects with respect to accomodating changes.[2]

Given that "social stratification and government have a close connection,"[3] we get the stratification pattern within a system and the activities of government and political groups within that system mutually setting limiting conditions upon

---

1. Apter adds, "Social stratification and government have a close connection. Ultimately, the actions of government affect stratification in some significant manner." - Ibid., p.223.

2. Emile Durkheim, The Division of Labor, (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1947); and Reinhard Bendix, "Social Stratification and Political Power," American Political Science Review, June 1952.

3. Apter, op.cit., p.223.

each other with respect to the changes that may be effected.

When changes to the stratification system are demanded, then the nature of such changes are determined by, among other factors, the following: (a) The view of the system from its members viewpoint. For example, how are the roles defined in a given system, and how are they ranked in a status hierarchy ? (b) The institutionalized criteria for stratification (example, economic, religious, and/or educational). (c) The recruitment patterns of the major groups comprising the system; i.e., by ascription and/or achievement.

Answers to the above questions provide a guide, so to speak, of the individuals commitment to the system. This has implications for change with respect to the system. Either the group values and institutionalized barriers to social mobility are tolerable and/or amenable to adequate change as perceived by members of the system, or they are perceived as unwarranted and/or unjustifiable. If the former is the perception of the majority, then the system will probably maintain itself. Alternatively, the demands made upon the government may far exceed its capabilities, resulting in changes to the system either at the micro or macro-level. The maintenance or alteration of the system is, in the final analysis, dependent upon the members of the system, who make their demands for mobility on the government through political groups. The latter being, as noted above, "the maximizer, sending out streams of satisfactions" to groups.

Modifications in social stratification are brought about by entrepreneurial activity. The two major types of groups engaging in such activity are economic and political. For analytical purposes, three types of political groups have been identified; i.e., parties, movements and associations, although other types may exist.[1] The importance of political groups is

1. Discussed above, see pp.31-32.

in the fact that between government and the social stratification system, they are "the crucial connecting links."[1]

Political groups, in seeking modifications in the social stratification system, are limited in their demands by the social stratification system itself. Further, limiting conditions to the demands for changes in the stratification system stem from the behavior and organization of the political groups themselves; their structures of leadership and their structures of membership.

Apter identifies four types of leadership structures, each being associated with an ideology. The characteristics of these have been elaborated elsewhere in this dissertation[2] and no useful purpose would be served by their replication here. With respect to change, the importance of these structures of leadership lies in the implications they have for the format of government and the social stratification system, and to the political system itself.[3] For example, a bureaucratic and durable leadership requires a highly participant structure of government with a format of indirect democracy, and a stratification system that is wide in range though coupled with an ease of mobility. If the requirements for such a leadership are non-existent, then clearly another structure of leadership based on another ideology will replace it. Thus, any given structure of leadership has implications for change through its association with an ideology.

As mentioned above,[4] four such ideological positions have been identified by Apter. Any given ideological position

1. Apter, op.cit., p.224.
2. Discussed above, pp.32-33.
3. As a matter of intellectual interest we may note Apter's threefold classification of leadership patterns with respect to their mode of operation in promoting political system change. These are based on his research in Africa, viz, in Ghana and Guinea, for example, leaders have sought to "mobilise" the total resources, physical and human, of their countries. In Nigeria (pre-Civil War) and Mali, a type of "consociation" was sought so that political unity might provide a means of bringing together a number of groups for purposes of common action. In Buganda, "change is filtered through the medium of traditional institutions, and is in the hands of a modernising autocracy." David Apter, The Gold Coast in Transition, op.cit; and The Political Kingdom in Uganda, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), pp.3-9.
4. Discussed above, p.33.

of the leadership structure, we have noted, reflects its degree of commitment to the social stratification system. This degree of commitment expressed in terms of an ideology sets more or less qualitative limits to the changes demanded. The demanded changes in turn, when translated into reality, contribute to the determination of changes any given system will undergo; i.e., whether the system will maintain itself or be altered.

Basically, each ideology refers to the degree of change sought in the stratification system. Thus, whilst in normal circumstances the ideological position of a political group leadership reflects its position vis-a-vis the stratification system, in extreme cases it is possible for a leadership to adopt an ideological position based on expediency. For example, if maintaining the leadership is the objective, then ideological positions may be adopted solely on the basis of their utility in terms of the stated objective.

The structure of membership is one of the factors conditioning the changes sought by political groups. Basically, the changes political groups seek are determined by their leadership, membership, stratification system, and the format of government. Each in turn also conditions the activities associated with the other variables and acts as limiting factors in promoting or halting changes. However, the reason for studying political group membership structures is that it is a variable that contributes to the determination of the structure of leadership and the ideology of the political group (i.e., the other variables that articulate and aggregate the demands for changes in the social stratification system). Such changes in turn lead to other changes in the system.

Thus far we have examined the factors that can lead to changes in the system. We can now turn our attention to examine how systems react to such changes over time. For analytical purposes we can view changes to the system over time along two dimensions; i.e., Systemic and System Changes.

When, despite the changes to the components of the system, the given system maintains itself over time, then such a change may be viewed as a Systemic Change. When used in this way, "system maintenance" means the maintenance of a given stratification system over time.[1] Thus, Systemic Change encompasses any alteration in the relationships of the variables that comprise the system as long as they do not, when taken together, amount to an alteration in the stratification system. Ascertaining such changes is, however, a matter for empirical observation.

We have already noted in our analysis that any given stratification system sets limiting conditions on the activities of government and political groups, to the format of government, and to the structures of leadership and membership within the political groups that comprise the system.

By contrast, System Change involves an alteration in the stratification system over time. More specifically, it involves the re-arrangement of variables so that a change occurs from one type of stratification system to another. Such a change may be induced by changes in any one or more of the variables that comprise the system, and may be empirically observed.

In proposing the model, we have already noted that Apter did not specifically seek to investigate the problem of change over time. However, he did recognize the dynamic aspects of political systems and formulated his three major analytical categories in a manner that permitted the study of change over time. Our own ability in identifying the possible factors that can cause change over time in systems may be seen as evidence of this. However, in attempting to deal with the problem of System Change, we have found that the model offers no guidelines. However, since the proposal of such guidelines was beyond the terms of reference of the model, Apter is clearly

---

1. The employment of "stratification system" as the criteria for discussing System-Change flows from Apter's view that "government policy is geared ... to the ultimate alteration of social stratification or aspects thereof." -Apter, op.cit., p.221.

not in default. Forearmed with a knowledge of the interrelationships of the major categories of the model and of the possible factors that can cause changes over time, it is but an easy step to develop guidelines for the purposes of studying System Changes over time. Such guidelines would be in the form of a classification of systems with respect to their social stratification. The degree of sophistication that the classification would possess is a matter for its authors' needs and purposes.

However, it may be added that such a classificatory scheme is imperative if a distinction is to be made between Systemic Changes and System Changes. In other words, without such a classification it would be impossible to analyze the dimension of change by which the system was effected over time.

Theoretically, the model seems to be highly cogent and, as such seems capable of permitting the study of change over time. However, for the purposes of empirically applying the model, we find that it is not without its difficulties. For example, what criteria do we employ for studying the social stratification system ? Is it to be income, education, birth, occupation, or some other variable, or some combination of these or others. Further, are the limitations imposed upon the organization and activities of government and political groups by the social stratification system ? Some clarification of such questions would have proved of immense value, and their absence only detracts from the immediate utility of the model.

Another criticism of the model is related to Apter's uncritical assumption that all members of the public are motivated towards political action by their strivings for mobility towards the higher echelons of the social stratification system. Further, as this concept constitutes his major variable, the necessity of explaining its choice seems all the

more pressing. We can always ask, why is social stratification the major variable and not the structure of government or political groups ? From a definitional point of view, the model need not justify itself. However, since models are hopefully suggested for the purposes of empirical application, some explanation would have been in order.

In conclusion, we find that the model leaves too many questions unanswered. However, it is even more significant that many of these questions were not raised. Without seeming to be too harsh with Apter, we concede that perhaps it is difficult for any author to foresee the problems that might beset their work in a highly fluid discipline. The extent to which we have found his proposals useful has already been identified. It should also be noted that the positive attributes were present despite the fact that he was seeking objectives different from those for which we have assessed him.

CHAPTER IV

LEONARD BINDER

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT IN A CHANGING SOCIETY: IRAN*

In proposing his model, Leonard Binder adopts a somewhat different posture. Unlike others, he does not feel that general theory is important as a prerequisite to comparative political research, given the present state of the discipline; that is, theory, insofar as it is general, necessarily reaches beyond empirical findings. Whilst the factuality of this at the present cannot be denied, it nonetheless remains true that this alone does not always have to be the case.

Binder's model was proposed in an attempt to break away from the "fruitless formalism" which characterized the existing works in the field, and whose methods and categories were felt to be incapable of promoting "understanding in its most comprehensive sense." Further, in proposing the model, Binder tries to reach for that which is "political,"[1] and at the same time be capable of empirical usage. However, despite the shortcomings of the earlier models, Binder unlike others, argues that many of the previous attempts have been "courageous formulations" and that they have produced some "fruitful" results. In the process of criticizing the earlier models, Binder formulates his own model and goes on to apply it to Iran.

Binder proposed his model to facilitate comparative

---

*Leonard Binder, Political Development in a Changing Society: Iran, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962), pp. 1-58.

1. "The essence of what is political is something that we all know and feel." - Ibid., p. vii.

analysis of political systems, each of which is characterized by a dominant conception of "legitimacy." Starting with the political system, he goes on to elaborate his major concepts and the interrelationships between them. Using legitimacy as his key concept, he very skillfully weaves the other concepts around it to present us with a well-thought and systematic model.

He starts with a basic definition: "The study of politics is the study of legitimization of social power."[1] For Binder, "the political system is composed of two elements which are closely integrated in mutual causality : power relationships and legitimizing actions backed by the dominant control of coercive force."[2] To employ Easton's terminology, these two elements may be seen in an input-output arrangement; inputs being the power relationships that create the legitimizing act. Such legitimizing acts either re-inforce the existing power relationships or seek to alter them. Further, power relationships at the political level are in a constant state of flux, reflecting the ever-changing environment : geographical, economic and cultural backgrounds.

In proposing the two concepts of legitimacy and power relationships, Binder argues that within political systems there are "groups" (whatever their focus of interest) engaging in a struggle for dominance of power within the power relationships. Obviously, not all groups are in a polarized situation with respect to their aims and actions. Their goals can be (a) common, (b) complementary, (c) situationally conflicting, and (d) mutually exclusive. Further, the political action of these groups is aimed at either the legitimization of existing

---

1. Ibid., p.16.
2. Ibid., p.33.

power relationships or at manipulating the power structures with a view to future legitimization. Such behavior by groups within a political system is of a functional nature and can be seen as the bridge between actual power relations and legitimizations. The functionalist behaviorist approach holds that when the political functions provide a regularity in the pattern of power relationships over time, then such power relationships can be said to have become institutionalized, and that such institutionalization helps determine the legitimization process.

The legitimization (or institutionalization) of existing power relationships, or the adjustment of power relationships in order to be congruent with existing legitimizations are the empirical functions of government. However, Binder rightly points out that governmental activity is neither limited to the performance of the above functions nor are formal governmental acts the sole legitmizing method within a political system. For example, legitimizing procedures include informal arrangements such as consultations with non-governmental organizations, ceremonies, appointments, delegation of powers to quasi-legal and quasi-administrative bodies, granting of honors, and so forth. It follows that systems can be differentiated and compared with respect to the kinds of legitimizing actions employed. Further, Binder points out that legitimizing functions of government need not necessarily coincide with those stipulated in the constitution and the laws.

Within any concrete political system, Binder argues that there is a unity between prevailing beliefs about the legitimate sources of authority and the behavior that flows from such beliefs (i.e., there is unity between thought and action, of ideal and practice, of the legitimate and the actual). Hence, theoretically speaking, the political beliefs and political behavior of people within a political system will take on an equilibrated configuration over time, given that beliefs and action are interdependent. When such a situation

exists in reality, the system can be said to be an "integrated" one. However, change being a concomitant of all forms of existence, there is a continuous change in the specific beliefs and actions of the people, thus leading to a "malintegration" of ideas and beliefs and actions. For comparative purposes, Binder suggests that concrete political systems be compared one with another against postulated models of static configurations of beliefs and acts. To facilitate this, he proposed a typology of political systems with respect to their legitimacy: traditional, conventional and rational. These are obviously ideal-types, and as such may be incongruent with concrete systems. Characteristics of more than one type of ideal system may be found in concrete systems (i.e., "Hybrids"), and these are characterized by the problem of "legitimacy confusion" which involves problems of change with respect to system legitimacy. However, the ideal-types as broad classifications facilitate the comparison of political systems.

Three types of political systems have been proposed. The traditional system approximates the Weberian ideal-type, and as such is characterized by a patriarchical leadership which justifies its acts on religious or other mystical grounds. That is, the system's legitimacy stems from the notion of a pre-ordained social order. The important forms of legitimizations in such a system are : the delegation of authority, consultations, contractual agreements, grants of honors and licences, and so forth. The techniques of gaining power are diffuse, even camouflaged, and includes the employment of strong-arm tactics, assassinations, coups d'etat, the cultivation of charisma, and bargaining by dominant reference groups with the patriarchal leadership. The stability of such systems can be described in terms of a "neutral equilibrium."

A conventional system is the equivalent of a working constitutional democracy. Political techniques include electoral campaigning, lobbying, formation of associations,

propaganda, and so forth. The legitimizations closely follow the traditional three forms of governmental activity, though co-option and consultation with special interests may also occur. However, within such a system, the emphasis placed upon "democracy" and "constitutionalism" always over-emphasizes the importance of the individual. Changes of an intra-systemic nature are not thwarted, and, as a result, such systems are "stable."

The rational system, by contrast, rests upon the tenets of logic and reason. It insists upon a congruency between the power relationships and legitimizations, the latter often representing the real and the desired state of affairs. Legitimizations are in the form of administrative regulations issued by organizations controlled by allegedly rationally-oriented personnel. The techniques of how Platonic Philosophers come to occupy the positions of kingship and guardianship remain obscure, though a priori logic dictates achievement criteria.

Power structures do exist, but ideally these too are hierarchically organized, as is everything else for political purposes. Within such an organizational framework, power relationships are acted out through bargaining processes. Groups of an independent nature are theoretically not permitted, though a few, possessing a modicum of independence, may exist in practice.

Contiguous upon the three proposed theoretical systems, Binder adds the categories of "developed" and "underdeveloped" systems, the characteristics of which are briefly discussed. Generally speaking, a traditional/rational system will be co-relative with an "underdeveloped"/"developed" system. This is not a logical inference but an empirical reality flowing from the definition, understanding and usage of the concepts.

The "developed"/"underdeveloped" distinction combined with specific patterns of system legitimacy are the classificatory

tools offered. Against these, political systems can be compared, both statically and dynamically, over time.

The model has been carefully worked out and systematically presented as a viable tool for comparative purposes. This has been done by isolating the posited key concept - "legitimacy" - and then expounding the theoretical interrelationships with the other concepts and with political phenomena. Binder's proposals lead to his contention that empirical research will lead us to find, as was found in Iran, analytically isolated clusterings of specific relationships within the examined political systems. Specific configurations of relationships are postulated as ideal-types for facilitating comparison, and as such his theoretical proposals have a priori plausibility. However, the basis or rationale by which the ideal-types were arrived at are not explained, and his own admission that numerous "hybrids" will be found lead us to question the suitability or appropriateness of his theoretical proposals, especially if it is recognized that they may be too far removed from reality.

Further, despite the logical impressiveness of Binder's model, certain glaring shortcomings or inconsistencies were noted. Having proposed his theoretical framework in the first chapter, it would not be assuming too much to hope that it would be employed in his analysis of Iran. After all, research is dependent upon some conceptual framework to give it coherence and relevance. However, he writes, "We began not with a theoretical framework, but with loose non-directed observation."[1] Either we can infer that Binder deemed his model unsuitable or inapplicable to empirical research work, or we can infer that the model was tailor-made to fit the facts that were found to be of importance with respect to Iran. Scholarly work within political science qua science, would,

1. Binder, op.cit., p.345.

in our opinion, demand that the utility of any proposal, hypothesis, or model be examined for its empirical validity. Binder's reasoning in suggesting the utility of his model could have taken two forms, and it is our opinion that both of these are of questionable value : (a) having proposed a model and outlined what it could tell us at the empirical level analytically, he could then apply it to Iran and come forward with what he said the model would do, i.e., say that a model will lead to X, then discover X, and claim that the model is valuable, or (b) starting from the premise that data X exists, construct a model which would take cognizance of it.

Another inconsistency in the model flows from his concept of instability or change, the two concepts being synonymous for Binder. He writes, "Change is not the product of the inquiry but its starting point, it is the basic postulate."[1] Further, he recognizes that change or instability are "purely matters of definition" and that, "theoretically, it may be possible to 'define away' change and instability, but that would be to deny the very existence of what most of us would like explained."[2] Given that Binder is seeking to explain what is changing and how, he seems to have lost himself in his own terminology. In the first chapter, he states, "the three systems of our system-legitimacy classification are ... Change from one of these systems to another is generally called instability."[3] Yet, referring to Iran, he writes, "The sources of instability in the Iranian system, then, are to be discovered, not in the existence of conflict over the distribution of political values, but rather in the dynamics of policy as the resultant of a number of political processes."[4] Surely, it is not too much

1. Ibid., p.346.
2. Ibid., p.346.
3. Ibid., p.37.
4. Ibid., p.346.

to expect that any concepts that are proposed will be of a sufficiently precise nature as to leave no room for ambiguity. Another instance of such confusion on Binder's part may be noted in his description of Iran, which is at one point considered to be " an essentially traditional system,"[1] and is then characterized in most of his work as a traditional-rational system. Adding further to the confusion, he concludes by characterizing Iran with a concept that has not been included within his model. He writes, "Iran is a political system in transition."[2]

The two immediate questions that arise, are : Are the characteristics that have been spelled out for the three political systems meaningful or not ? If they are, and it is hoped that they are, then, what kind of a political system is Iran supposed to be in reality ?

Despite the merits of the model, it is difficult in conclusion not to agree with Rigg's view that Binder's work "is sometimes not only confusing but confused..."[3]

In proposing his model, Binder has noted the inadequate attention paid to the problem of change, and within his work he has consciously sought to provide a remedy for this. He writes, "We began with the very notion of instability and change, ... and we have attempted to give them meaning."[4] Elsewhere he writes, "Change is not the product of the inquiry, it is the basic postulate."[5]

Recognizing change as a social phenomenon that is an essential part of all life, Binder has identified three sources of political systems change. These are analytically broad

---

1. Ibid., p.23.
2. Ibid., p.344.
3. Fred W. Riggs, "The Theory of Developing Polities," World Politics, April 1954, p.161.
4. Binder, op.cit., p.345.
5. Ibid., p.346.

enough to encompass any force that may cause a political system to change.

The first source of change is environmental. For analytical purposes this is further sub-divided into two major forms; International Environment and Social Environment. As is implied, the former refers to the various pressures and forces from other systems acting upon a given system. Social Environment refers to the cultural influences, foreign markets, imports, technical assistance, and so forth, that are within the boundaries of a political system.

The second source of change has been described as "Normal System Eccentricity." By this, reference is made to the necessary deviation of legitimizations from the power relationships that they are supposed to legitimize. These deviations arise from the fact of changing power relationships within political systems, and are endemic to all political systems.[1]

The final source of change arises from "Dysfunctional System Maintenance Activity." Dysfunctionalism as a concept has two distinct applications, and in the interests of clarity these will be differentiated. As a concept it can refer to the political system qua system as an analytical construct; that is, to the observable representation of the forces that undermine the political system as defined.[2] Alternatively, it can be employed in reference to the undermining effects of specific policies and behavior on a specific political system. It is the latter usage which is intended by Binder; i.e., when an existing array of legitimizations are in danger of being seriously undermined by specific policies or behavior, changes may be made as responses to maintain the given political system. More

1. for further elaboration, see below, pp. 57-58.

2. Refer to A.R. Radcliffe-Brown, "On the Concept of Function in Social Science," Structure and Function in Primitive Society, (London, 1952).

specifically, such changes are to be viewed as responses aimed at maintaining a given political system. A political system in turn is characterized by a broad array of legitimizations. Given that numerous power relationships, not necessarily complementary, are seeking legitimizations at any given point in time, the cost of preserving a political system with its array of legitimizations may involve the accomodation, in whole or in part, of new power relationships.

Further, in discussing the phenomena of change as applicable to political systems, Binder makes an analytical distinction between two types of change. For our purposes these can be viewed as two dimensions of change: In one there are changes that maintain the "stability" of a political system, and in the other, there are changes that cause the political system to become "unstable."

Before examining the above two types of change, it will be appropriate to examine the referents of such change, viz, Binder's political system and his classification of political systems. As noted, for Binder, the political system "is composed of two elements which are closely integrated in mutual causality : power relationships and legitimizing actions backed by the dominant control of force."[1] Further, Binder has offered a threefold classification of political systems with respect to their system-legitimacy. These are: traditional, conventional and rational. Each type of political system as an ideal-type is characterized by an array of legitimizations based upon some ideology or ideologies.[2]

We can now proceed to examine two things: the two types of change outlined by Binder with respect to political systems, and the relationship between the three identified

---

1. Binder, op. cit., p.33.

2. For further details, see above, pp.49-50.

factors that cause political systems to change and the two types of change that political systems undergo.

Changes that maintain the "stability" of a political system can be viewed as intra-systemic changes, for their net effect is to maintain a political system over a period of time. Viewing Binder's political system types with their broad array of legitimizations, it would follow that when changes do not basically alter the given array of legitimizations of a given political system, be it a traditional, conventional or rational political system, then the political system in question is said to be maintained. Binder has termed this "stability." Furthermore, "stability," we are informed, results when changes to the political system are accomodated within the existing framework of techniques, processes and legitimizations of the political system. Hence, "stability" for Binder is not associated with the stability of personnel or with the political institutions described in a constitution.

Changes that fail to maintain the political system, or changes that result in the "instability" of a political system are related by Binder to his threefold classification of political systems. Binder writes, "Systems change, but when this involves a change in the ideological sense, involving the array of legitimizations, then such a change affects the stability of a system."[1] To be more specific, he adds, "Changes from one of these systems to another is generally called instability."[2]

Basically, the three factors that cause changes to systems (i.e., environmental, normal system eccentricity, and dysfunctional system maintenance activity) can either individually or collectively lead to stability or instability in political systems. The exact combination or permutation of factors that cause political systems to change, and the changes that may result are clearly matters for empirical observation.

---

1. Binder, op. cit., p. 37.
2. Ibid., p. 37.

International and/or Environmental factors help determine the changes which may occur in political systems. For example, a favorable harvest at home has different implications for the legitimization of power relationships within a given political system, than does a sudden bleak outlook for exports. Either the political system will successfully meet the challenges and stress emanating from the geographical, economic, social and cultural spheres, or else, it will be altered. That is, possess a new array of legitimizations.

Normal System Eccentricity is an endemic feature of all political systems, and can be best understood by viewing the political system in terms of an input-output arrangement. The inputs are the power relationships[1] that create the legitimizing act,[2] and the act in turn tends to reinforce existing power relationships or to change them. However, the numerous power relationships at any given time result in numerous legitimizing acts, not all of which are compatible with the rest. Further, the difficulty of accurately translating a given power relationship in a legitimized act leads to transformation, rather than rigidity of power relationships. This can also be viewed in terms of a time lag between the emergence of a power relationship and its legitimization. These inaccurately translated power relationships, plus the new power relationships generated by environmental factors, are part of the systemic inefficiencies of the political system. These inefficiencies result in repeated reviews of the legitimacy of power relationships. The reviews take one of two empirical forms : power relationships can be brought into conformity with existing legitimizations, or, legitimizations may be revised in terms of existing or some preferred power relationships.

---

1. Binder rightly points out that the concern of the political scientist is with power relationships at the political level. Anything that affects the legitimization of social power is at the political level.- Ibid., p. 16.

2. Legitimization is the institutionalization of power relationships, and is largely speaking, an activity of the government.

A perfectly efficient system would be one in which all the power relationships are immediately and accurately translated into legitimizations. But clearly, such a state of affairs is impossible to attain for numerous reasons,[1] including the fact that change is a continuous process.

Under normal circumstances the systemic inefficiencies that characterize Normal System Eccentricity can be acccomodated by a political system; i.e., the political system remains "stable." However, an intense cultural or other crisis can broaden the divergence between legitimized power relationships and the generally acknowledged ideas of system legitimacy. Immediate demands for new legitimizations may be raised, and it is possible that a given array of legitimizations may be unable to accomodate the new demands. In such cases a political system becomes "unstable." In some cases, a foreign power or a protective international organization may act as a catalyst.

Dysfunctional System Maintenance Activity is, prima facie, akin to Normal System Eccentricity, though the distinction is an important one, and for the same reason it will be clarified here. Whereas the latter is essentially a systemic inefficiency that is endemic to all political systems, as noted above, the former is a consequence (unpredictable in many cases) of specific policies and behavior. Given that Dysfunctional System Maintenance Activity is a factor that causes changes in political systems, the question whether it will lead to stability or unstability can only be answered by a thorough examination of the resources of a given system and the direction of such resources with respect to system-maintenance. In short, the causes of change and the direction of change as dealt with by Binder in his analytical framework can be determined empirically for any political system or systems.

---

1. Refer to Binder, op.cit., p.36.

The model is rare amongst our sample in that it consciously seeks to examine the factors that cause changes to political systems and the effects such changes can have upon the system. However, despite the commendable theoretical endeavors of Binder, the model was not empirically employed by him in his research on Iran.[1] Such an exercize would have served to reveal much of value with respect to its operational strengths and weaknesses.

With respect to employing the model for purposes of studying the problem of change, we have found that the model presents certain difficulties. In specific terms, these refer to studying the dimension of System Change, or the phenomena of "instability" (changes that fail to maintain the political system over time). As already noted, this involves an alteration in the array of legitimizations that characterize a system. But, the precondition of identifying any such alteration must of necessity involve an ability to identify the array of legitimizations that characterize a system at a point in time. We have found that the model does not allow for this. There are two reasons for this.

Firstly, we cannot know of all the power relationships seeking legitimizations at a given point in time. Unless we know this fact we cannot precisely say what legitimizations have been effected. This difficulty stems from the fact that legitimizations are not solely granted by formal governmental acts and regulations, but also by informal channels such as granting of honors, delegations of authority, inclusion in religious ceremonies, and so forth. Where informal channels are employed, the difficulties for the researcher or observer in knowing precisely the power relationships that have been legitimized are very real, and even then the problem of ascertaining whether the legitimizations are absolute or only

1. The whole study is based on impressionistic data.

half-hearted remain.

Secondly, even if we know of all the power relationships seeking legitimizations at any given point in time, the phenomena of Normal System Eccentricity ensures that not all of these will be legitimized by any future point in time. The problem here, then, is one of precisely knowing which, of all those power relationships have achieved legitimization by a given point in time.

The importance of knowing precisely the given "array of legitimizations" that characterize a system at a given point in time stems from their employment as the criteria differentiating system stability from system instability; i.e., system-changes. Hence, it follows that unless we know the above, we cannot account for any "instability" that such a system may experience.

For the purposes of analyzing "instability" in systems, we can construct a classificatory scheme with respect to different arrays of legitimizations. The degree of refinement and the specific criteria employed in such schemes would be a matter for the predilection of the authors. In this respect, Binder writes, "The point at which the pre-existing system ceased to be stable, and precisely when some new system will become stable are purely matters of definition."[1]

Binder's own threefold classification of system-types, whilst not proposed for the specific purposes of studying system-changes, can with ease be adapted for such study.

Further, for any classificatory scheme to be useful, it is essential that it have explicit cut-off points differentiating the system-types one from another. The desirability of this explicitness cannot be overstressed, for it involves the very raison d'etre of the scheme itself, viz, facilitating an analysis of change along two dimensions. To the extent that such explicitness is absent from any classificatory scheme, it would be difficult to analyze the dimension of change effected upon the system.

1. Binder, op.cit., pp.345-346.

However, despite the shortcomings noted in Binder's work, we nonetheless feel that his proposals merit some praise. After all, they represent one of the few theoretical attempts tackling explicitly the problem of change in political systems over time, and this around a central organizing concept, viz, system-legitimacy. Further, it is a merit of his proposals that they can with some adjustment and some refinement overcome many of the above noted shortcomings, and that they can, in toto, provide us with viable tools for studying the problem of change in political systems over time.

Tentative steps are often fraught with difficulties, as are Binders', but then, such steps are more praiseworthy for their farsightedness than for the intrinsic merit that they may possess.

CHAPTER V

GABRIEL A. ALMOND: AN INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Gabriel A. Almond is, by almost any standard, an outstanding contemporary figure in the comparative politics field. Four of the models that he has been associated with are examined in this dissertation. Of these, two have been co-authored : one with Sidney Verba and the other with G. Bingham Powell.

We have considered his models in a group because their distribution in accordance with the chronological order generally being followed in this dissertation would have unnecessarily dispersed the writings of this scholar. While there is little continuity in his thought, the shifts in his thinking, even though they do not provide the primary focus for our study, may be clarified. The four models themselves are treated separately in their chronological order, and their discussion will follow the common pattern adopted for the purposes of this dissertation; i.e., the model, methodology used, concern with respect to change and analysis.

To the examination of the models, we shall now turn our attention.

CHAPTER VI

GABRIEL A. ALMOND:

COMPARATIVE POLITICAL SYSTEMS*

Growing out of the dissatisfaction with the prevalent theories of comparative government with respect to its tools of analysis, methods, and the objectives sought, Almond proposed a model that was the first to employ the Parsonian sociological concept of "political culture." His proposals were by no means meant to be the compensating factor to the shortcomings attributed to the discipline. He writes,

> At the risk of saying the obvious, I am not suggesting to any colleagues in the field of comparative government that social theory is a conceptual cure-all for the ailments of the discipline. 1

Using political culture as his key variable, he offered a classificatory scheme for comparative purposes based on the types of political cultures within existing political systems. Within his model, a new vocabulary is employed to discriminate between the essential properties of his classes. This vocabulary is distilled out of the Weberial-Parsonian tradition in social theory[2] and is employed because of the specific advantages flowing from it.

Firstly, a political system is a system of "action." In other words, the concern is with the empirically observed behavior emanating from the existing norms and institutions of a political system, rather than a mere description of such norms and institutions.

---

*. Gabriel A. Almond, "Comparative Politicaly Systems," Journal of Politics, August 1956, pp. 391-409.

1. Ibid., p. 391.

2. Max Weber, The Theory of Social And Economic Organization, trans. by A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947).

Secondly, the unit of the political system is the "role," the definition of which is in Parsons and Shils,"a role is that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process."[1] A patterning of interactions is then called a "structure" and a structure of "roles" is defined as a political system.

Thirdly, the political system is differentiated from other systems with the help of Weber. It is defined as "the patterned interactions of roles affecting decisions backed up by the threat of physical compulsion."[2] Such a definition delimits politics and the political, and the concept of system implies that the roles within it are interdependent and that a significant change in any one role affect changes in the others, and thereby changes the system as a whole.

Finally, every political system is alleged to be embedded in a particular pattern of orientations towards political action. This is referred to as political culture. According to Parsons and Shils, any orientation to political action involves three components: cognition, affect or cathexis, and evaluation.[3]

The frequencies of the different modes of orientation to action within political systems leads to different patterns of orientations. It is important to note that patterns of orientations towards action are not limited to a political system; i.e., they may spill over. For purposes of facilitating comparative political analysis, Almond has identified four different types of political cultures, each possessing specific characteristics. To their elaboration we shall now turn.

Anglo-American Political Systems are characterized by a "homogeneous " and "secular" political culture. The role

---

1. Talcott Parsons and Edward A. Shils (eds), Towards a General Theory of Action,(Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 23.

2. Almond, op.cit., p.395.

3. For further elaboration, see, Parsons and Shils, op.cit., p.58.

structure of such political systems is (a) highly differentiated, (b) manifest, organized and bureaucratized, (c) consists of roles which, functionally, possess a high degree of stability, and (d) is diffuse with respect to its power and influence.

Pre-Industrial Political Systems (or partially industrialized and Westernized political systems) are characterized by a mixed political culture, in which elements of at least the modern and traditional political culture are present. Additionally, elements of a charismatic political culture would be present. Such mixed political cultures are characterized by (a) a relatively low degree of structural differentiation, (b) the likelihood, due to the absence of a stable and explicit role structure, of a high degree of role substitutability (i.e., no stable division of labor), and (c) a high degree of mixed political role structures. For example, within a modern political role structure such as parliament, behavior is ostensibly controlled by formal and established norms. However, traditional role structures such as powerful families, priests, tribal chiefs, and traditional norms may be operational.

Totalitarian Political Systems are marked by a seemingly homogeneous political culture, though such homogeneity is synthetically achieved through the high degree of politicization within the political system. Thus, under the facade of a high degree of consensuality, a relatively high degree of attitudinal heterogeneity prevails. Totalitarian role structures have at least two distinctive characteristics: Firstly, the predominance of coercive roles (i.e., the penetration of all other role structures). For example, all forms of organization and communication become saturated with a coercive flavor. Secondly, there is a functional instability of the power roles, the purpose of which is the prevention of any stable delegation of power and thus the prevention of the diffusion of power or the creation of other power centers.

Continental European Political Systems share a frag-

mented political culture, as distinct from the mixed political culture mentioned earlier, and are a consequence of the uneven pattern of their cultural development. The manifestations of such a political culture are afforded through the significant survivals of older cultures and their political manifestations. However, all the cultural variations share common roots and a common heritage. For purposes of simplification, it can be said that such systems possess three major political sub-cultures, viz,(a) the pre-industrial, primarily Catholic components, (b) the older middle-class components, and (c) the industrial components proper. Two important political role structures that are characteristics of such systems are: a sense of general alienation from the political system stemming from the absence of a cohesive political culture. The other is a non-individuation of the political roles (i.e., in contrast to other types of systems, the roles are embedded in the sub-cultures and tend to constitute a separate sub-system of roles.). Two further general aspects of the role structures of such systems, again in contrast to the other systems mentioned above, are, (a) the higher degree of role substitutability vis-a-vis the Anglo-American political systems, though lesser than the non-Western systems, and (b) the high degree of the possibility of totalitarianism, or say a "Caesaristic" breakthrough by a charismatic nationalism that transcends the political sub-cultures in an effort to overcome the "immobilism" that usually is attendant in such systems.[1]

Explicitly, Almond's model does not seek to offer a framework for the analysis of change. However, in outlining and employing the concept of a political system, it can be said that he has taken cognizance of the problem of change

1. For an analysis of France, see Roy C. Macridis, "France," in Macridis and Robert E. Ward (eds)., Modern Political Systems : Europe, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963).

with respect to political life.

Briefly, the basic unit of a political system is the "role." A political system consists of all the patterned interactions of roles, or a structure of roles affecting decisions backed up by the threat of physcial compulsion. Further, Almond informs us that the concept of system implies that the"roles are interdependent and that a significant change in any one role affects changes in the others, and thereby changes the system as a whole."[1]

Recognizing within his model that political systems may change, it is our objective here to examine how the model deals with the problem of change viewed longitudinally. We shall do this by raising two important questions : (a) What factors cause political systems to change over time, and (b) How do such changes over time affect the political system ?

From the above outlined concept of the system, it will be noted that antecedent to a change in the system is a change in the role. But since a role is "... that organized sector of an actor's orientation which constitutes and defines his participation in an interactive process,"[2] it follows that a change in a role is a change in an actor's orientation which defines his participation in an interactive process. In simple terms, a change in an actor's political role is a change in the orientation of the same actor towards politics. To aid further clarification we may note that any orientation towards political action involves three components : cognition, affect or cathexis, and evaluation.[3] It follows from this that, a change in a political role involves a change in one or more of the three components of orientation towards politics. These three components of orientation towards politics basically

1. Almond, op.cit., p.395.
2. Parsons and Shils, op.cit., p.23.
3. For further elaboration, see, ibid., p.58.

represent an individual's knowledge of politics, his attitudes towards politics and his political values.[1] But since the political system[2] is only a sub-system of the larger social system,[3] an individual's orientation towards politics must of necessity be influenced by the larger social system, and his orientations towards it. In other words, the individual's orientations towards politics are influence both by the political system and the larger social system. If we view the factors within a political system that help shape the three components of an individual's orientation towards politics as being endogeneous, then the actual orientations of an individual towards politics is a function of both endogeneous and exogeneous factors. Easton has termed them as "intra-societal" and "extra-societal" factors. As these factors change, we can expect an individual's orientations towards politics to change. However, as a note of caution, we may point out that no one-to-one or any other specific relationship between orientations towards politics and the factors that help determine it are posited. Where ascertainable, this is a matter for emperical investigation in each case.

Following the notion that a change in a political role causes the whole political system to change, we have thus far examined the cause/s that change/s political roles. We shall now proceed to examine the consequences of a change in a political role upon a political system, viz, changes in

---

1. By cognition is meant the knowledge and discrimination of the objects, events, actions, issues and the like. By cathexis is meant the investment of objects, events, issues, and the like, with emotional significance, or affect. By evaluation is meant the manner in which individuals organize and select their perceptions, preferences, and values in the process of establishing a position vis-a-vis political action. Parsons and Shils, op.cit., p.58.

2. The political system qua system is a determinate system of social behavior delimited for analytical purposes.

3. The highest level of abstraction is intended here, viz, the whole world as a system.

the political system as a whole. For analytical purposes, such changes will be studied along the two dimensions: (a) Systemic Change,[1] and (b) System Change.

Systemic Change occurs when one or more roles constituting a political system change, with the political system maintaining[2] itself over time. However, in speaking of the maintenance of a system it is necessary to describe the system that is being maintained. For this purpose, we have Almond's fourfold classification of political systems with respect to their political culture. These have been adequately dealt with earlier.

The four types of political systems are differentiated on the basis of their role-structure. Hence, when a role-structure changes, changes are caused to the political system with the result that the given configuration of role structures characterizing the political may or may not be changed. Where the latter is the case, we can say that the political system as whole has been maintained,(i.e., that the changes have been purely of a Systemic nature.) For example, the role structure of an Anglo-American Political System is (a) highly differentiated, (b) manifest,organized and bureaucratized, (c) characterized by a high degree of stability in the function of the roles, and (d) likely to have a diffusion of power and influence within the political system as a whole. If, following a change in a particular aspect of a particular role in an Anglo-American political system, the above conf-

1. We have preferred using the concept of Systemic Change instead of the concept of System Maintenance. To Easton, System Maintenance is weighted with the notion of salvaging the existing pattern of relationships and directs attention to their preservation. Further, we have shied away from the concept of System Maintenance because of the connotations associated with it. Easton writes," It [i.e.,System Maintenance] is normally associated with the idea of stability and, as normally used, quite alien to the idea of change." David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis,(New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965),esp.p.88.

2. System Maintenance as employed by us is employed merely as a description and not as an analytical concept.

iguration of role structures are maintained over time, despite the changes to the political system, then the said political system is deemed to have been maintained.

System Change occurs when the role structure of a political system changes over time to the extent that it in effect, equals the role structure of another type of political system. For example, if the role structure of an Anglo-American political system changes over time, with the effect that it represents more accurately the role structure of, say, a Pre-Industrial political system, then we can view such a change as System-Change.[1]

Though he has offered his model for empirical usage, Almond has left the methodological task to those who will try it out for "fit." However, to Almond's innovating zeal is due the credit for introducing Parsonian concepts into comparative politics for the purpose of empirical applicability. Since then, following his lead, Parsonian concepts have become an important feature of many models.

The immediate question Almond set for himself was to provide a "tentative and provisional answer,"[2] with respect to facilitating systematic comparison among the major types of political systems. Borrowing from sociology and anthropology the concepts of "political system," "role structure," and "orientations," he sought "to set up and justify a preliminary classification into which most of the political systems which we study today can be assigned."[3]

As a "provisional" or temporary answer, his efforts must be in retrospect deemed, fruitful, because (a) he

---

1. David Easton has encompassed such a phenomenon within the concept of "System Persistence." He writes, "Persistence signalizes the importance of considering, not any particular structure or pattern, but rather the very life processes of a system themselves. In this sense a system may persist even though everything else associated with it changes continuously and radically." D. Easton, op.cit., p.88. With respect to Almond's model, the system can logically only persist within the limits of his fourfold classification of political systems.

2. Almond, op.cit., p.392.

3. Almond, ibid., p.392.

recognized the difficulties involved in introducing sociological concepts of political system analysis into comparative politics and spelled them out, (b) he admitted the need for developing additional concepts for purposes of handling political system analysis, and (c) he subsequently further refined and developed the tools of analysis and went on to successfully use them in empirical research. Given that major breakthroughs in any field are a result of speculative inquiries painstakingly investigated over time, it can be said that the above model was an important step. Perhaps, it was even an unavoidable step in the development of the discipline to its present state.

Almond developed his model as a response to the shortcomings of the available schemes that sought to facilitate comparative political analysis, and these he mentions briefly. However, having proposed his model, nowhere are we informed of the benefits that his work affords, vis-á-vis the existing models. In this he is rather traditional.

A virtue that Almond claims for his typology is its ability to facilitate the classification of existing political systems. But classification is not synonymous with comparison. To be sure, Hecksher subsequently pointed out that classification was "a necessary condition for comparison."[1] Presumably, Almond was well aware of the fact that classification was a necessary, but not a sufficient factor in comparison, though he fails to show such an awareness (i.e., the method for comparison has not been explicated, nor are we informed as to what follows the classificatory stage, or, how we should compare ?).

A further criticism that Almond's work merits is its failure to explicate and interrelate the concepts that he introduced. For example, what are the criteria that identify

---

1. Gunnar Hecksher, The Study of Comparative Government and Politics, (London: George, Allen & Unwin), 1957, p.39.

the three varieties of orientations presented for empirical purposes ? Further, what types of roles, when aggregated, constitute an orientation ? What frequency of any given orientation is adequate before it can be labelled as being a pattern of orientation ? What is the relationship between roles and orientations to a political system ? Is one or the other or both expected to comprise such a system ? No rationale derived empirically or logically is presented.[1] Theoretical inadequacies of such a nature quite clearly preclude the possibilities of employing the model meaningfully, at least not without some refinement. It is, of course, true that such improvements are contained in his subsequent works and will be noted in further chapters of this dissertation. However, these are shortcomings in the model presently examined.

Finally, the validity and rationale of the proposed classification is left unexplained. That it is necessarily arbitrary is conceded, for any scheme is of such a nature. However, the criteria of relevance in such instances must be explicated. Further, it is not clear by what evidence or necessity of logic Almond has assumed that a given set of role structures characterize a category ?[2] By what logic are the proposed categories of political system or systems meaningful as analytical tools?

The numerous questions raised above and the shortcomings that have been identified are serious lacunae for any model. In retrospect, they also help to account for the non-employment of the model, and for the numerous clarifications

1. Leonard Binder too presents a similar line of criticism, op. cit., pp. 7-11.

2. Pye has criticized the imputing of clusters of variables to certain kinds of political processes. Despite the fact that he was referring to another context, the argument is nonetheless an important one. See, Lucien W. Pye's review of The Politics of Modernization by David E. Apter, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965). The review appeared in the American Political Science Review, June 1966, pp. 396-7.

and modifications to which the model was subsequently subjected to by Almond. However, the latter may be seen as evidence of the utility of the concepts employed within the model.

With reference to the concept of change, Almond's model permits an analysis of changes to political systems over time along the two dimensions examined above.[1] However, there is yet another aspect according to which changes to a political system may be studied, and it seems that Almond has not, at least explicitly, taken cognizance of this. We can view such a change as a variant of the category of System Change. It, can be termed System Extinction or the complete breakdown and evaporation of a political system.[2]

By definition, a political system is the patterned interaction of roles affecting decisions backed by the threat of legitimate physical compulsion. It follows then that a patterned interaction of roles affecting decisions which are not backed up, for whatever reasons, by the threat of legitimate physical compulsion is not a political system. In other words, in such a society no authoritative allocations of values can be made. Easton writes,

> This outcome is neither impossible nor unusual. It has occurred when the membership of a society has been utterly destroyed through some natural catastrophe such as an earthquake or epidemic, or when the society has failed to reproduce itself biologically, as perhaps in the case of the Mesa Verde Indians. It may happen in the limiting case when, for whatever reasons, a war of all against all, in the Hobbesian sense, breaks out and cooperation becomes impossible even for the minimal purposes of law and order. 3.

Changes to societies amounting to the latter

---

1. See above, pp. 69-70.

2. In Easton's terminology such a phenomena signalizes the "non-persistence" of a political system. David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis, pp. 82-83.

3. Ibid., p. 82.

have occurred and can occur. Easton's observation may be noted in this respect: "Historical political systems have disappeared, some permanently, others to recover their integrity."[1] He goes on to add, "The political systems of American Indian, of Scotland, or the Baltic societies are examples of these types."[2] Admittedly, destruction and termination of a society for want of a system through which decisions backed up by the threat of physcial compulsion may be effected are rare historical occurrences. Nonetheless, the failure to recognize the political systems do not always endure may be viewed as a shortcoming in Almond's work.

Another criticism of the model is the restricted scope it affords the dimension of System Change. This criticism flows from the scope of his classification. Almond's own admission of the "inconclusiveness" of his classification does not however reduce the fact that the model acts as a limiting factor in attempts to deal with the problem of System Change. There are, at least hypothetically, numerous permutations of role structures unaccounted for by Almond's classification of political systems. Some of these are incapable of being subsumed under his four broad types of political systems.[3] For example, in contrast to Almond, S.N.Eisenstadt has differentiated from historical examples, at least ten different types of political systems with respect to their degree of political role differentiation,[4] and we shall examine one of them here for the purposes of showing the inability of Almond's classification to subsume it. Eisenstadt's "Centralized Historical Bureaucratic Empire" cannot be

---

1. David Easton, ibid., p.83.

2. Ibid., p.83.

3. Alfred Diamant suggests that the analytical differences between political systems or groups of systems may be questionable. "Is there a Non-Western Political Process," Journal of Politics, February 1959, pp.123-27.

4. S.N.Eisenstadt, The Political System of Empires, (Illinois: Free Press, 1963).

subsumed under Almond's fourfold classificatory scheme. This type of system is characterized by a limited autonomy only in the political sphere. The limitation is only in terms of differentiations of roles and activities. As far as the latter characteristics are concerned, Almond's "Pre-Industrial Political System" can subsume it, but even here a caveat exists: Almond points out that the limited differentiation of roles and activities in the Pre-Industrial Political System may be in the form of mixed cultures (modern and traditional role structures co-existing), with one sub-culture dominating another. Further, with respect to the limited autonomy of Eisenstadt's above mentioned system, no system-type of Almond can subsume it.

A final criticism of Almond's model refers to the lack of rigorous criteria capable of differentiating between the four types of political systems. From our perspective of examining changes in systems, we have pointed out above that this is an important requirement for any classification if it is to be empirically useful.[1] The absence of explicit cut-off points in Almond's classification renders difficult the task of analyzing the dimension of change effected. Therefore, employing the model as it is, we will only be able to provide, at best, a vague determination of the dimension of changes effected. At worst, we will be unable to discern the differences between the two dimensions of changes effected. Examples of the difficulties posed by the classification may be seen in the characteristics of Anglo-American and Pre-Industrial political systems. The two systems are differentiated largely on the basis of their role and structural differentiation, and the system-types are characterized by varying degrees of differentiation. But matters of degree are

1. See above, p. 60.

always relative in the absence of specified configurations of quanitative indices. In addition, the fact that political systems are not necessarily found as mirror-images of ideal-types, helps to further obfuscate the fluid criteria of differentiation between the types.

The major merit of Almond's model is that it has introduced for the first time concepts that had hitherto been employed only in other disciplines. As an innovator seeking tools of analysis, Almond's attempts are laudable. In retrospect, the foresight exercized in his choice of concepts show that his attempts deserve commendation. Indeed, the popularity of the same concepts today owe, to a significant degree, much to Almond's work.

In conclusion, fairness demands that we emphasize the fact that the model in question was explicitly proposed for facilitating comparative political analysis rather than the analysis of changes in political systems. Where he has fallen short with respect to the latter, the failings ought not to be construed as a reflection of his work, especially since the ends in question were, at best, of no concern, and, at worst, unforeseen.

CHAPTER VII

GABRIEL A. ALMOND

INTRODUCTION:

A FUNCTIONAL APPROACH TO COMPARATIVE POLITICS*

A sophisticated, lucid and ambitious effort to provide a functional framework for comparative purposes has been proposed by Almond in a book co-edited with James Coleman. The theoretical model is proposed by Almond, it is then employed for "area analysis" by five area specialists. This analyses cover seventy-six "developing" countries. Finally, Coleman summarizes "the modal characteristics" of the investigated polities and at the same time plots the range of differences in the new states along a matrix of "modernization."

The objectives of the model are twofold. First, "to construct a theoretical framework that makes possible, for the first time, a comparative method of analysis for political systems of all kinds."[1] Second, it is argued that attempts to understand the new political entities and predict the directions political change will take place within them will be better achieved by describing their properties in functional categories and deducing general statements about them, rather than through the "traditional" approach which essentially conceals the factors and interests influencing political behavior.

The model was proposed because of the fact that the existing conceptual schemes employed a vocabulary and methods

*. Gabriel A. Almond, "Introduction : A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics," in Almond and James Coleman, The Politics of the Developing Areas, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), model is outlined in pp. 3-64.

1. Ibid., p. v.

that were unmindful of the enormous changes that have occurred in political cultures and political structures. Failure to take cognizance of these facts meant that the complexity of political phenomena which we seek to understand was inadequately grasped or analyzed.

As aids to achieve the above ends, concepts have been borrowed from sociological and anthropological theory and introduced in the model. Many of these concepts are concerned with "action" rather than "description" and as such, their usage reflects a different way of thinking and studying politics. Some have labelled this approach the "behavioral approach".[1]

Using an eclectic approach, Almond considers and borrows from the works of Weber[2], Levy[3], Lasswell and Kaplan[4], and Easton[5] to propose a definition of the political system in order to define what is "political" and at the same time to differentiate it from other "systems". A "political system" then, is "that system of interactions to be found in all independent societies which perform the functions of integration and adaptation (both internally and vis-a-vis other societies) by means of the employment, or threat of employment of more or less legitimate physical compulsion."[6]

---

[1]The emphasis is on studying 'what is' rather than 'what ought to be', though the latter is investigated in so far as it affects the former. See, Almond and Powell, Comparative Politics: A developmental approach, (Boston & Toronto: Little, Brown and Co., 1966), p. 7.

[2]Max Weber, "Politics as a Vocation," in Gerth and Mills, From Max Weber, (N.Y.: 1946), p. 78.

[3]Marion Levy, Jr., The Structure of Soceity, (Princeton, N.J.: 1952), p. 469.

[4]H.D. Lasswell and Abraham Kaplan, Power and Soceity, (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1950), p. 76.

[5]David Easton, The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science, (N.Y.: A Knopf, 1953), p. 130.

[6]Almond & Coleman, op. cit., p. 7. The exercise of legitimate force is not meant to be the sole concern of a political system, but its distinctive quality.

Further, three "properties" of a political system are spelled out so that we may comprehend the implications of employing a systems analysis: First, a political system must include comprehensiveness; i.e., all the interactions, both inputs and outputs, which affect the use, or the threat of use of physical coercion. Secondly, all interactions are interdependent; i.e., a change in one subset of interactions will produce changes in all the other subsets within the system. Thirdly, a political system has boundaries; i.e., the political system is analytically distinct from other systems.

Almond then proceeds to specify the universal characteristics of political systems and at the same time suggests how each of these can be used to facilitate comparison among them. The Political system has two fundamental conceptual characteristics. One of these is that it has a Political Structure; which is defined as "the legitimate patterns of interactions by means of which this order (internal and external) is maintained."[1] Further, the political structures or interactions may be occasional or intermittent in nature. The other characteristic is that of Political Functions. All political systems perform certain functions which are universal in scope. Almond has specified seven political functions. These form the base of the proposed model, which in itself can be viewed as a move in the general direction of systematic-functional theory. The categories were developed to enable the comparison of political systems as whole systems rather than merely facilitate the comparison of aspects of political systems.[2] Easton's earlier model on the other hand, with its

---

[1] Ibid., p. 11.

[2] For e.g. Lasswell's seven categories were designed particularly to facilitate judicial comparison. See, H.D. Lasswell, The Decision Process; Bureau of Governmental Research, University of Maryland, 1956, p. 2.

conceptual simplicity, viz., its three functions (demands, supports, and policies), is derived from general systems theory and remains too close to the generic model of a system, with its interdependence, its boundaries and its inputs and outputs for it to be particularly discriminating in the political field.[1] However, in proposing his functional categories, Almond has evidently drawn upon Easton's model and others. He divides the seven functions into Input and Output categories in the manner of Easton, the former being the political functions and the latter governmental functions. These are:[2]

Input Functions

1. Political Socialization and Recruitment
2. Interest Articulation
3. Interest Aggregation
4. Political Communication

Output Functions

5. Rule-making
6. Rule application
7. Rule Adjudication

Both modern Western political systems with their relatively high degree of functional specificity, and traditional systems with their highly diffuse and undifferentiated political and social structure manifest a multifunctionality of political structure. Another characteristic of political systems is that they are generally culturally mixed. In other words, in all kinds of political systems, elements of both "modern" and "primitive" cultural characteristics will be found at the same time in varying degrees. We can now turn our attention to a brief examination of the seven functional categories.

---

1. David Easton, "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems," World Politics, April 1957, pp. 383.

2. Almond & Coleman, op. cit., p. 17.

The first of these is the political socialization and recruitment function. Socialization or acculturation is the individual induction process through which the political norms, values, beliefs, ideals, and techniques or the political cultures and structures of societies are perpetuated. We are informed that the early stages of this process are the same in all political systems, regardless of its degree of structural complexity.[1] For comparative purposes we can compare this function being performed in different political systems in a number of ways with the aid of Parsonian variables. We can focus our analysis on the structures that perform this function (i.e., manifest/latent), the styles of performance (i.e., specific/diffuse), the elements that are involved (i.e., particularistic/universalistic) and the manner in which affective and instrumental elements are combined. Impingent upon the acquisition of attitudes towards a political system, its roles, policies and its various structures are also the knowledge of the performance of these roles and the input and output functions of the system.

The political recruitment function is linked to the socialization function in as much as it recruits members of the society and inducts them into the specialized roles of the political system; training them in the appropriate skills, values, expectations and affects. To quote Almond again, the recruitment function, "consists of the special rule socializations which occur in a society 'on top' of the general socialization."[2] At the comparative level, the structures that perform this function (e.g., family, class, and/or political parties) and the styles of recruitment may be studied. The styles of recruitment refer to the way in which ascriptive

---

1. Ibid., p. 30.
2. Ibid., p. 32.

and particularistic criteria combine with performance and universalistic criteria.

The Interest Articulation function refers to the articulation of interests, claims, and demands for political action. The importance of this function stems from the fact that it occurs at the boundary of the political system. To be more specific, (i) the character of the boundary between the society and the polity, and (ii) the boundaries between the various parts of a political system (e.g., parties, legislatures, bureaucracies), are determined by the structures that perform this function and the styles of their performance. For example, a relatively high incidence of interest articulation by groups will mean poor boundary maintenance between the polity and society and within the polity itself and vice-versa. The styles of political interest articulation can be seen in terms of opposite pairs; manifest/latent; specific/diffuse; general/particular; and instrumental/affective. In general, the more latent, diffuse, particularistic and affective the style, the more difficult it is to maintain the boundary between the polity and society. At the same time, the needs, claims and demands (inputs) from the society into the political system will be in less aggreeable form with respect to the degree of possible responsiveness.

Four types of structures that perform the interest articulation function within political systems have been identified; viz., (a) institutional interest groups, (b) non-associational interest groups (e.g., group membership based on kinship and lineage groups, or status and class groups), (c) anomic interest groups, and (d) associational interest groups.

The Interest Aggregation function simply provides for the aggregation of interests, claims, and demands which have been articulated by the interest articulators of the polity. However, at times this function may overlap with the articulation function and in some societies it may be virtually

indestinguishable from it. Given this possible confusion, Almond has sought to clarify the concepts. He writes, "we reserve the term 'aggregation' for the more intensive levels of the combinatory processes, reserving the term 'articulation' for the narrower expressions of interest."[1]

The aggregative function may be performed by numerous structures within the political system (e.g., cabinets, legislatures, political parties, and/or bureaucracies), and its manifestations take the form of public policies, bargaining and recruitment of personnel. A modern structure performing this function is the political party system. Four types of political parties are identified, each with its own distinctive style of performing the aggregative function. Authoritarian party systems (including Totalitarian ones) permit little overt interest articulation and therefore, most aggregation is performed by the party hierarchy, using its own channels. Dominant non-authoritarian party systems lack a focus of policy interest in general, therefore aggregation results in an avoidance of divisive issues in order to please its diverse and tenuously held membership, which is usually united in a common cause. In Competitive two party systems, aggregation usually takes the form of political parties competing for political office in order to translate their demands into policies. Within Multi-party systems two patterns of interest aggregation emerge. In the "working" type of system, interests are aggregated at both the party and parliamentary level. In the latter case, this is done in terms of the coalition-making process in the legislature. In the "immobilist" type of systems aggregation takes place through the formation of fragile coalitions in parliament.

---

1. Ibid., pp. 39-40.

The Political Communication function provides the thread through which all the inputs and outputs of a political system are performed, and as such it can be seen as the crucial[1] boundary-maintenance function. Flowing from this is the argument that the nature of media communication (e.g., whether autonomous or controlled, differentiated or undifferentiated) affects the manner in which all other functions are performed.

The utility of employing the communication function as an analytical tool stems from the fact that different political systems have different identifiable patterns of communication and styles of communication. For comparative purposes, the structures performing this function and their styles of performance can be studied. However, since all structures including political and social structures perform this function, they can be studied in terms of their elaborateness with respect to the degree of their penetration in informal and intermittent structures of political communication. The styles of political communication can be seen in terms of opposite pairs, i.e., manifest/latent, specific/diffuse, particularistic/generalistic, affectively neutal/affective.

The governmental functions are rule-making, rule-application and rule - adjudication. These are the functions performed by the three main structures of government, i.e., legislature, executive and judiciary. In proposing that the functions that they perform be studied instead of the structures, Almond, for analytical purposes, seeks to differentiate the role from the structure. As elsewhere within the model, his concern is with the performance of functions. These can be studied by noting and comparing functions and their styles of performance.

Because of their overwhelming prevalence in the non - Western areas, Almond has sought to illustrate the performance of the above functions with the aid of three types of political systems suggested by E. Shils as characterizing

1. This function is crucial in the sense that the performance of all other functions involves communication.

the new societies: tutelary democracies, modernizing oligarchies and traditionalistic oligarchies.[1] In these systems, it is suggested, that the boundaries between the structures performing the output functions is poor, i.e., the structures are undifferentiated with respect to functions. By contrast, the "boundary maintenance" in Western systems is relatively good. Further, it is suggested that examining the political cultures of different political systems together with the manner and model in which the political functions are performed can be used for making deductions about the mode and scope of governmental functions. Parsonian pattern variables can help us in this endeavor.

However, Almond has expressed doubts about the efficacy of narrowing our focus to the study of governmental functions in facilitating the comparison of the performance of political systems. As a consequence, greater stress has been rightly placed upon the four political functions. The reasons for this are the indeterminacy of the formal governmental structures in most of the non-Western areas; and the deviations from constitutional and legal norms that occur in the performance of governmental functions. Further, studying the governmental structures would have yielded little of predictable value, for it is what "goes in" and "how" that is most significant in showing that which "comes out."[2]

It should be noted that Almond's functional model did not explicitly seek to deal with the problem of change.[3] However, one of the objectives of the proposed model is to facilitate the analysis of political systems. Insofar as political system analysis is employed in its widest sense, then to that

---

1. Edward Shils, "Political Development in the New States," (mimeographed paper prepared for the Committee on Comparative Politics, Social Science Research Council, 1959).

2. Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.52.

3. Despite the title of the book (The Politics of the Developing Areas), the model itself is concerned with facilitating cross-sectional analysis of political systems, especially those that are termed the "developing areas." Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.11.

extent the model should be deemed capable of analyzing any phenomena whose referent is the political system. Changes to political systems constitute one such phenomena. If changes occur to political systems, then the model should be capable of analyzing such changes. It is our purpose here to examine how this is done. To be more specific, we shall seek to understand how the model deals with the problem of change viewed longitudinally. Towards this end, two questions will be raised: What factors cause political systems to change, and, how do these changes affect the political system ? Basically, the model employs functional categories, universal in scope, as the tools for the understanding of political systems. The functional categories are dichotomized into inputs and outputs of the political system, with the former representing the political functions and the latter the governmental ones. Following the implications of systems analysis, we have the interdependence of the functional categories that comprise the system. But, following the dichotomization of the seven functional categories into inputs and outputs, it may be more useful to study the interdependence between the dichotomized classes and within the categories of each class, i.e., the interdependence between the inputs and outputs, and within the inputs and outputs. We can now proceed to examine the factors that cause changes to political systems.

In functional terms, the analysis of a political system involves studying the structures that perform the seven universal functions and the styles of their performance. Therefore, any changes in the structures that perform the said functions and/or in the styles of their performance means a change in the political system itself. But, in order to understand what factors cause changes in political systems, we have to understand why a political system performs as it does.?

The two major influencing factors that determine why certain structures perform certain functions and the styles of their performance are the political culture of the system and the political socialization patterns of the political system. The political culture of a system refers to the system of beliefs (values and norms), symbols, and authority patterns operating within the system. Through the process of political socialization, the individual is inducted into the political culture. Its end product is a set of attitudes (i.e., cognitions, value standings and feelings) towards the political system, its various roles and role incumbents. It also includes knowledge of values affecting, and feelings toward the inputs and outputs of the system. Coupled with the socialization function is the recruitment function.[1] The latter recruits people into roles[2] and the former decides the performance of these roles.

In suggesting that the political socialization pattern inducts individuals into the political culture, we do not intend to convey a static impression. In other words, the political culture is capable of being changed or modified by the political socialization patterns. After all, the political culture does not exist in a vacuum. The political system is a part of the larger social system, and it also is comprised of numerous sub-systems of its own. Thus, the political culture will, to an extent, reflect the characteristics of the larger social culture and of the numerous sub-cultures. The various sub-cultures interact producing changes in the political culture. For example, environmental factors

1. "The political recruitment function takes up where the general political socialization function leaves off. It recruits members of the society out of particular subcultures - religious communities, statuses, classes, ethnic communities, and the like - and inducts them into the specialized roles of the political system, trains them in the appropriate skills, provides them with political cognitive maps, values, expectations, and affects."- Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.31.

2. Any patterned interaction of roles is called a structure.

such as urbanization, industrialization, literacy, trade and commerce, technology, and so forth, are constantly interacting. Such interaction determines the political culture, and changes in the pattern and content of interaction go towards producing changes in the political culture of the system. In referring to the political culture of systems, Almond writes, "All political systems - the developed Western ones as well as the less-developed non-Western ones - are transitional systems, or systems in which cultural change is taking place."[1]

Changes in the political culture, amongst other things, lead to changes in the political socialization patterns, and these, in turn, lead to changes in the structures that perform the seven functions and the styles of their performance. To quote Almond again, "Insofar as the culture and structure are adapting and changing, the socialization patterns are also likely to be changing."[2]

Further, the political socialization patterns within the numerous sub-systems that comprise the political system may differ, producing a fragmented political culture, and where this differs from earlier socialization patterns to the sub-system, changes in the political system itself will be caused.

To the political socialization patterns, we can add the recruitment patterns and the changes to the same. Thus, we have an elaborate network of political culture, political socialization and political recruitment patterns mutually influencing and being influenced by each other. This whole network is also simultaneously interacting with the larger social system - the environment. Such interactions help produce changes in both directions, i.e., to the political culture, political socialization patterns, political recruit-

1. Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.24.
2. Ibid., p.27.

ment patterns and to the larger social system itself. In any empirical study of a political system, the direction and influence, and the points where the influence is exerted can be studied and ascertained.

The emphasis on studying the political culture and the political socialization patterns stem from their importance in the analysis of political systems and to the analysis of change. The performance of the other functions of the political system are related to the performance of the socialization and recruitment function, and this in turn, as we noted above, is related to the political culture of the system. Further, the performance of the political functions (inputs) helps determine the governmental functions (outputs)[1], i.e., the inputs help determine the outputs and vice-versa. In addition, given that the inputs-outputs of a political system operate within the larger social system (the environment), we have the latter exerting an influence on the political system in the form of cultural influences.

Indeed, having understood the political culture of a system and the political socialization function together with how changes may occur to them, it is but a simple step to understand the consequent functional changes that occur in political systems and the factors help cause such changes. Almond explains this more vividly when he writes,

> "The analysis of the political socialization function in a particular society is basic to the whole field of political analysis." He goes on to add, "Furthermore, the study of political socialization and political culture are essential to the understanding of the other political functions. For, if political socialization produces the basic attitudes in a society toward the political system, its various roles, and public policy, then by studying political culture and political socialization we can gain understanding of one of the essential conditions which affect the way in which these roles are performed, and the kinds of political inputs and outputs which these roles produce." - 2.

---

1. For a distinction between political and governmental functions, see above, p.80.
2. Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.31.

Having examined the factors that cause changes to political systems, we can now seek an answer to our second question, viz, How do these changes affect the political system ?

In answering this question, the model offers us little help, but then it did not seek to answer this question. As no typology has been provided with respect to the performances of the seven functions by structures and styles, we can only say that any change in the structure(s) performing the function(s) and/or in the style(s) of performance causes a political system to change over time. Apart from saying that the political system changes over time, we cannot say much else with the aid of the model, as no characterization of different systems has been provided. Such a change over time involves different structures performing the functions and/or different styles of performance.

Almond does not propose any specific method for empirical usage. The five area specialists whose works are included in the book have freely followed their own approach in analyzing the performances of the political systems, the only common feature is that the analysis was done largely in terms of Almond's functional categories.

The theoretical model is a highly sophisticated and conceptually well thought-out piece of work, and it is not surprising that it has been received with favor and enthusiasm by the discipline in general.[1] As a model, it has also been applied successfully to numerous countries, apart from the seventy-six "developing areas" considered in the book.[2]

---

1. For example, Fred W. Riggs has described it as the "bible." Refer to, "The Theory of Developing Polities," in World Politics, October 1963, p.148.

2. See the country studies in Little Brown Series, Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1964-65.) Jean Grossholtz, Politics in the Phillipines; Richard Rose, Politics in England; Frederick C. Barghoorn, Politics in Russia; Leonard J. Fein, Politics in Israel; Robert E. Scott, Politics in Mexico; Leonard M. Thompson, Politics in the Republic of South Africa.

However, as a model it is not without its critics. Leonard Binder considers its claim to being a functionalist system of the polity and concludes that it is "really neither functionalist nor a system."[1] Binder argues that the functionalist categories have been derived neither by logic nor by empirical research, and that they are not informed by any general theory of politics. Further, he feels that the claim that it comprises a system is arbitrary.

Whilst Binder's criticisms are partly correct on factual grounds, they are in our opinion misdirected. Models to be sure are of many kinds, and amongst these are included models that have been arbitrarily formed for purposes of postulating intuitively felt relationships, so that these may be tested. That such a model is most unlikely to "fit the facts" is agreed, but surely the utility of any model lies in its ability to explain, indicate areas for further research, and perhaps, predict. As for the shortcomings on other grounds, Binder has failed to spell them out. However, it is our contention, that a model does not have to be the offspring of an accepted theory. It can, with equal validity, be purely speculative in nature, and be a step in the direction of theory-building. However, with respect to any model, we recognize that there is either an explicit or an implicit theory behind it.

Binder has also failed to spell out what he means by a system, and whether or not there is only one understanding of functionalism. To our knowledge, there are at least three ways of looking at functionalism, or rather three ways in which functionalism has been employed; (a) in terms of the social system, (b) in terms of a concrete practice or system, and (c) in terms of concrete social structures.[2]

Almond's wish that the model be considered as a tentative step in the direction of developing a "probabilistic"

---

1. Leonard Binder, op.cit., p.10.

2. Ernest Nagel distinguishes seven meanings of functions and shows how rarely in the functionalist literature they are distinguished. E. Nagel, The Structure of Science, (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1961), pp.522-26.

theory of politics can now be considered. He suggests that "political systems be compared in terms of probabilities of performance of the specified functions by the specified structures."[1] Statistical formulation of the theory and its variables would, it is hoped, make explicit the nature of any proposition with respect to the structures, functions and styles of performance of the polity. However, having found the statistical correlation between the above, the question may be asked, So what ? Since a political system qua system can be in a state of flux flowing from the inter-dependent nature of its components, and the interaction of the system with its environment, how do we ensure that any given statistical relationship will hold long enough for comprehension and prediction purposes ? Further, since each component of a system is affected by numerous forces, many of which are diffuse in nature (and intermittent), how do we know what variables have affected structure X, or to what extent ? Or, are all of these variables too to be quantified for reference purposes, assuming that they do lend themselves to quantification. Whilst we certainly share Almond's aspirations, we feel it may be premature for these prospects to obtain, given the complexity and diversity of political phenomena.

At a different level, Almond's theoretical model merits further criticism. The model, like Binder's model, seems to have been determined partly by the empirical data presented to him. Almond admits that,"much of its content was developed after the area sections were completed."[2] This has numerous implications for research, some of which have already been discussed elsewhere.[3] A similar point, and some additional

1. Almond and Coleman, op. cit., p.59.
2. Ibid., p.viii.
3. See above, pp.51-52.

criticism has been made by Heinz Eulau. He writes:

> "the particular country analyses seem to be quite independent of the theoretical chapter as well as to each other. Clearly a distinction should be made between conducting empirical research in different sites within a unified theoretical framework which is uniformly operationalized in all phases of the research process, and post-facto interpretation of separately conducted research, no matter how much that research may have been 'influenced' by prior theoretical understandings among individual researchers." -1.

Further, Almond's mere substitution in the case of output functions of descriptive categories by analytical ones seems to have accomplished little. That the bureaucracy and judiciary legislate, the executive adjudicates, and so forth, has been known for a long time, and the point is made by Almond himself. If no new concepts capable of explaining such mixed roles could be elaborated, then our thinking essentially remains wedded to the old triad and its concomitants, and in this Almond could have contributed more. However, he recognizes the shortcomings, but fails to offer a solution. He writes:

> While there is justification for having underplayed the governmental structures in this study, their
>
> neglect in the development of the theory of the functions of the polity represents a serious shortcoming. The threefold classification of governmental or output functions ... will not carry us very far in our efforts at precise comparison of the performance political systems. - 2.

Lastly, one of the alleged limitations of employing a functional-system theory as proposed by Almond is that it facilitates only "static" analysis.[3] This flows from the equilibrium or harmony implicit amongst the parts of the system. Thus, in studying the "developing" areas, such a framework can only provide analytical "snapshots" of political

---

1. Heinz Eulau, "Comparative Political Analysis: A Methodological Note," Midwest Journal of Political Science, November 1962, p.402.

3. Referring to the above model in a subsequent book, Almond and Powell write, "Our earlier formulation was suitable mainly for the analysis of political systems in a given cross section of time." Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1966), p.13.

2. Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.55.

systems with respect to the structures that perform given functions, and their styles of performance, but it cannot account for any changes to political systems. In short, the functional model does not lend itself towards facilitating a "dynamic" comparative political analysis of systems, and neither was this its intent. Such an objective was subsequently sought by Almond in his article of 1965.[1]

With respect to studying the problem of change, the model has proved itself capable of providing us with an analysis of change. This, however, reflects more the internal logic and inner consistency of the model, than a successful attempt to deal explicitly with the problem of change. After all, any model that seeks to facilitate the analysis of a political system should spell out the elements of the polity, the interrelationships between the various elements that comprise it, and perhaps the possible changes to such relationships, and the causes of such changes. That these have been spelled out by Almond in this model is a reflection of the strength of the model with respect to facilitating the analysis of changes in political systems.

With respect to understanding the effect, changes in political systems have upon the political system itself, we have noted the absence of a typology that may facilitate our inquiry. As Almond did not propose to answer this question, he has neither proposed such a typology. However, the model does not prevent analysts from developing typologies that may suit their needs[2] with respect to understanding change. The typology could be characterized by specific configurations of structures performing functions in specific styles. Such a typology could facilitate an analysis of change along two dimensions: Systemic Change and System

1. Gabriel A. Almond, "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems," World Politics, January 1965, pp. 183-214.

2. One author commenting upon typologies, suggests that the ideal-types be so constructed that they can act as guideposts for empirical research. "As the type is constructed, real societies may be arranged in order of the degree of resemblance to it." R. Redfield, "The Folk Society & Culture," in Louis Wirth (ed.) Eleven Twenty Six, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1940), p. 39.

Changes to political systems that result in the political system being characterized by the same TYPE over time could be viewed as Systemic Change, and changes that cause a political system to be characterized by another TYPE over time can be viewed as System Change. Clearly, the distinction between the two dimensions of change is dictated by the typology constructed. But, since typologies are heuristic devices, this is not a criticism. Insofar as the typology facilitates our understanding of change, to that extent, we may say it is useful, and the greater the understanding facilitated by the typology, the greater is the utility of the typology.

With respect to Almond's expressed desire of a "probabilistic theory of politics," we feel that such a theory would be useful from the perspective of understanding changes in political systems over time. Such a theory would lend statistical accuracy to the analysis of political systems, and since the analysis of change is related to that of political systems, statistical accuracy would aid the analysis of changes in political systems too. However, the feasibility of a probabilistic theory of a polity is quite another matter, and has been commented upon earlier in this chapter.

Another strength of the examined model lies in the fact that it has tackled a formidable task in shaping new concepts, such as political culture, role, structure, and so forth, to suit the contemporary discipline of politics. Further, the model has linked the concepts together in an intricate pattern to form the now much respected functional model of politics. That the model can further the analysis of change in political systems testifies to the utility of the concepts employed by Almond and the manner of their linking together to form a model.

As for certain shortcomings that have been identified above with respect to our immediate objective, it may be

pointed out that they do not constitute or reflect a failure of the model to fulfil certain ends. Surely, we cannot indict a model's capabilities for falling short in areas that it did not explicitly seek to cover.

CHAPTER VIII

GABRIEL A. ALMOND AND SIDNEY VERBA: THE CIVIC CULTURE*

Almond and Verba in their study have sought to ascertain, with the aid of quantitative indices, the cultural characteristics of five nations. These are then examined against a posited model of Civic Culture. The latter represents the characteristics of a functioning democratic political system.

Basically the model concerns itself with the interrelationships at a given point in time of numerous variables that help characterize the political culture of a political system. The political culture of a nation is, "the particular distribution of patterns of orientations towards political objects among the members of the nation."[1]

A three fold classification of orientations (i.e., cognitive, affective and evaluative)[2] and a three fold classification of objects of political orientation have been

---

*Gabriel A. Almond & Sidney Verba, The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations, (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1963).

1. Almond and Verba, op. cit., pp. 14, 15.
2. See above, p. 2 (for further elaboration).

identified. The threefold classification of objects of political orientation is: (a) specific rules or structures, such as legislative bodies, executives, or bureaucracies; (b) incumbents of roles, such as particular monarchs, legislators, and administrators, and (c) particular public Policies, Decisions, or Enforcements of decisions.[1]

Depending on the type of orientations the citizens of a nation have, we can, for analytical purposes, characterize nations with given types of political cultures. To further this end a three fold classification of political cultures as ideal-types has been proposed, (i.e., parochial, subject and participant culture.[2]

It may be noted that the above classification of cultures was intended to enable the cultural characterization of political systems on the basis of the particular distribution of patterns of orientations at a given point in time. In other words, the model has consciously concerned itself with facilitating the characterization of political cultures of systems on the basis of the orientations at given cross-sections in time. It follows then that no conscious attempt was made, for analytical purposes, to accomodate cultural changes in systems over time.[3]

---

1. Almond and Verba, op. cit., p. 15.

2. See above, p. 3.

3. Almond and Verba write "...our classification has left out entirely the dimension of political development and political change." op. cit., p. 21.

The Civic Culture introduces highly refined conceptualization for comparisons of political attitudes in five countries; Britain, the United States of America, Germany, Italy, and Mexico. Five thousand interviews were planned and gathered, and their interpretation took almost five years. Considering the magnitude of the problems encountered and the methods they devised to circumvent them, it is indeed a significant feat.

The purpose of this model are many and may be seen from different levels. It seeks to fulfill the need for a significant systematic comparison among polities based on quantified analysis. In doing so, it attempts to be novel. However, in so doing it is very often neither systematic, comparative, nor quantified. It contributes to the theory of democracy by suggesting that certain attitudinal attributes are characteristic of democracy and that certain structures help sustain it. Further, it seeks to identify the social and personality factors that augur well for the emergence and maintenance of a democratic civic order. It has improved, conceptualizations of broad cate gories and used methodological innovations.

The model is formulated in the first chapter and the methodological considerations take up the next. The main body of the book is then devoted to the careful reporting and

interpretation of the data collected within the model's frame-work. The major variables have to do with such phenomena as orientations toward the political system, politics and government, ability and level of participation, extent of co-operation as exhibited in the prevalence of ability to form organizations and as related to trust and confidence in leaders both supporting and opposing the citizen's views. The concluding chapter relates the concept of 'civic culture' to democratic theory.

The model is based on a host of carefully defined terms with their relations with one another carefully spelled out. The authors start with the concept of the political culture, which, when applied to a national context comprises, "the particular distribution patterns of orientations towards political objects among the members of the nation."[1] The rest of the discussion refined, elaborates, defines, and relates the constituent parts of this statement to each other.

With Talcott Parsons help, three types of orientations are presented:

> (1)"cognitive orientations," that is knowledge or belief about the political system, its role and the incumbents of these roles, its inputs, and its outputs; (2) "affective orientation," or feelings

---

1. Almond and Verbe, ibid., p. 15.

> about political systems, roles, personnel, and performance, and (3) "evaluative orientation," the judgements and opinions about political objects that typically involve the combination of value standards and criteria with information and feelings.[1]

Next, "the particular distribution of patterns" is considered. These are interpreted to mean either a "general" political system (toward which such sweeping sentiments as "big,""small," "patriotic" are expressed), input or output processes (these are defined in terms of David Easton's formulation), or "self" as political actor, at the other end of the scale.

The types of orientations are then related to the types of distribution patterns, with the purpose of conceptualizing the different kinds of political cultures.

It is the frequency of orientations toward the distribution patterns that determine the nature of the political culture. The absence of frequency of any type of orientation (that is, ignorance of, or indifference toward) any type of distribution pattern would indicate a "parochial political culture." A high frequency of affective orientation towards output patterns and the general political system, but its absence towards other patterns, sould be a "subjective political culture." Finally, a high frequency of "explicit" orientation towards all the

---

1. Ibid., p. 15.

the distribution patterns (i.e., general political systems, input process, output process, and self as active participant) would be a "participant political culture."

However, very few political cultures are of such a homogeneous nature that they fit one category or another. What is more, their "mixed" character can be of two kinds: (i) an orientation toward the pattern of attributes may not be uniform (i.e., it may be "subject" in one case and "participant" in the other), and (ii) political cultures themselves may exhibit a mixture of characteristics of one kind and another (i.e., an overwhelmingly participant political culture may have pockets of subject and parochial cultures).

In order that a citizen's attitudes towards effective performance may be discerned, three further concepts are introduced to relate political cultures to political structures. These are, "congruence, threshholds, and proportions." A congruent political culture would match with, or, be appropriate for a particular political structure. "In general, a parochial, subject, or participant culture would be most congruent with, respectively, a traditional political structure, a centralized authoritarian structure, and a democratic political structure."[1] Since incongruent relationships are

1. Ibid., p. 21.

quite frequent, their further classification, it would appear, is required. When related to the types of orientations, this process may yield a scale. When frequencies of all types of orientations are positive (i.e., a congruent political system prevails) an "allegiant" political culture would exist; when some type(s) of orientations are strong while others are weak, an "apathetic" political culture; and when the orientations are either weak, indifferent, or negative, an "alienized" political culture.

Since most systems are incongruent, the three types of political cultures (parochial, subject, and participant) may also be seen as combinations: "parochial-subject," "subject-participant," and "parochial-participant." These combinations are the only ones selected because of their occurence in the past or present. "Parochial-subject" political culture was the initial stage toward political development in the history of many nations; and "subject-participant" was their next stage. However, there is nothing inevitable about political development proceeding through these categories; a complete halt or even regression is just as possible. "Parochial-participant" political culture is characteristic of the new states. The existence within it of the extremities is the source of much instability.

The prevalence of heterogeneous political systems necessitates some further refinement of concepts. Within each political culture there are likely to exist pockets of different cultures. The latter are called subcultures and may be of two kinds: (1) a kind of subculture that denies legitimacy to the political system, and (2) one characterized by disagreement with the policies and orientations of the predominant culture, but not questioning its legitimacy.

A similar distinction may also be drawn in the role cultures of those that fill the positions in the specialized structures; e.g., army, party, communications. The differences in their cultures may stem from the procedures or requirements of recruitment, or in the process of induction into the roles after recruitment. The extent of the differences would be significant, but more so would be their nature: whether they do or do not question the political system's legitimacy.

For theoretical purposes, "Civic Culture" is contrasted with democratic polities views of their own political culture as it is described in civic manuals for citizenship training. These stress citizen's participation, adequate flow of information, "rational" choice in casting votes, and so forth. The essential characteristics are activity, rationality, and involvement; it may be called the "rationalist-activity" model.

"Civic Culture", on the other hand, shares some of these attributes, but actually falls short of meeting these criteria fully. It is a mixed culture, combining different orientations, cultures and incongruencies. Its heterogeneity includes passivity, traditionality and parochial values.

The civic culture is apt for democracy as it helps maintain that fine balance upon which a democratic polity supposedly rests. The nature of this balance and the civic culture's contribution to it need explanation.

The hallmark of any democracy is the check, control, and influence the masses can have over the governmental power. The issue here is of giving power to the government officials and yet keeping them responsive to the masses' needs. But surely giving the officials power implies a degree of passivity on the part of the masses. Any conflict is therefore channelled through the established institutional structures of a democratic system: e.g., formal and informal checks, and/or elections. It is also reconciled in the attitudes of citizens, as the survey showed. In this respect, the authors suggest that no danger exists to the existence of the political system itself. Referring to politics, they write "as much as our data suggest and as the data from many other studies confirm, is not the uppermost problem in his (i.e., the citizen's) mind."[1]

1. Ibid., p. 482.

A different kind of balance is also called for in the "Civic Culture." This is between cleavage and consensus. Since democracy is seen as a choice among alternatives, there are bound to be differences as to which alternative should be chosen. While this provides for cleavage, an essential condition of democracy, it should not cut so deep as to threaten the existence of the system. Hence, an overriding consensus is necessary which will adjust differences. Data on social trust and co-operativeness, and attitudes towards primary groups substantiate this view. Appeals to overriding considerations such as solidarity of the political system and "rules of the game" are relevant here. So also is the tradition of "loyal opposition."

Despite the above, it is important to note that the model permits an examination of the factors that may lead to changes in political cultures over time. Indeed, our first objective here is to examine the factors that lead to changes in political cultures over time.

Given that the political culture of a nation is the particular distribution of patterns of orientations towards political objects among the members of the nation, it follows then that changes in the particular distribution of patterns of orientations towards political objects among the members of the given nations lead to changes in its political culture.

In speaking of changes in the "particular distribution of patterns of orientations" we are, from an analytical perspective, essentially speaking of two kinds of changes: (a) changes in the patterns of orientations, and (b) changes in the particular distribution of orientations.[1] We shall examine each briefly.

In terms of changes in the pattern of orientations, any given political culture is a cultural "mix", i.e., it includes orientations of all three kinds—parochial, subject and participant. Thus a "parochial," "subject," or "participant" political culture includes all the above three types of orientations. Further, any one or more of the given patterns of orientations can change over time; i.e., a "parochial" orientation can change into a "subject" or a "participant" orientation.

Changes in the orientations of individuals can be caused by many factors. For example, by changes in the relationships between patterns of social interaction; by changes in the relation between organizational affiliation and activity and political competence and participation; by

---

1. These may respectively be viewed as the qualitative and the quantitative components of a culture. Changes in an orientation, from a parochial to a subject or participant orientation can be seen as a qualitative change, and changes in the particular distribution or orientations can be seen as a quantitative change.

changes in the political attitudes effected by patterns of participation in family, school, work-group; and by changes in the culture itself.

Further, changes in orientations along our threefold classification are not effected at the expense of earlier orientations. In other words, a new orientation does not replace an earlier one. Instead, it acts as an additional stratum, though, to be sure, it does not leave the earlier orientations unchanged. In this respect, Almond and Verba write: "The participant culture does not supplant the subject and parochial patterns of orientations. The participant culture is an additional stratum that may be added to and combined with the subject and parochial culture." In addition they write, "The parochial orientations must adapt when new and more specialized orientations enter the picture, just as both parochial and subject orientations change when participant orientations are acquired."[1]

With reference to changes in the particular distribution of orientations, it should be noted that since all types of political cultures are in fact cultural "mixes," we have all

1. Almond and Verba, op. cit., p. 20.

three types of orientations in any given culture. The criteria by which political cultures are designated depends on the particular distribution of orientations. Therefore, if the particular distribution of orientations changes, from say a majority of parochial orientations to a majority of subject or participant orientations, then clearly the designation of the given political culture will also change. For the purposes of empirically ascertaining these orientations at a given point in time, Almond and Verba have outlined methods for obtaining quantitative indices. However, the precise criteria by which a particular distribution of orientations is translated into given political cultures has not been spelled out. Researchers can develop their own guidelines to suit their specific objectives.

Having examined the concepts of "patterns of orientations" and "particular distribution of orientations," we have shown how changes to these may occur, and the relationship of such changes to other components of the culture. In addition, it may be noted that changes in the patterns of orientations and/or in the particular distribution of orientations must lead to changes in the political culture.

In examining political systems with respect to changes in their culture, we find that further complications are involved. These flow from the fact that each kind of polity

(i.e., traditional, authoritarian, and democratic) has only one form of structure that is congruent with its own culture.[1] Hence, changes in the culture of a polity, when uncompensated by corresponding changes in the structure of the same polity, may lead to incongruence between structure and culture. Such incongruence or instability in turn induces further changes in the structure(s) and/or culture of the polity. The actual extent and nature of these changes cannot be logically inferred, but have to be determined empirically.

Further, such incongruence for various reasons may be a common feature of numerous political systems,[2] and because of their widespread prevalence, Almond and Verba have identified three types of systemically mixed political cultures; viz., the parochial-subject culture, the subject-participant culture, and the parochial-participant culture.[3] The factors that lead to changes in these types of political cultures are

---

1. "A congruent political structure would be one appropriate for the culture; in other words, where political cognition in the population would tend to be accurate and where affect and evaluation would tend to be favorable. In general, a parochial, subject, or participant culture would be most congruent with, respectively, a traditional political structure, a centralized authoritarian structure, and a democratic political structure." For further elaboration see, ibid., pp. 21-22.

2. For example, Almond and Verba write: "Particularly in these decades of rapid cultural change, the most numerous political systems may be those that have failed to attain congruence, or are moving from one form of polity to another." Ibid., p. 21.

3. For an elaboration of the characteristics of these types of political cultures, see Ibid., pp. 23-26.

the same as for any other type of political culture. These have already been identified above. However, with respect to the political cultures of political systems, there are certain limiting factors that help to determine changes in culture. The nature of the culture itself is a limiting factor. Since the political and psychological dimensions of any political culture have great significance for the stability and performance of the political system, it follows that they would also help determine further changes to the said system. As a logical extension of the above argument, when changes in the culture of a political system occur, the manner in which the shift takes place helps determine further changes in its culture. In this respect, Almond and Verba write, "The way in which the shift from a parochial to a subject culture is solved greatly affects the way in which the shift from a subject to a participant culture takes place."[1]

Thus far we have examined the factors that lead to changes in political cultures, with and without respect to political systems. The second and final objective of this chapter is to examine the effect of changes within political cultures upon the type of political culture itself. For analytical purposes we can view this along two dimensions: Intra-Cultural Changes and Cultural Changes.

1. Ibid., p. 24.

Intra-Cultural Changes encompass all alterations in the relationships of the components of a given culture-type, provided the analytical culture-type itself remains unchanged. Thus it would encompass changes in the relationships of the elements within each component, and changes in the relationship between the components of a given culture. Where such changes do not, in toto, add up to a change in the culture-type itself, we have an Intra-Cultural type of change.

However, prior to an examination of this dimension of change it is implicit that we have knowledge of the analytical characteristics of the various culture-types. As noted above,[1] Almond and Verba have broadly spelled out the cultural characteristics of three ideal types and of three mixed types of political cultures. For operational purposes, the Almond and Verba classification is rather ambiguous and needs greater precision, and possibly some refinement. Alternatively, a new classification embodying these characteristics can be developed and employed.

Cultural Changes occur when the net effect of changes within the components of a culture and between the relationships of the components of a culture is a change in a particular

1. See above, pp. 107, 110.

culture-type itself. The characteristics of the various culture-types are matters of definition, and whatever the degree of refinement such a classification may possess, its utility from our immediate perspective can only be empirically determined.

The whole theory of civic culture is inductively derived and hence some attention is paid to methodological problems. Almond and Verba's concern is unequivocal. "The ultimate criteria," they write," is the method by which...(the facts) are gathered."[1]

The method they employ is that of survey research. The influence and insights of voting studies is obvious and it is openly acknowledged. However, their study differs in that its focus is attitudes and not elections. It is cross-national, as opposed to national, and they have availed themselves of previous insights gained from interpolity comparisons.

Almond and Verba approach the political orientations directly by asking the people what they think and feel. This was done by proceeding with a carefully worded questionnaire through qualified interviewers to a representative sample of the citizens. By asking the same questions in the five countries, they have made comparison possible. Broad enough terms for political phenomena were employed in order that the

1. Ibid., p. 43.

study may have approximately the same meaning in all the cultures to which the interviewees belong. By so doing, they managed to conceptualize in a useful manner: one that avoids ambiguity.

Survey research has its own problems, and one that covers five countries has as many more. For comparative purposes, the data must be equal in all the five countries. How does one take note of the differences in language, techniques of interviewing, cultural attitudes towards being interviewed, point of time in a nation's history or the proximity to a major event when the interview takes place. Pre-testing as many of the controllable factors as possible does help the achievement of better results, but it must be borne in mind that all the factors do not lend themselves to pre-testing. Almond & Verba write, "No matter what sort of study is contemplated, one must contend with these difficulties."[1] Yet another problem associated with equivalence of data is that of its interpretation. A broad conceptualization may provide categories for political attitudes (e.g., political participation), but it does not indicate how it should be measured. Indices, of course, can be drawn up, but it is difficult to make them broad enough to be equivalent. Voting, party membership, interest group formation

1. Ibid., p. 61.

and so forth may have one kind of meaning and significance in one culture and have a different meaning and significance in another culture. How then, are the data on each of such indices to be interpreted? A related issue concerns the object of orientation. When an individual's orientation toward an aspect of government, let us say, has been described, its interpretation may still present difficulties. Each orientation may be the product of any number of different experiences within a given political culture. Similarly, the problem of finding comparable social groups—in education, income, class, and so forth exist.

While explicitly stating the difficulties, Almond and Verba are eager to show that they are inherent in any kind of survey research; even a survey confined to one nation cannot completely eliminate all the possibilities of error and bias. As a partial remedy, they indicate five measures that they undertook to "maximize comparability." These measures were:

> (a) steering away from political institutions and formal structures of government; (b) the use of broad variables, like "trust", in order to overcome criticism of ethnocentricity; (c) the stress on the perception of the interviewee himself, in order to overcome the object of orientation difficulty; (d) the reliance on a cluster or pattern of of related indicators, rather than reliance on one; and (e) the delineation of groups by broad criteria, rather than by narrow and specific ones, in order to obtain equivalency.

Their attempts at conceptualization are admirable, but

their usefulness remains to be proved. Some of their concepts have not been put to use in either the collection or interpretation of data. For example, the set of terms introduced to relate political culture to political structure, such as congruence, threshholds, propositions, have not been used. The latter two have not even been defined. It is unfortunate that such relationships were not pursued, for they may have had possible connections with political orientations. Neglect to explore such possible connections have detracted from the study's almost exhaustive character.

The model describes the component parts of the civic culture. Having identified them, it endeavors to relate them to democracy. This results, essentially, in a contrast between the civic culture and the rationality-activist model of democracy. Subsequently, however, the contrast seems to dissolve into compatability, They write:

> The civic culture appears to be particularly appropriate for a democratic political system. It is not the only form of democratic political culture, but it seems to be the one most congruent with a stable political system.[1]

Some confusion results from this. If the civic culture is the empirical reflection of a functioning democracy, as they

---

1. Ibid., p. 498.

stress[1], then the concern for the appropriateness of one for the other amounts either to tautological reasoning or to an inadequate clarification of the meanings of "civic culture" and "democratic political system."

Finally, a technical point may be raised: the size of the "representative" sample chosen for each country. On what basis was 1,000 interviews in each country chosen? If treating each country on an "equal" basis is the objective, then the question of the representativeness of a sample vis-a-vis the universe can also demand other figures, on the basis of population, area, history, education, and so forth. Do not these indices influence the size of a representative sample? Such issues are important in any cross-national research, and Almond and Verba's neglect of them is a weakness.

Formerly, we have noted that the model is a static one, and the study of the political cultures of five nations by Almond and Verba is based on cross-sectional data empirically obtained. However, by separating and examining the various analytical variables we have found that it is possible to study

---

1. They write, "We have argued that these two nations (the United States and the United Kingdom) must clearly approximate the model of the civic culture..." Ibid., p. 493.

changes in political cultures over time. That such a study would be pregnant with difficulties is not denied. But given that it was not the formal intention of the authors to facilitate such a study, any difficulties that do arise in the performance of such an exercise are not necessarily to be viewed as criticisms of Almond and Verba's work.

One of the difficulties is central to the study of culture change, and involves the linking of citizen's orientations to their performance. The authors write, "The relationship between political culture and political structure becomes one of the most significant researchable aspects of the problem of political stability and change."[1] Theoretically, it would seem that the performance of individuals would match their orientations. But Almond and Verba argue that this is not necessarily the case, and for purposes of studying the same they have introduced the concepts of, "proportions, thresh-holds and congruence."[2] However, having introduced these concepts to cover an important aspect of political phenomenon, we find it extraordinary that two of these concepts, i.e., "threshholds and proportions" have not even been defined, and

---

1. Ibid., p. 34.

2. Ibid., pp. 20-23.

that none of the concepts have been employed in their empirical study.

For the purposes of studying changes over time, the study of citizens performances and their relationship to orientations are essential for at least two reasons: (a) incongruence between orientation and performance can in many instances lead to changes in the orientations of individuals and changes in the orientations we have already noted, does lead to changes in the political culture, and (b) the performance of individuals at any given point in time acts as a limiting condition on further changes that the culture may undergo.

Another difficulty may be seen in Almond and Verba's classification of political cultures. In defining their five nations by culture-types, the authors have not specified the precise criteria by which a particular distribution of orientations is labelled X rather than Y. Indeed, we may ask, at what point does a parochial culture become a subject culture? From an explicit point of view, the question remains unanswered. In a sense, the lack of precise cut-off points seems ironical in a study which is highly oriented to quantitative indices. Having employed quantitative methods for ascertaining the different types of orientations existent in a nation at a given point in time, it was but a simple step to develop a mathema-

tical scale for assigning culture-types to political systems. Not only have Almond and Verba failed to carry their mathematical zeal to its logical end, they have even failed to specify the criteria by which culture-types may be designated or were designated by them in their study. Such an outline could have served as methodological guidelines for future researchers.

In a model that is exemplary in many respects, such lacunae are a pity.

CHAPTER IX

GABRIEL A. ALMOND AND G. BINGHAM POWELL. COMPARATIVE POLITICS: A DEVELOPMENTAL APPROACH.*

The model is offered as a response, tentative in nature, to the challenges that the discipline of comparative government faces; viz (a) the search for comprehensive scope, (b) search for realism, (c) search for precision, and (d) the search for theoretical order. The absence of these quests are also the characteristics that are associated with the 'traditional' approach which has dominated the field until recent times, and which was criticized by Macridis.[1]

The emphasis of the proposed model is on attitude and behavior, rather than on institutions and ideology. Incorporated within the proposed functional model, which is offered for the purposes of facilitating political analysis, description and comparison, is the variable of "political development."[2]

---

* Gabriel A. Almond and G. Bingham Powell, Jr. Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, (Boston & Toronto: Little, Brown & Co., 1966).

1. Roy C. Macridis, The Study of Comparative Government, (New York: Random House, 1955).

2. This is discussed below, see p. 122.

Almond and Powell write, "Political change is one of the most pervasive and fundamental concerns of our analysis."[3] Further the concept of political development was introduced into the model in order to be more realistic with respect to the characterization of political systems. They recognize that change is the law of life, and that political systems are no exception. All political systems are always developing. A genuine comparative politics must be able to compare political systems both over time and over space. It is the achievement of Almond and Powell that their model can be employed for comparing political systems, whether they be primitive, democratic or totalitarian, Western or non-Western. It can also be employed for comparing political systems at different levels or stages of "development." With this scope in mind, the authors write, "We have emphasized political development because we believe that this approach enables us to lay the basis for prediction as well as for description and explanation."[2] Indeed, the authors have lavished great care and attention in developing a framework capable of

---

1. Almond & Powell, op.cit., p.41.

2. Ibid., p.301.

facilitating a dynamic system and process analysis of political systems. In so doing, they overcome the static bias of earlier functional-system models,[1] which at best could only provide simultaneous "snapshots" of political systems.

Apart from facilitating comparative analysis of political systems, the model is also a tentative attempt in the direction of a comprehensive theory of political development. Empirical data obtained through the application of the model will advance us towards this end. Three basic exercises pointing towards the theory have been outlined:

(1) a model of the political system has been presented and the ways in which description and comparison can take place have been elaborated with respect to the performance of political systems; i.e., capability function, conversion patterns, and system-maintenance and adaptation processes; (2) a typology of political systems has been presented with respect to the basic developmental structural and cultural characteristics. The types are compared with respect to their relationships to different levels and patterns of performance; (3) these various types of political systems have been related

to their

1. See, for example, Almond's functional model in Almond and Colemen, The Politics of the Developing Areas, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1960), pp. 3-64.

to their historical experience with respect to the four identified, so-called problems of system-development.

The proposed model follows a functional approach to comparative politics and is developed directly out of the functional theory of the Federalist Papers and the separation-of-powers theory of government; focusing on the functions of legislation, administration, and adjudication. However, for enabling comparison and description of the contemporary distinctive processes of political action, the original tripartite political functions have been extended to include the political functions of interest articulation, interest aggregation, and communication. The latter three functions have been added as analytical tools to take cognizance of the new institutions that have emerged since the publication of the Federalist Papers, and whose functions precede or impinge on the original three functions.[1]

Like the systems theory of the Federalist Papers, Almond and Powell too talk in terms of 'systems,' though they give the concept greater explicitness. Further, in order to avoid the static implications of systems theory,[2] the

---

1. The functional-system model of Almond and Powell is distinguished from Easton's and Deutsch's models in our analysis further on. See below p.125.

2. See our analysis of Almond's functional model, p.86.

concept of political system has been modified to permit the exploration of developmental patterns of political systems. This is done by viewing political systems as "whole entities shaping and being shaped by their environments."[1] In other words, to tackle the processes of political development, the conception of the political system has been tailored to enable it to deal with the events that lead to political development; viz., the interaction of the political system with its domestic and international environment.

The model under investigation, like others involving Almond, employs "system" as its principal concept. Following Weber's formulation, the exercise of legitimate force is accepted as the distinguishing characteristic of a political system. Almond and Powell elaborating on the concept of a 'political system; write,

> When we speak of the political system, we include all the interactions which affect the use or threat of use of legitimate physical coercion. The political system includes...all structures in their political aspects. Among these are traditional structures such as kinship ties and caste groupings...anomic phenomena such as assassinations, riots,...formal organizations like parties, interest groups and media of communication.[2]

Further, implicit in the concept of the political system are its 'properties'. What these are and what their implications

---

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 14.

2. Ibid., p. 18.

are in any analysis are briefly re-iterated below.[1] The two key concepts in systems theory are Interdependence and boundary maintenance. Interdependence is characterized by a situation wherein the properties of one component in a system change, all the other components and the system as a whole are affected. Boundaries between the political system and its environment distinguishes the political system from other social systems. However, the political system's boundaries are subject to large fluctuations, given that a political system is composed of interacting roles[2] and structures[3] or set of interacting sub-systems,[4] and it will be noted below that these are subject to fluctuations themselves. The limits of these fluctuations are determined by the interaction process. System

---

1. The usefulness of the concept, its origins and development, its 'properties' and its implications for analysis have been spelled out in our outline to Almond's Model I, pp.63,64 and Almond's functional model pp.77-79.

2. Roles—"That particular part of the activity of individuals which is involved in political processes." Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 21. Individuals have non-political roles too. For example, the same individual may be a Member of Parliament, a lay preacher and a businessman. The concept of 'role' has been further refined by R.T. Holt "...role is defined solely in terms of actual behaviour; there is no 'belief-value' rule. In other words, we use the term role to refer to what is commonly identified, or 'real role' as opposed to 'ideal role'." See R.T. Holt, "A Proposed Structural-Functional Framework for Political Science," (Philadelphia:American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1965)--Functionalism in the Social Sciences, ed. Don Martindale, op. cit., p.87-88.

3. Structures—set of interrelated roles which make up the political system.

4. Subsystems—these consist of related and interacting roles—for example, legislatures, courts and pressure-groups.

theory usually divides an interaction process (i.e., 'system') into three phases: input-conversion-output. The inputs and outputs of a political system involve the political system with other social systems and can be viewed as its "transactions". The conversion process is internal to the political system. The boundaries of a political system thus extend to the outer ranges of its "transactions"; i.e., from the sources of its inputs to the effect of outputs on other social systems.

Other key concepts employed within the model are "structure" and "culture". Their importance lies in the fact that, "As we learn about the 'structure' and 'culture' of a political system, our capacity to characterize its properties, and to predict and explain its performance is improved."[1]

"Structure", we have already noted above, is a particular set of interrelated roles. For example, the formal behavior within a Court of law comprises a formal "structure". For the purposes of analyzing the development of political systems, two further concepts that are related to "structure" are employed in the model. First, the recruitment function; that is, the process by which individuals are recruited for the purposes of performing specific roles, whether old or new.

---

1. Almond and Powell, op.cit., p.24.

This function is essential if the system is to exist over time; i.e., keep its roles manned and its structures functioning. Secondly, the concept of role or structure "Differentiation" is employed to indicate aspects of development or transformation of the Political system. Almond and Powell write,

> By "differentiation" we refer to the processes whereby roles change and become more specialized or more autonomous or whereby new types of roles are established or new structures and sub-systems emerge or are created. When we speak of role differentiation and structural differentiation, we refer not only to the development of new types of roles and the transformation of older ones; we refer also to changes which may take place in the relationship between roles, between structures, or between sub-systems.[1]

"Culture" consists of the attitudes, beliefs, values and skills which are found within an entire population. The political culture of a society can be viewed as "the underlying propensities of a political system or the psychological dimension of a political system." Given that the actual performance of a political system is to a great degree regulated by its psychological dimension, the study of the latter is important in assessing the former.

Two concepts related to political culture and employed in the model for the purposes of analyzing "development" are "Political socialization" and "Secularization". At one point we are told that Political socialization is the process whereby

---

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 22.

political attitudes and values are inculcated as children become adults and as adults are recruited into roles."[1] Further on we are informed that this is the process "by which political cultures are maintained and changed."[2] Secularization has been defined as "the process whereby men become increasingly rational, analytical, and empirical in their political action."[3] The philosophy and implications of such a view will be examined in an analysis further on.

In employing the developmental concepts of "structural differentiation" and "cultural secularization", the authors have rightfully pointed out that no unilinear pattern of development is implied[4] and that historical evidence shows both positive and negative development with respect to structures and cultures.[5] As such, the concept of "development" can be viewed synonymously with "change".

---

1. Ibid., p. 24.

2. Ibid., p. 64.

3. Ibid., p. 24.

4. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 25; also see S.P. Huntington, "Political Development and Political Decay," World Politics, April 1965.

5. S.N. Eisenstadt, The Political Systems of Empires, (New York: Free Press, 1962).

Thus far, the political system has been described as consisting of inter-acting political roles, structures and sub-systems, and of underlying psychological propensities which affect these inter-actions. In terms of Input-Output analysis, such a process consists of inputs from the environment (other social systems), or, from within the political system itself, the conversion of these inputs within political systems and the production of outputs into the environment. Outputs may produce changes in the environment and these in turn may affect the political system (i.e., "feedback"). The flow of inputs and outputs includes "transactions" between the political system and the components of its domestic and international environments. The inputs of a political system can come from three sources: domestic society, the political elites within the political system, and the international environment.

On the output side of the process, four classes of "transactions" initiated by the political system have been identified. Different kinds of political systems have different kinds of responses to demands. The "transactions" take the form of extractions; regulations of behavior; allocations or distributions of goods and services, opportunities and so forth; and symbolic outputs. Extractions take the form of tribute, booty, taxes or personal services. Regulations of behavior

can take various forms and can affect the whole gamut of human behavior and relations. Allocations or distributions ofggoods and services, opportunities, status, and so forth is a self explanatory "transaction" and symbolic outputs include affirmations of values, dipplays of political symbols, statements of policies and intent.[1]

Accepting the utility of functional analysis, Almond and Powell examine the functional aspects of political systems and suggest that by comparing the performance of political structures and the regulatory role of political culture, as they fulfill common functions in all systems, it is possible to analyze and compare different political systems.

The functioning of any political system can be viewed on three different levels according to Almond and Powell. These are (1) in terms of capability functions; (2) conversion functions and (3) system maintenance and adaptation functions.

Capability functions describe a political system's overall performance as a unit in its environment: i.e., How it is shaping this environment and how it is being shaped by it? The categories of capability are thus simply ways of talking about the input and output flows of the political system. The categories of capability are: regulative, extractive, distributive and responsive. Conversion function or "processes" are

---

1. Almond and Powell, op.cit.,p.27.

internal to the system. They are the ways in which a system transforms inputs into outputs. In a political system this involves the ways in which "demands" and "supports" are transformed into authoritative decisions and are implemented. The conversions processes may be analyzed and compared according to a six-fold functional scheme by examining the ways in which the following functions are performed: (a) Interest articulation, (b) Interest aggregation, (c) Rule making, (d) Rule application, (e) Rule adjudication, and (f) Communication. System Maintenance and Adaptation functions involve the ways in which individuals are recruited and trained for political roles; i.e., recruitment and socialization functions. The ways in which these two functions are performed affects the pshchological dimension of the political system, which in turn conditions the performance of a political system. Before a comparison of Political Systems can take place, there must be in Hecksher's words, "...a fundamental similarity (technically, an 'isomorphism') between the two objects compared..."[1] If political systems are to be compared in terms of the relationship between functions and structures,

1. Gunnar Hecksher, The Study of Comparative Government and Politics, (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1957), p. 73.

it must be agreed that functions and structures are common to all political systems. Thus the universal characteristics of political systems are spelled out. These have been dealt with in a more thorough manner elsewhere.[1] Briefly re-iterated, they are: (a) Universality of political functions, (b) Political Structure, (c) Multifunctionality of political structures, and (d) Mixed cultural characteristics. Having defined the characteristics of political systems and the concepts related to it, together with their interrelationships, we can now proceed to examine how political systems may be compared.

At one level, political systems can be described and compared on the basis of the tri-partite scheme of functional analysis; i.e., the performance of political systems in their environments (their capabilities), their input-conversion-output patterns (their conversion functions and structures), and their system maintenance and adaptation processes (socialization and recruitment), and the interrelationships among these three levels of functions. By emphasizing the performance of political systems, the focus is on 'what is' and this undeniably enables the classification and comparison of systems to be more effective.

---

1. See our outline of Almond's functional model, pp. 77-79.

Whilst the above approach facilitates comparison, another manner in which comparison can be made is also suggested. The latter approach is a dynamic one in as much as it enables us to deal with the growth and development of political systems. It is proposed in the form of a classification of political systems with respect to their degree of structural differentiation and cultural secularization, these two being the major independent variables. They are also related to each other.

The classification is based upon the contributions of numerous theorists, classical and contemporary, whose concerns were not limited to politics. The classification proposes three major classes which are further divided to yield sixteen sub-classes of political systems and covers a wide range extending from Primitive Bands to Premobilized Democratic Modern Systems.[1] According to the degree of structural differentiation and cultural secularization, the three main classes are:

1. Systems with intermittent political structures have a minimum of structural differentiation and a concomitant diffuse, parochial culture.

2. Systems with differentiated governmental-political structures having a high degree of 'subject' culture.[2]

---

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 217.

2. For an elaboration of the concepts of 'subject' and 'participant' culture, see our outline of Almond and Verba's model.

3. Systems in which differentiated political infrastructures have developed along with some form of 'participant' political culture.[1]

Each of the sixteen forms of political systems have been discussed in some detail by Almond and Powell and each of these 'levels of development' are associated with aspects of the functioning of particular classes of political systems; i.e., their conversion characteristics, capabilities and system maintenance patterns. For example, the authors indicate that the 'patrimonial kingdom' had a higher level of development than others within the same class, and this is spelled out in the following manner, which indicates the relationships between the variables;

> The 'higher' level of development refers to differences in structural differentiation and cultural secularization, and these are related to differences in conversion patterns, in levels of political system capability, and in socialization and recruitment processes.[2]

They write elsewhere, referring to the relationships found,

> Thus, in comparing the characteristics of modern political systems or classes of them, we find patterns of performance and capability associated with these powerful variables: level of differentiation and secularization, and subsystem autonomy.[3]

Thus by structuring the comparison around the development concepts, Almond and Powell have presented a model

---

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 217.

2. Ibid., p. 304. See also diagram on p. 308.

3. Ibid., p. 307.

which enables the comparison of systems which are alike in respect to one set of major characteristics, while different in another. For example, we can systematically compare the characteristics associated with democratic systems at different levels of development, and go on to formulate general hypotheses about the kinds of associated relationships. Series of such hypotheses and their empirical applicability will in the course of time contribute towards a theory of development. Whilst, the authors have proposed numerous hypotheses based on impressionistic and historical data woven around the "level of development" concept, they have done so in the hope of expanding a theory of development, though their own propositions for our purposes can be said to constitute a theory of development, however ill-refined and ill-related.[1]

Another problem to which a theory of political development would seek answers is; Why has a particular political system developed along certain lines? How can we make sense of the different patterns of political development? The answers to these questions are sought and are important, if we agree that a theory must explain and predict. In order to

---

1. Almond and Powell, op.cit., p.302. - "Our classification contains elements of prediction and generalization, as well as a basis for more refined developmental theory - that of specifying relationships between more and more complex systems and environmental factors - towards which political science can build."

understand the "why" of development, the authors have proposed a four-fold classification of system-adaptation problems or challenges based upon Western experience. The contention of the authors is that the system-responses to a specific system-challenge help determine its pattern of development and its potentialities. "Development," we are told, "results when the existing structure and culture of the political system is unable to cope with the problem or challenge which confronts it without further structural differentiation and cultural secularization."[1]

It is the merit of Almond and Powell's developmental approach that it can also enable the classification of political systems according to their political past, an important factor that helps determine and shape their future. In other words, the way in which the political system responds to the four types of challenges, or problems, has to be described in terms of the development of the three functional levels which have already been pointed out. The relationship of these levels to degrees of differentiation and secularization has been shown.

---

1. Ibid., p.34.

The four system development problems or challenges, based upon Western experience are:[1]

1. "State building": this is the problem of penetration and integration. Basically it is a structural problem, i.e., what is involved is primarily a matter of the differentiation of new roles, structures, and subsystems which penetrate the countryside.

2. "Nation building": this refers to the process whereby loyalty and commitment are transferred from the local and parochial level to the larger central political system. As such, it emphasizes the cultural aspects of political development.

3. "Participation": the demands from groups and individuals in society for a greater say in the decision-making processes. This leads to the formation of a political infrastructure which expects to be involved in decision-making.

4. "Distribution": the pressure from the domestic society to employ coercive power for the purposes of redistributing income, wealth, opportunity and status.

If the political system successfully confronts the challenge of state and nation-building, how is this reflected in terms of new roles and structures, and in its recruitment processes to these roles and structures, and how does it create the attitudes and propensities appropriate to the new pattern of of operations in the political system? Thus, by examining the responses to system challenges with respect to structural and cultural changes, theories can be developed for predicting the responses of political systems to specific challenges and at the same time political systems can also be "engineered" to successfully meet challenges.

---

1. Almond and Powell, op.cit., pp.35-37.

Having examined the model for its general characteristics, it is our objective here to examine how the model deals with the problem of change over time. In specific terms we wish to examine the factors that cause political systems to change over time and the effect such changes have upon political systems. In proceeding to examine the model with respect to the above, it is useful to view the interactions that comprise the political system in terms of inputs-conversion-outputs process. Such a process consists of inputs from the environment or from within the political system itself, the conversion of these inputs within the system, and the production of outputs into the environment.

Following the example of David Easton, inputs into the system may be divided into two types: demands and supports.[1] For the purposes of illustration, examples of each type of inputs may be noted. Demands are based on desires including those for (a) the allocation of goods and services, (b) the regulation of human behaviour, (c) participation in the political system, (d) communication and information, and so forth. Such demands may be in various forms, combinations and degrees of intensity. Examples of types of support are:

1. David Easton, "An Approach to the Analysis of Political Systems," World Politics, April 1957, pp. 383-408.

(a) material supports, (b) participatory supports, (c) obedience to law and regulations, (d) attention paid to governmental communication, and so forth. Generally speaking, demands affect the policies or goals of the system, while supports such as goods and services, obedience and deference, provide the resources which enable the political system to carry out its goals.

On the output side of the process, four classes of transactions initiated by the political system have been identified.[1] These usually correspond closely to the supports that have been cited above and are (a) extraction, in the form of booty, taxes or personal services; (b) regulations of behavior in various forms and embracing the whole gamut of human behavior and relations; (c) allocation or distribution of goods and services, opportunities, honors, and the like; and (d) symbolic outputs, including affirmations of values, displays of political symbols, statements of policies and intentions, and so forth.

Lastly, we may note that the flow of inputs includes transactions between the political system and the components of its domestic and foreign environments, and inputs may come

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 27.

from any one of three sources; i.e., the domestic society, the political elites, and the international environment.

In examining how the model tackles the problem of change over time, we have found that it offers two avenues along which the said problem may be viewed; viz., in terms of "levels of functioning," and in terms of "development."

An analysis stressing Levels of Functioning examines political systems as whole entities shaping and being shaped by their environment.[1] To facilitate analysis, the functioning of political systems is viewed on three different levels, which may alternatively be seen as three points of view: (1) In terms of the operation of the political system as a unit; (2) its own internal operations; and (3) "system maintenance and adaptation.

The operation of the political system as a unit in its relations to other social systems and to the environment are viewed in terms of its "capabilities." The authors write, "When we speak of the capabilities of a political system, we are looking for an orderly way to describe its over-all performance in its environment."[2] Towards this end, four

---

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., pp. 13,14.

2. Ibid., p. 28.

categories of capability have been offered: viz, "regulative, extractive, distributive and responsive," These categories are simply ways of talking about the flows of activity into and out of the political system.. They tell us, in other words, how a system is performing in its environment, how it is shaping the environment and how it is being shaped by it.

The second level of functioning is internal to the system. Here we may refer to the "conversion processes." The conversion processes or functions are the ways systems transform inputs into outputs, or the ways in which demands and supports are transformed into authoritative decisions and implemented. A sixfold functional scheme has been provided for the purposes of facilitating analysis, and we have already elaborated them in our outline of the model.

The final level of functioning is that of "system maintenance and adaptation functions." This refers to the re: recruitment of personnel to perform the various roles that embody the political system, and the socializations of such personnel towards the performance of roles. These functions do not directly enter into the conversion processes of the system, but they affect the internal efficiency and propensities of the system and hence condition its performance.

Changes in any of the inputs of the system (i.e., the demands or supports of the system) lead to changes in the "capabilities" of the system. The precise nature of such changes are a matter for empirical observation, and political systems may be characterized by different categories of capability. Further, changes in the "capabilities" of the system lead to changes in the other levels of functioning of the same system. In this respect, Almond and Powell write, "A change in capability will be associated with changes in the performance of the conversion functions, and these changes in turn will be related to changes in political socialization and recruitment."[1] And insofar as changes in the latter two levels of functioning lead to changes in the inputs of the system, further changes will be occasioned.

Thus, in examining the factors that can cause changes in political systems, we find that changes in any one of the two components of inputs (demands and supports) leads to changes in the other levels of functioning of the system. The above three levels of system functioning are but three ways of looking at a political system, andcchanges in one level lead to changes in the other two; such changes being initiated by changes in the inputs of the system.

---

1. ibid., p.30.

Finally, as no classificatory scheme linking levels of development to the inputs-outputs of a political system has been provided, we do not have an outline of various configurations of political system characteristics. In the absence of the latter we are unable to analytically assess the effects of specific changes upon political systems. Further, irrespective of the degree of change effected, we can at best only say that a change has occurred.

An analysis stressing an examination of change in terms of "development" is the second and final avenue along which the problem of change can be tackled with the aid of Almond and Powell's model. From the definition of "development,"[1] we may note that a political system is developing if it undergoes increasing structural differentiation and cultural secul-

---

1. "Development results when the existing structure and culture of the political system is unable to cope with the problem or challenge which confronts it without further structural differentiation and cultural secularization." - ibid., p.34. Structural differentiation in simple terms means a change in the roles that comprise a structure, and/or changes in the relationship of the roles that comprise the given structure. And since a political system is composed of a set of interacting roles or structures, any change in the roles or their relationships also involves a change in the political system itself.
Cultural secularization refers to changes in the psychological dimension of the political system. But given that a political system is but a set of interacting roles, it follows then that a change in the psychological dimension of the political system must also involve a change in the psychological dimension of the given set of interacting roles. And changes in the latter lead to changes in the roles themselves, and these, in turn lead to changes in the political system.
In short, when differentiation and secularization occur in a political system, we have change in the political system.

arization.[1] But as these involve changes in the political system, we can for the purposes of this model view the concept of development as a facet of change. Almond and Powell in referring to the developmental emphasis of the model write,"...we have to deal with those processes which maintain or change political system over time."[2]

We can now proceed to examine the factors that lead to development. According to Almond and Powell, "The events which lead to political development come from the international environment, from the domestic society, or from the political elites within the political system itself."[3] For example, threats to a political system from other political systems may lead it to review its resource organization and allocation, and/or to develop new roles, and/or to condition itself over time to meet the challenges. Internal sources of challenge to the system stem from changes in the patterns of commerce, agriculture, industrialization, and so forth. Such

---

1. Development as employed can be both positive and negative in scope--See, S.P. Huntington, "Political Development and Political Systems of Empires, (New York: Free Press of Gelencoe, 1962.)

2. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 22.

3. Ibid., p. 34.

changes may lead to demands by a rising middle-class for greater participation in the formulation and implementation of policy. The elites may pose a challenge to the system by making additional demands upon it for resources.

Whatever the precise impulses for political development may be, they necessarily involve a significant change in the magnitude and content of the flow of inputs into the political system. As the primary link between the environment, in its largest sense, and the political system, inputs play a significant part in determining changes to the political system. For example, if the demands far exceed the capabilities of the system, or the supports prove inadequate, then clearly the political system must undergo some systemic changes if it is to maintain itself over time. Alternatively, a system-change must take place.

For the purposes of facilitating system-developmental analysis, Almond and Powell have identified four types of challenges that may lead to political development in systems. The sequence listed below reflects the chronological order in which they developed in Western experience: (a) State-Building, (b) Nation-Building, (c) Participation, and (d) Distribution.[1]

---

1. For an elaboration, see p. 145 above.

In addition to the above system challenges, we may note below some environmental factors that help determine the capacity of a given political system to successfully face the system challenges confronting it. In this respect, Almond and Powell write, "We shall argue that the earlier historical experiences of political system as well as the environmental challenges to which they are currently exposed affect their propensities for change and set limits on the ways in which they can change."[1] Some environmental factors affecting political systems are:

(a) the stability of a system at any given point in time. This affects the performance of a political system and is heavily dependent upon the types of problems it faces.

(b) the developments (e.g., economic, and/or technical) in other social systems at a given point in time. These can and do affect the development of a given political system.

(c) the resources a political system can draw upon under various circumstances. This affects the manner in which the political system can tackle its problems.

(d) the functioning pattern of the system itself. This determines its ability to withstand fluctuations in its demands and supports.

(e) the responses of political elites to given political system challenges. This affects the manner in which the problem is tackled, and ultimately it affects the outcome.

Thus far we have examined the manner in which political systems are affected by events and impulses that lead to

---

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 215.

development, the origin of such events and impulses, the types of challenges political systems may encounter along the path of development, and the environmental factors that help shape the system-responses to any given system challenge. In short, we have examined the various factors that can lead to political system development over time.

We now propose to examine how the development of a system over time may be viewed analytically with the aid of the model. Towards facilitating this end we can employ the classificatory scheme proposed by Almond and Powell.[1] This is based on pairs of more or less continuous major variables which are closely associated with one another: differentiation and secularization. The system types within the classification differ among themselves according to the degree of differentiation and secularization.

With the aid of the classificatory scheme we can analyze two dimensions of political system development over time; viz., Systemic Change and System Change. System change includes any alterations in the relationships of the variables that comprise the system, as long as the degree of differentiation and secularization that characterize it are not altered. For

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 217.

example, a Mobilized Democratic Modern System is characterized by a relatively high degree of differentiation and secularization and, again relatively speaking, by Subsystem Autonomy and Participant Culture. Provided these characteristics are not undermined or altered (i.e., the system does not undergo changes to the extent that its degree of differentiation and secularization resemble the characteristics of another type of system), then we can say that such a change is of Systemic nature. By contrast, System Change involves an alteration from one specific type of political system to another. For example, when the differentiation and secularization characteristics of a Mobilized Democratic Modern System change to the extent that they more clearly become the characteristics of a Mobilized Authoritarian Modern System, then such a change can be termed as a System Change.

It will be of course appreciated that the dimension of change effected is a matter of definition. In this case the differentiating criteria between the system-types of the given classification acts as the dividing line between the two dimensions analyzed above. Of the models that have been investigated, Almond & Powell's theoretical model is one of the most impressive that has yet been proposed for the purposes of facilitating comparative analysis of political systems and as

such is likely to provide the basis for one of the most important approaches to comparative politics in the foreseeable future. It is in fact comparative, both in time and in space. Unlike other models, the range of this model is very broad indeed. It can: (a) facilitate the political analysis of any political system with respect to its performance, (b) facilitate cross-comparison between systems with respect to their performances (in their entirety) and their "levels of development", (c) with the addition of the developmental approach it becomes possible to compare political systems on the basis of their historical development, viewed in terms of system performance and "level of development", (d) provide a general criterial framework enabling explanation and prediction of the pattern of development of specific political systems, and (e) given the interrelationships between the variables, provides information making it possible to obtain or sustain a given "level of development", together with its corresponding patterns of system performances.

In Weber's terms, the formal approach followed by the authors is largely "value-free", seeking explanatory aids wherever they may be found.[1] The analysis obtained does

1. "The attainment of depth and realism in the study of political systems enables us to locate the dynamic forces of politics wherever they may exist - in social class, in culture, in economics and social change, in the political elites or in the international environment." - ibid. p. 7.

not to seek to ethically evaluate political systems. On the contrary, it seeks to describe, explain and predict.

The attempt of analyzing any model, theory or approach demands that its characteristics be spelled out and any shortcomings be identified and explicated. The authors set out to present an analytical perspective capable of explaining the characteristics of any political system. Concepts have been employed to facilitate this, and it is on the grounds of conceptual clarity that the model is at its weakest. We shall now elaborate on this with examples from the model.

By the authors' own admission, the principal concept employed is "political system", and it is the comparison of political systems that they seek. The concepts of "state", "government" and "nation" have been deliberately avoided by Almond and Powell because these are "limited by legal and institutional meanings" and they "direct attention to a particular set of institutions usually found in Western societies".[1] This is certainly true of "state" and "government", but to suggest that the concept of "nation" is limited by legal and institutional meanings is misleading. On the contrary, it is difficult to find in politics a concept that is more difficult

1. Almond and Powell, op. cit., p. 16.

to define in purely legal and institutional terms than the concept of "nation". Further, even in modern Western societies the concept of "nation" does not direct our attention to a particular set of institutions. For example, the modern German nation has two sets of political institutions, and Canada may not be a "nation" at all.

At another level, the authors legitimately question the possibilities of success with respect to the problem of "nation-building" in many of the newly-independent areas of the world. At the same time the authors continuously talk of the "new nations". Why this confusion? Either there are or there are not new nations in Asia and Africa.

Secularization, we are told, is the process whereby men become increasingly rational, analytical and empirical in their political action.[1] However, we are not informed of the criteria according to which the authors, in the tradition of the Western Enlightenment, express such faith in the political rationality of man. Given the growth of literacy and the opening of new avenues of communication and information, are we to-day more rational politically than our predecessors? Was Germany under Hitler more rational than pre-industrial Germany? Was political action in Russia under Stalin more

1. Ibid., p.24.

rational than under the Tsars? Modern man lives by as many myths as his earlier counterpart, and there is no unilinear progression of rationality, of the political type or any other.

Further, the concept of secularization also presents substantial intellectual problems. Do all political cultures follow a common secularization process or are there different processes related to different cultures? Is the process of secularization an inevitable one?

In elaborating the concept of "political socialization", two mutually incompatible definitions are offered.[1] These suggest that the process of political socialization leads to both the maintenance and change of given political cultures. Isthis feat possible? It is our contention that in all the above examples, conceptual clarity is lacking. Models are offered for empirical purposes, and if the components of a model (i.e., concepts in this case) are inadequately spelled out, then rigorous and systematic application of the model is made that much more difficult.

At another level, we have noted that for the purposes of predicting and explaining the "why" component of development, the authors have introduced a four-fold classification

---

1. See pp. 128, 129 above.

of system development problems, or challenges (in a specified order) based upon the experiences of Western societies. The responses to these problems, we are told, can help explain the developmental patterns of any given political system. Alternatively, the existence of specific characteristics of structures, functions and culture can help us to predict the developmental potentialities of a political system. It is remarkable that Almond and Powell have had no difficulty in presuming that the pattern of development of Western societies will be replicated by the non-Western societies, notwithstanding their structural and cultural dissimilarities. Surely, the authors should make the rationale behind such a presumption explicit, for there is no evidence to suggest that all political systems will encounter the same problems and in the same order. If differing systems A and B successfully overcome system development problem P spparately, then both will necessarily have the same level of development X. On *a priori* grounds, this could only be valid if it is agreed that both systems A and B possess exactly the same characteristics in terms of roles, structures, system performances and culture. But this is hardly ever the case.

Following the logic implicit in the authors' presumption, one could with equal validity contend that non-Western soc-

ieties pattern of development will be replicated by Western societies. The onus of showing that the non-Western systems will follow the pattern of Western systems development and the reasons for this rests upon the shoulders of Almond and Powell. Perhaps they ought to be reminded that there are many paths to Jerusalem and that however pleasant and comforting Jerusalem is to the Christian, the Moslem has his Mecca and the Hindu his Benares, who can know precisely where each will ultimately want to go.

The functional approach followed by the authors can be distinguished from the "systems" approach followed by David Easton,[1] and the "communication" or "cybernetics" approach followed by Karl Deutsch.[2] Basically, Easton explores and elaborates the implications of accepting "systems analysis" as a framework, so that its value towards theory formation may be appreciated. Deutsch, on the other hand, has organized a conceptual structure around the concept of "message" and its related "networks" as the major unit for a kind of analysis that can lead towards a theory of political communications; though he does use the "system" approach. In contrast to Deutsch and Easton, Almond and Powell's

---

1. David Easton, A Systems Analysis of Political Life, (New York: J. Wiley, 1965).

2. Karl W. Deutsch, The Nerves of Government, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1963).

functional-system approach grows out of the separation-of-powers theory, and seeks to treat the functions that are performed by institutions that have emerged as a consequence of diverse cultural and political changes. In soddoing, it borrows rows conceptual tools from sociological and communication theory for the purposes of facilitating our understanding of politics, for the purposes of explanation, and hopefully for the purposes of prediction.

The authors have consciously attempted to tackle the problem of change in political systems over time[1] and they have done this with some success. We have been able to identify the factors that cause change or development and the effects on the political system. For the purposes of tackling the problem of change, the authors have elaborated a highly refined and intricate theoretical model that could lend itself for the purposes of application. But given that the processes of political change are extremely complex and that they rest upon a very large number of interesting factors, it remains to be empirically determined whether the model has taken cognizance of them all. Indeed, the authors recognize that any theory of development or change must be examined

---

1. "Political change is one of the most pervasive and fundamental concerns of our analysis." - Almond and Powell, op.cit., p.41.

for its validity and that, "The advancement of knowledge comes through the testing and reformulation of theories."[1]

Yet, despite the above, themmodel is of a high quality from the perspective of change. Indeed, it is one of the most sophisticated examined yet. Further, the model is not only the most recent of those examined in this dissertation, it also represents the latest efforts of Almond (in this case co-authored by Powell). Some significant changes in his thinking may be noted. For example, in contrast to the static bias of his earlier functional models, he now writes, "It is increasingly obvious that the study of politics must be a dynamic system-and-process analysis, and not a static and structural one."[2]

Further, the proposed classificatory scheme is not only comprehensive enough to facilitate detailed analysis of the diverse types of political systems that embrace the experience of mankind, it can also facilitate developmental analysis of political systems. This is made possible by relating within the classification the variables of structural differentiation, autonomy, and secularization to the other aspects of the

---

1. ibid., p.300.
2. ibid., p.41.

functioning of particular classes of political systems; i.e., their conversion characteristics, capabilities, and system maintenance patterns.[1]

With respect to the classification scheme employed, the question of explicit cut-off points between the various system types remains. These are, as noted earlier, of prime importance to our two dimensional analysis of change. Theoretically, one can easily differentiate between the types, but in practice the different system-types usually diminish into each other and render analysis difficult. The difficult nature of the problem is conceded, yet attempts to overcome them must be made if precision is desired. In this respect, Almond and Powell seem to offer us some hope. They write, "We are simply arguing that one political system differs from another in certain specified ways and that these differences are subject to measurement in the empirical sense of the term."[2] Clearly, it would have been a great contribution to all concerned if some techniques for measuring system differences within the classification scheme would have been revealed. Regrettably, Almond and Powell have chosen to leave the above statement unqualified.

---

1. ibid., p. 300.
2. ibid., p. 215.

In conclusion, we have noted that it is the substantial achievement of Almond and Powell that they have incorporated within their developmental approach an important feature of man's existence; i.e., change. But, towards what directions are changes taking place? Towards what directions are political systems developing? Whether, and how rapidly, the "developing" systems can modernize are obviously legitimate and important questions. Even more important, however, is the question: after development, what? In what directions will systems develop when they have reached a high "level of development"? The "developed" systems of to-day, whether democratic or authoritarian, cannot remain unchanged. In what directions will they develop? To this ultimate question, Almond and Powell do not attempt an answer. Their silence is a pity, especially since for them, "the ultimate test of the strength of a scientific theory is its ability to generalize and predict."[1] A theory of political development that does not even raise such questions, is clearly, so much the poorer for it.

1. ibid., p.300.

CHAPTER X

SOME CONCLUSIONS AND GENERAL REMARKS.

We have examined the models individually with respect to their major characteristics and their relationship to the study of the problem of change. Such an exercise should perhaps be considered as only the first step towards an over-view of the models. As the major objective of this dissertation is an examination of how the models deal with the problem of change, it is appropriate that our attempts at providing an over-view of the models be restricted to those characteristics that bear directly upon the problem of change.

Such characteristics refer to the discernible views and methods within our models with respect to the problem of change. Do the model-builders feel change ought to be studied? If so, how? Another characteristic refers to the modal attributes. Do any of the modal attributes have implications for the study of change? The functional attributes of our models may be seen as an example. These are some of the modal characteristics that will be examined in this chapter.

This chapter, then, attempts to (a) examine the views and methods of the model-builders with respect to the study of change, (b) the functional attributes of the models and their relationship to change, and some general remarks.

Views and Methods of the Model-Builders. With the publication of Macridis'[1] models, the "traditional" approach was for all practical purposes rejected.[1] In his indictment of the "traditional" approach, Macridis informs us that it ignored the dynamic factors that account for change and that it laid an emphasis on studying the constituent parts of

---

1. Macridis, op.cit.

a polity.[1] By ignoring the dynamic factors that account for change, it is suggested that no need was discerned or felt by scholars to facilitate the study of change. If nature answers only when questioned, then it is clear that questions relating to political changes had not yet been asked. Indeed, the contemporary concern with the study of change can be said to have begun with the publication of Macridis's model itself. To appreciate and ascertain the nature of this concern we shall now examine the views and methods of the model-builders and attempt an over-view of the same.

All the examined models provide for the analytical study of a polity and for the comparison of one polity with another. These were, among others, some of the very criteria for the selection of our models. Of the seven models that we examined, only Binder and Almond and Powell consciously set themselves the task of facilitating the study of change. The remainder of the model-builders, as may be noted in our analysis of the models, indicate varying degrees of informale concern with the study of change. We will now turn our attention to them.

Macridis's concern with the study of change let him to formulate analytical categories that would enable such study. Referring to his four analytical categories, he informs us that these can help us to "get an abalytical picture of the differences between systems and the way in which these differences affect profoundly such concerns as political consensus, stability, and change."[2] Basically, Macridis' concern with the study of change was limited to studying the conditioning factors that helped to account for changes amongst systems. Apart from furthering our understanding of the phenomenon of change, such knowledge would hopefully generate hypotheses and theories of change in systems.

---

1. "... the traditional approach has ignored the dynamic factors that account for change." He goes on to add, " It /i.e. the traditional approach/ has concentrated on what we have called political anatomy." - ibid.,p.11.
2. ibid.,p.36.

Apter's interest in the study of change is similar to Macridis', and like him, he too develops his analytical categories in a manner that would facilitate the study of change through the process of comparative treatment. Whilst Apter's immediate interest was focused on understanding and aiding the workings of democracies in Africa, such a focus does not limit the scope of the model with respect to studying different types of systems. Speaking of his model, Apter writes: "It seeks to produce theories by developing a scheme". He adds, "It is through the comparative analysis of democracies under widely differing conditions and through time that we can learn something about their potentialities and ultimate compatability with drastic social change."[1]

Almond's first attempt was the first political culture model proposed for political analysis, and it outlines a fourfold classification of political culture types. Changes within given types and from one type to another are determined by changes in the constituent elements of the system, viz, roles. The type of change effected within a given system is determined in terms of his classificatory scheme. The novel conceptual vocabulary employed in this article includes the concept of "interdependence" of roles, the latter being the basic constituent elements of the system. However, the model represents a tentative formulation for facilitating political analysis and the concept of interdependence of roles permits an analysis of change, assuming that for analytical purposes we can at least identify and perhaps quantify individual roles.

The attempt by Almond and Coleman was based on Almond's earlier political culture model. In it, they expressed hopes for the emergence of a probabilistic theory of politics. Such a theory would be concerned with the

---

1. Apter, op.cit.,pp.236-7.

understanding and ultimately the prediction of changes over time.. The possibility of quantifying the variables towards this end is recognized.[1] Such a step would, in turn, enable the attainment of an element of precision in identifying and measuring changes in political systems over time. Changes in systems would, however, be ascertained from a series of analytical "snapshots" taken over time, and theories of change would be developed from such inductively obtained data.

Almond and Verba's model seems to have achieved the closest synthesis between it and its application. The formulated variables are geared toward, and used, as empirical indices. The quantification of orientations in a political system thus permits the ascertainment of changes in culture-types and changes within cultures. However, the analytical picture obtained of the political culture is essentially a static one, and in this respect it resembles Almond's functional model. That theories of change can be formulated on the basis of inductively obtained cross-sectional data is agreed, though its value for the purposes of understanding and predicting changes over time remains questionable.[2]

Finally, we may now consider the models of Binder and Almond and Powell. These authors it may be recalled, consciously set themselves the task of facilitating the study of change.

Binder writes, "Change is not the product of the inquiry, it is the basic postulate."[3] In his model, Binder attempts to study changes in terms of what is happening and how?[4] The neatly spelled out interrelationships of the constituent parts of the model and its internal logical consistency help

---

1. "The functional theory of the polity... does specify the elements of the polity in such form as may ultimately make possible statistical and perhaps mathematical formulation." - Almond and Coleman, op.cit. p.59.

2. See chapter 1 for further elaboration.

3. Binder, op.cit.,p.346.

4. ibid.,p.345.

identify any changes that may occur and the nature of such changes. However, the longitudinal study of change in terms of cause and effect requires knowledge of "why" changes occur. Such a question has not been raised. The upshot is that theories based on data obtained through investigating the "what" and "how" of change may not necessarily facilitate the successful understanding and study of longitudinal change. We have argued in our introduction to this dissertation that understanding the "why" component of change is desirable if theories of change are to be fruitfully employed in contemporary research problems.

Referring to their model, Almond and Powell write "Political change is one of the most pervasive and fundamental concerns of our analysis."[1] Their model is the latest and one of the most sophisticated of our examined models. It is also the only examined model that attempts to understand and study change longitudinally in terms of its causes and effects. Towards facilitating this end, adequate developmental categories have been proposed, and the possibility of their quantification is recognized.

For the purposes of understanding the manner in which our seven models seek to relate themselves to the problem of change, the models may be dichotomized with respect to their approach to the study of change.

If the "traditional" approach as Macridis informs us ignored the dynamic factors that account for change, then the publication of Macridis' model can be seen as the beginning of an epoch in which attention was being paid to the study of change. We can say that questions relating to change became a common, though not necessarily an essential, component of political analysis. All our examined models deal in some form or another with the problem of change.

---

1. Almond and Powell, op.cit.,p.41.

Macridis and Apter suggest understanding changes in systems through the process of comparative treatment, and ultimately building theories of change upon such knowledge. Almond's first model and the models co-authored with Coleman and Verba are political culture models in which the concept of system,[1] with its interdependence of roles, plays a central part. Typologies of systems are constructed and the interrelationships of their elements are spelled out. Through an understanding of these interrelationships, changes to systems may be discerned. Almond and Coleman's model and Almond and Verba's model suggest the quantification of variables. This is then operationalized. The quantification of variables serves to enhance our abilities to ascertain precisely and analyze changes in systems.

However, whilst the above models enable the analysis of changes in systems over time, such an analysis is essentially based on cross-sectional data of political systems. This consists of a series of "snapshots" taken over time for the purposes of ascertaining changes. On the basis of such knowledge, hypotheses and theories of change may be developed. The possibility of deficiencies in theories of change obtained through such a method must be noted, for they have important methodological implications: (a) the "snapshots" obtained may be unique experiences, and (b) where the time span of the total "snapshots" taken is short, the possibility of "finding" or discovering spurious associations between the variables increases.

Binder's model, whilst categorically addressing itself to the problem of change, nevertheless follows the above method of studying and understanding it. However, the fact that its objective included the specific study of the phenomenon of change leads us to categorize his attempts as being half-way between the above cited-models and those of Almond and Powell.

---

1. This is dealt with in greater detail further on, see p.171.

The attempts of the latter may be seen as representing a new trend or inaugurating a new era in that it explicitly seeks to understand the "why" component of change. Such a concern may be seen as reflecting the dominance of the theme of political development as a major focus of theoretical attention and inquiry[1] by the Committee on Comparative Politics.[2] More specifically, the model followed Almond and Powell's participation in the said Committee on Comparative Politics in 1963,[3] which also concurrently sponsored a series of conferences and institutes leading to the publication of a set of volumes exploring various aspects of political development.[4] The theoretical formulation of Almond and Powell, with its developmental emphasis, categorically seeks to know the "why" of change.[5] To what extent this emphasis will be maintained is difficult to predict, and it is noteworthy that Almond and Powell express their framework cautiously: "What we have outlined thus far may be viewed as preliminary exercises pointing towards a theory of political development."[6]

---

1. See Fred W. Riggs, "The Theory of Political Development," in Contemporary Political Analysis, ed. James Charlesworth, (Philadelphia: Free Press, 1967), p.328.

2. This is a Committee of the American Social Science Research Council.

3. In 1963 Almond proposed a new theoretical framework designed to relate his political system concept to the problems of political change. - "Political System and Political Change," American Behavioral Scientist, June 1963, pp.3-10. Two years later he wrote another essay explicitly advocating a developmental framework for the study of political systems. -"A Developmental Approach to Political Systems," World Politics, Jan. 1965, pp. 183-215. That he has not abandoned this approach may be judged from the publication of his model now being examined. It is devoted to the comparative analysis of political systems from a developmental viewpoint. - Almond & Powell, op.cit.

4. See the Studies in Political Development series (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1964-1965): Vol. I, Lucian W. Pye (ed.), Communication and Political Development; Vol. II, Robert Ward and Dankwart Rustow (eds.), Political Modernization in Japan and Turkey; Vol. III, Joseph La-Palombara (ed.), Bureaucracy and Political Development; Vol. IV, James Coleman (ed.), Education and Political Development; Vol. V, Lucian W. Pye and Sidney Verba (eds.), Political Culture and Political Development.

5. Almond and Powell, op.cit., pp.314-322.

6. ibid., p.322.

We have already argued that longitudinal studies of change in terms of cause and effect are desirable if we are to successfully develop comprehensive frameworks for the purposes of comprehending and studying the vital phenomenon of change, so relevant to the contemporary polities of the world. Almond and Powell's model represents the only examined work that seems to be moving in this general direction, and we hope that future studies in this field will do likewise.

A final criticism of all the examined models is their neglect of the possibility of system "extinction" or evaporation. Easton has termed this as "non-persistence" of systems and he has outlined historical examples of their occurrence.[1] Clearly, in studying systemic changes longitudinally we need to know the effects of variables on systems: what kinds of system behavior lead to system survival or maintenance, and what kinds to deterioration or death?

Whilst authors who have not formally addressed themselves to studying the problem of change can be excused with respect to the above, it is difficult to overlook such omissions in the works of Binder, and Almond and Powell.

In our study of the models with respect to the phenomenon of change, we found one generic theme running through all the models, viz , functionalism. In other words, within our models, traces of the influence of other social sciences may be seen, especially in the terminology and conceptual foci that they employ. These reflect an adherence to the functional theories derived from sociology and anthropology.

We pointed out earlier that contemporary model building activity was partly a response to an increasingly felt hostility towards the study of formal-legal institutions of government. What has tended to replace that earlier focus have, to a certain degree, been some of the features associated with functionalism.

---

1. David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis, chap.6, pp.77-101.

According to Almond, some of its most prominent exponents are the sociologists Talcott Parsons,[1] Robert Merton,[2] and Marion J. Levy;[3] and anthropologists Bronsilaw Malinowsky[4] and A. R. Radcliffe-Browne[5]. Referring to them, he explains that

> Though they /i.e., the functionalists/ differ substantially in their concepts of system and function, what those men have been saying is that our capacity for explanation and prediction in the social sciences is enhanced when we think of social structures and institutions as performing functions in systems. 6

Whilst this is a useful introduction towards an understanding of the functionalist orientation, it would not suffice for the purpose of obtaining some measure of functionalist influence within our models. To provide this, we shall relate the models to two recurring issues in the functionalist literature: (a) the view of the polity in terms of a political system, and (b) emphasis on "functional requisites, interdependence and equilibrium". 7

All the models refer to the polity as a political system, though such a referent has differing implications for each author. Almond states this framework explicitly:

---

1. Talcott Parsons, The Social System, (Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1951; Parsons and Shils, Toward a General Theory of Action, (Camb, Mass: Harvard Univ. Press, 1951); and Parsons, Robert F. Bales and Shils, Working Papers in the Theory of Action, (Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1957).

2. Robert Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, (N.Y.: Free Press, 1957).

3. Marion J. Levy Jr., The Structure of Society, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952).

4. B. Malinowsky, Magic, Science and Religion, and other essays, (N.Y: Doubleday, 1948; and A Scientific Theory of Culture and other essays, (Chapel Hill, N.C: Univ. of N.C. Press, 1944).

5. A. R. Radcliffe-Browne, Structure and Function in Primitive Society, (N.Y: Free Press, 1952).

6. Gabriel A. Almond, "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems," op.cit., p. 184.

7. ibid., p. 184.

> The term "system" has become increasingly common in titles of texts and monographs in the field of comparative politics. Older texts tended to use such terms as "governments" or "foreign powers". Something more is involved here than mere style in nomenclature. The use of the concept of system reflects the penetration into political theory of the anthropological and sociological theory of functionalism. -1.

Of the models examined, Macridis' seems to be, relatively speaking, the least committed formally or substantively to all the ramifications that ensue from viewing the polity as a political system. It would seem that for him such a view involves nomore that a conscious and systematic view of relationships among the variables considered relavant for the study of the polity. He writes:

> The very word "system" causes a number of people to raise their eyebrows while to others it has connotations of group research that suggest the suppression of the imagination and sensitivity of the observer for the sake of conceptually determined and rigidly adhered to categories. This is far from being the case. However, a systematic approach simply involves the development of categories for the compilation of data and the interrelationship of the data so compiled in the form of theories, i.e. the suggestion of variable relationships. - 2.

By contrast to Macridis, Apter seems very highly committed to functionalism. Following Levy's functionalist school of sociology, he views the political system as a subsystem of the social system. The former is distinguished from the latter on the ground that "it is a concrete structural requisite for any system."[3]

---

1. ibid., p. 184.
2. Macridis, op.cit., pp. 21-22.
3. Apter, op.cit., p. 229.

Binder's view of the political system seems rather intricate. It appears that his view of the political system is built around the "dominant pattern of legitimacy" in which the political act is seen in the midst of "the logical dichotomy between belief and political behavior."[1]

Like Macridis, Almond in his first model is a little vague. In it, he contrasts the concept of system with that of process and prefers the former. His rationalization is that "the concept of system implies a totality of relevant units, an interdependence between the interactions of units and a certain stability in the interaction of these units (perhaps best described as a changing equilibrium).[2]

In the model developed with Coleman, Almond consciously goes about bridging the gap between the "political" and the "system". After revising the definition of politics to include the performance of integrative and adaptive functions of society by means of the exercise of physical compulsion, he introduces the idea of input and output functions. That is the crucial stage. He writes:

> With the conceptions of input and output, we have moved from the definition of "political" to that of the "system", for if by the "political" we mean to separate out a certain set of interactions in a society in order to relate it to other sets, by "system" we mean to attribute a particular set of properties to these interactions. Among these properties are (1) comprehensiveness, (2) interdependence, and, (3) existence of boundaries. - 3

---

1. Binder, op.cit., p.19.

2. Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," op.cit., p.393.

3. Almond, "Introduction: A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics," in Almond and Coleman, op.cit., p.7.

Almond and Verba concentrate on "the patterns of orientation towards political objects among the members of the nation."[1] The sum of these orientations is the political culture of the polity. Political culture is then related to the political system by (a) characterizing a whole political system on a basis of a sample of interviews; (b) ascertaining the interviewees' orientations towards others' orientations; and (c) testing the characteristics of the political system against sets of political attitudes so that one may be related to the other.[2] While Almond and Verba do not elaborate in any detail on what the constituent elements of a political system are, they broadly distinguish, after Easton, the input and output functions of a political system. And they emphasize the orientation to political structure and process, not orientation to the substance of political demands and output.[3]

Almond and Powell categorically sharpen the concept of political system to free it from any taint of a conservative bias. They write, "The conception of the political system which we follow in this book is one of interdependence, but not one of harmony."[4]

The characteristics associated with the concepts of "Requisites", "Interdependence" and "Equilibrium" were proposed by Almond "as three conditions,"[5] implicit in the sociological school of functionalism, though not as one group of characteristics associated with functionalism as they are being considered here. However, there is perhaps some merit

---

1. Almond and Verba, op.cit., p.15.

2. ibid., pp.73-74.

3. ibid., p.29.

4. Almond and Powell, op.cit., p.12. Further, to them, interdependence means that "when the properties of one component in a system change, all the other components and the system as a whole are affected." - ibid., p.19.

5. Almond, "A Development Approach to Political Systems," op.cit., p.184.

in considering them as a group here, insofar as they tend to form a cluster (together with the concept of political system) both in logical as well as sociological theory.

In seeking the common denominator of the functionalist schools of thought, some explanatory remarks concerning the above three concepts, however brief and crude, may be attempted. "Requisites," or "prerequisites," may be seen as the essential requirements that phenomenon X has to meet in order for it to be so regarded and distinguished from Y, Z, and so forth. The purpose may be entirely definitional, for example the requisites of oxygen are the elements that comprise it and the environmental factors that support such a composition. However, some functionalists have gone beyond such a stage. They conceive of the requisites for a society (i.e., social system) and proceed to identify those requisites most directly related to politics; the political system is then conceived as a sub-system of the social system.[1]

"Interdependence" and "equilibrium" are so closely related that they may be considered together. We suggested above that a system is defined in terms of its properties or requisites; the latter when defined as integral parts of the

1. See sources cited in footnotes 1-6 on p.171 above; see also D.F. Aberle et al, "The Functional Prerequisites of a Society," Ethics, Jan. 1950, pp.100-111.

system, would obviously bear some relationship to the former. Interdependence may be seen as referring to that relationship. However, in so doing, it postulates that a change in one brings about change in others. But prior to such changes, functionalist analysis assumes the existence of a hypothetical state of balance, or order. The concept of equilibrium may be seen in such a light. Almond sums up the relationship between interdependence and equilibrium aptly:

> When one variable in a system changes in magnitude or in quality, the others are subjected to strains and are transformed, and the system changes its pattern of performance; or the dysfunctional component is disciplined by regulatory mechanisms, and the equilibrium of the system is re-established. -1

Prior to examining the models, it would be appropriate to further explore some viewpoints on the concept of equilibrium, as implications for change are involved.

The claim is often made that the methodological as well as substantive concerns of functionalists have a conservative orientation, a predilection to view the status-quo as desirable, or neglect the sources, as well as the patterns -

---

1/ Almond, "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems," op.cit. p.185.

of change in society.[1] These charges have been the focus of considerable controversy. Many of the bases, as well as implications of these charges, have been refuted in some fashion or another.[2] Whilst we agree that the functionalists have tended to ignore the problem of societal change and transformation, we do not feel that there exists a necessary or inherent bias within the functionalist "doctrine". The functionalist framework is said to provide a method for the study of survival, maintenance, as well as stress and trans-

---

1. William Flanigan and Edwin Fogelman, "Functionalism in Political Science," in (ed) Don Martindale, Functionalism in the Social Sciences, (Phil, Pa: A.A.P.S.S.,1965), pp.111-26. Don Martindale, "Limits of and alternatives to Functionalism in Sociology, "ibid. pp. 127-43; Bernard Barber, "Structural-Functional Analyses: Some Problems and Misunderstandings, "American Sociological Review, April 1956, pp. 129-37; Kingsley Davis, "The Myths of Functional Analysis as a Special Method in Sociology and Anthropology. "A.S.R. Dec. 1959, pp. 757-773; Walter Buckley, "Structural-Functional Analysis in Modern Sociology," in Howard Becker and Alvin Boskoff, eds., Modern Sociological Theory in Continuity and Change, (N.Y.: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1957), esp. pp. 236-59; Carl G. Hempel, "The Logic of Functional Analysis, " in Llewellyn Gross, ed., Symposium on Sociological Theory, Evanston, Ill.: Row, Patterson, 1959) pp. 271-307; and Alvin W. Gouldner, "Reciprociety and Autonomy in Functional Theory," ibid. pp.241-270.

2. See, for example, Ian Whittaker, "The Nature and Value of Functionalism in Sociology," in Don Martindale, op.cit., pp.144-62; Ernest Nagel, The Structure of Science, (N.Y.: Harcourt, Brace.,1961),pp.532-3.

formation in system.[1]

We can now commence with our examination of the models. Macridis' model seems, relatively speaking to adhere least to functional analysis. His four categories, as pointed out earlier, do not comprise a system. The relationships among them are only tenuous, thereby precluding the possibility of their being described as interdependent, and no order or balance is prescribed for them to approach the state of equilibrium.

Apter lies on the other extreme. As noted in the analysis of his model, he defines the political system as a sub-system of the social system. The structural requisites of government are carefully worked out by him. While social stratification is his central variable, the others are intimately related to it and form clusters. Interdependence amongst them is stressed, not through "requisites", but through the independently postulated variables; government, political groups and the other units of analysis dependent upon

---

1. However, David Easton has, after "a careful scrutiny of the language used" in the functionalist literature, shown that "equilibrium and stability are usually assumed to mean the same thing." - "Categories for the Systems Analysis of Politics," in Easton, (ed), Varieties of Political Theories, (N. J: Prentice-Hall, 1966), p.145. See also his "Limits of the Equilibrium Model in Social Research," Behavioral Science, Vol. 1. (1956), pp.96-104. In his own work he has consciously endeavored to indicate how the static bias in functional theory can be avoided. See his A Systems Analysis of Political Life, (N.Y: John Wiley & Sons, 1965). Almond and Powell have also recognized the static bias of systems theory, though they have modified their systems model to enable a developmental study of political systems, op.cit. p.13 esp.

them.[1] Apter does however speak of "affinites" and "relat ionships" among the variables, but whether these amount to a state of equilibrium is difficult to assess.

For Binder, the political system does not comprise specific categories of structures or functions. The "requisites" that he seems to implicitly provide are certain power relationships challenging or supporting the legitimacy-system of the polity. Further, no connection among such relationships is imposed, since in both their origins as well as consequences they are not neatly categorized. Equilibrium, he concedes, is an ideal-type of an integrated system; i.e., when behavior and belief coincide. He writes:

> In their generality, beliefs and political behavior comprise an analytical system which is, by definition, always in equilibrium. But when we refer to specific beliefs and specific behaviors in the perceptible world of continuous change, we must focus our attention on degrees of malintegration of ideas, of political behavior, and of each with the other. - 2

In his first model, Almond makes no conscious attempt to develop any requisites of the political system. However, like Apter, he explicitly states his adherence to the concept of interdependence in systems analysis.

---

1. Lucien W. Pye has recently criticized the assumptions made concerning the hanging together of clusters of certain variables. See Pye, review of The Politics of Modernization, by David E. Apter, A.P.S.R., June 1966, pp.396-7.

2. Binder, op.cit., p.14.

> The concept of system implies that these roles are interdependent and that a significant change in any one role affects changes in others, and thereby changes the system as a whole. - 1

Embedded within this statement may be the idea of equilibrium, but in his description of the four major types of political systems, neither of the concepts of interdependence or equilibrium have been pursued.

However, with Coleman, Almond specifies four universal properties of all political systems. These may be considered as requisites of a system. Interdependence is indicated as one of the "properties of the system."[2] While not the subject of explicit concern, equilibrium may be assumed to inhere in Interdependence.

Almond and Verba are not concerned with the actual performance of political systems, but with the individual's cognitions of it. Interdependence may therefore be seen most clearly in their empirical data on clusters of attitudes that constitute one or another kind of political culture. Further, equilibrium is not relevant to their empirical setting since the effect changes in variables have on one another

---

1. Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," op.cit., p.395.

2. Almond, "Introduction: A Functional Approach to Comparative Politics," op.cit.p.7.

can appropriately be studied over time, while Almond and Verba provide, a "snapshot" so to speak, of the attitudes of individuals at a point in time.

Almond and Powell in their quest for a developmental approach to politics explicitly reject the notion of equilibrium or harmony,[1] and in so doing argue that their previous model[2] had static and conservative implications. They write, "Our earlier formulation was suitable mainly for the analysis of political systems in a given cross-section of time."[3]

From the above review of the models, the following generalizations emerge. Macridis and Binder seem relatively immune from the spell of functionalism. While they resort to the use of some variables traceable to functionalist literature, their core concepts and general orientations do not appear to be controlled by it. Almond's first model is a transitional formulation, and it is therefore almost impossible to classify it amongst our other models. However, the penetration of functionalist influence is not pervasive and the variables that emerge are not easy to relate to the harsh realities of empirical research.

---

1. "The conception of political system which we follow in this book is one of interdependence, but not one of harmony." - op.cit., p.12.

2. Almond and Coleman, op.cit.

3. Ibid., p.13.

The other models (Apter's, Almond and Coleman's, Almond and Verba's, and Almond and Powell's) are on the opposite extreme. Though distinct and separate from each other, they are deeply imbued with the norms of functionalism. The implications of systems analysis are carefully spelled out and the highest priority accorded to empirical operationalization. Exemplary amongst these is Almond and Verba's model in its attempts at synthesizing the variables derived from functional theory and vigorously quantified through survey research.

Model-building, as a conscious effort within the literature of comparative politics, is a phenomenon that has recently come into its own, and it has much to commend it. Through the explicit rendering of its analytical criteria and conceptual framework, it holds the promise of facilitating better, scientific, and rigorous scholarship in comparative politics. Consciously stating the rationale as well as the purpose of the criteria of relevance is likely to avoid many pitfalls. Some clarity of thought is likely to be introduced insofar as extraneous and irrelevant variables and criteria are eliminated. The stress on logical consistency is likely to avoid some lacunae that may otherwise have been overlooked. Where categories or typologies are proposed with

a view to facilitating the organizing of data (as they are expected to), rigour is achieved, and at least some of the requirements of science are met.[1] Comparisons are facilitated. Errors of logic, emphasis and relationships are easily detected and eliminated. Finally, the relevance of conceptualization is related to defensible, or atleast plausible empirical grounds, or to use David Easton's phrase, "empirically oriented theory."[2]

However, models, despite the above, can be culture-bound, neglectful of some crucial variables and perhaps insufficiently sensitive to the problems of change. Such considerations are specifically relevant to the problems of empirical application of the models, and will be briefly viewed here.

In contrast to the universalistic scope of our models, we may note some views of contemporary authors who contend that such a scope is meaningless and that "the politics of non-Western countries forms a distinct category for study."[3]

---

1. For some of the characteristics associated with "behavioral credo" see David Easton, A Framework for Political Analysis, p.7.

2. David Easton, The Political System: An inquiry into the State of Political Science, (New York: Alfred K. Knopf, 1960).

3. George McT. Kahin, Guy Pauker and L. W. Pye, "Comparative Politics of Non-Western Countries," A.P.S.R., Dec. 1955, pp.1022-41; see p.1023.

Such a view calls into question the ability of our examined models to serve as an adequate guide for the purposes of collecting data in non-Western areas.[1]

Further, the above criticisms simply that our models, as products of Western political science, have failed to confront some specific problems. Such a criticism does not, however, discount the heroic attempts of many of our model-builders at dealing with the politics, the areas, the culture and the history of polities that are alien to them. The essential point is that they have been deemed unsuccessful in capturing vividly some profound and subtle intricacies of the non-Western political process. Even though our model-builders implicitly deal with it, no satisfactory resolution emerges. Clearly then, the process of elevating models analogically derived from Western experience to a universalistic position is not without its problems.[2] However, it is

---

1. See, Fred W. Riggs, "The Theory of Developing Polities," World Politics, Oct. 1963, pp. 147-71; Barrington Moore, Jr., "The New Scholasticism and the Study of Politics," World Politics, Oct. 1953, pp. 122-38; Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Allen H. Barton, "Qualitative Measurement in the Social Sciences: Classification, Typologies and Indices," in D. Lerner and H. Lasswell (eds), The Policy Sciences, (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1951), pp. 155-92; G.McT.Kahin et al, op.cit.; Lucien W. Pye, Politics, Personality and Nation-Building, (New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1962), pp.15-31; David E. Apter, The Politics of Modernization; Dankwart Rustow, "New Horizons for Comparative Politics," World Politics, July 1957, pp.530-49. All these authors have felt obliged to devote their energies at postulating the characteristics of non-Western politics.

2. A source generally relevant to this whole issue is Gideon Sjoberg, "Operationalism and Social Research" in Llellwyn Gross, op.cit., pp.603-27.

not our intention nor is it necessary to conclude from this that a universalistic model of polity is impossible, or that such models cannot appropriately attend to specific issues of the type suggested above. It is only to say that neglecting to confront squarely the issue of whether Western models are adequately applicable to all the polities must remain a basic deficiency of our models.

With respect to the study of change, the recognizable differences between the Western and non-Western polities have to be bridged. What needs to be focused on above all are the crucial variables that are pivotal in spurring change and the factors that help determine the direction and measurement of that change. The models are of very little help in meeting these needs.

In stating the above, it is not being suggested that this is an easy problem to resolve. Indeed, the contemporary literature of comparative politics is almost monopolized by this elusive but unavoidable task of determining the sources, direction and measurement of political change.[1]

Following from the above observations of our models, model-building as a scholarly effort has to face the fear of

1. The sources generally relevant are: The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, March 1965; The five volumes in the Princeton series, op.cit.

becoming an end in itself. At least four of our seven models have never been operationalized in any form; i.e., Almond's first model, Macridis' model, Apter's model and Almond and Powell's model. The only purpose and test of these efforts, viz, empirical use, is in some danger of being ignored. Kaplan's apt observation may be noted:

> The model itself ... becomes the object of interest as means so often usurp the importance of the ends they are meant to serve. The failing I am speaking of is the tendency to engage in model-building for its own sake. Candor must acknowledge the existence of this tendency, just as we recognize the corresponding tendencies to carry out experiments or to perform measurements only for the sake of experimenting or measuring. - 1

Simultaneous to this undesirable stream in contemporary comparative politics is another stream. This refers to the more or less empirical studies in comparative politics that are based largely on impressionistic information. Their authors are either ignorant of, or have chosen to deliberately disregard, the models of comparative politics. Their works, severed from any theoretical base, degenerates into what Binder has called "inside dope."[2] This apparent lack of

---

1. Abraham Kaplan, The Conduct of Inquiry, (San Francisco; Chandler Publishing Co., 1954.); see also, Ann Ruth Willner, "The Underdeveloped Study of Political Development, "World Politics, Jan. 1964, p.479; David Easton, The Political System: An Inquiry Into the State of Political Science, p.6.

2. Binder, op.cit.p.9.

convergence between models becoming ends in themselves and empirical studies ignoring the conceptual frameworks proposed by models is a source of concern for those who hold the idea of the scientific study of politics dear.

Finally, the reason for our deliberately stressing the weaknesses (logical and substantive as well as those of application) of the models may be noted. It has not been our desire here to be purely destructive or to put the stamp of disapproval on the recent movements in comparative politics. In a sense, no approach is ever so perfect as to require no improvement. Instead, the inadequacies have been emphasized in the hope that a rigorous theory of political change, capable of encompassing as wide a scope of polities as human experiences permit, will ultimately emerge. Towards this end, the interest of political theorists and political scientists converge in such a way as to invite the best efforts of political scientists. If this dissertation stimulates such efforts and provides useful intellectual cues for those concerning themselves with this important problem, it will have more than served its purpose.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BOOKS

Almond, Gabriel A. and James S. Coleman (eds.). The Politics of the Developing Areas. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960.

Almond, Gabriel A. and G. Bingham Powell. Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1966.

Almond, Gabriel A. and Verba, Sidney. The Civic Culture. Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Apter, David E. The Gold Coast in Transition. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1955.

_____. The Politics of Modernization. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1965.

Barghoorn, Frederick C. Politics in Russia. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965.

Binder, Leonard. Iran: Political Development in a Changing Society. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1962.

Brecht, Arnold. Political Theory. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1959.

Brown, Bernard E. New Directions in Comparative Politics. New York: Asia Publishing House, 1962.

Deutsch, Karl W. The Nerves of Government. Models of Political Communication and Control. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Easton, David. A Framework for Political Analysis. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1965.

_____. The Political System. An Inquiry Into the State of Political Science. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1960.

_____. A System Analysis of Political Life. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.

_____. (ed.). Varieties of Political Theories. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Eckstein, Harry and Apter, David E. (eds.). Comparative Politics. A Reader. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Eisenstadt, G. N. The Political System of Empires. Illinois: Free Press, 1963.

Fein, Leonard J. Politics in Israel. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965.

Gross, Llewellyn (ed.). Symposium on Sociological Theory. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Patterson and Co., 1959.

Grossholtz, Jean. Politics in the Philippines. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.

Heckscher, Gunnar. The Study of Comparative Government and Politics. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1957.

Kaplan, Abraham. The Conduct of Inquiry. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1964.

La Palombaro, Joseph (ed.). Bureaucracy and Political Development. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Lasswell, Harold D. and Kaplan, Abraham. Power and Society. A Framework for Political Analysis. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1950.

Levy, Marion J., Jr. The Structure of Society. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1952.

Macridis, Roy C. The Study of Comparative Government. New York: Random House, 1955.

Macridis, Roy C. and Brown, Bernard E. (eds.). Comparative Politics. Notes and Reading. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press, 1964.

Merton, Robert. Social Theory and Social Structure. New York: Free Press, 1957.

Nagel, Ernest. The Structure of Science. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1961.

Northrop, F. S. C. The Logic of the Sciences and the Humanities. New York: Macmillan, 1947.

Parsons, Talcott and Shils, Edward A. (eds.). Toward a General Theory of Action. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1951.

Parsons, Talcott. The Social System. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1951.

Pye, Lucien W. Politics, Personality and Nation Building. Burma's Search for Identity. New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, 1962.

_____. Aspects of Political Development. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.

Pye, Lucien W. and Verba, Sidney (eds.). Political Culture and Political Development. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1965.

Riggs, Fred W. The Administration of Developing Countries. The Theory of Prismatic Society. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co., 1965.

Rose, Richard. Politics in England. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1964.

Scott, Robert E. Politics in Mexico. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965.

Thompson, Leonard M. Politics in the Republic of South Africa. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1965.

UNESCO. Contemporary Political Science. Paris: UNESCO, 1950.

Waldo, Dwight. Comparative Public Administration: Prologue, Problems, and Promise. Chicago: American Society for Public Administration, 1964.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organization. Translated and edited by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947.

ARTICLES

Aberle, D. F., Davis A. K., Marion J. Levy, Jr., and F. X. Sutton. "The Functional Prerequisites of a Society," Ethics, January 1950.

Almond, Gabriel A. "Comparative Political Systems," Journal of Politics, Vol. XVIII, No. 3 (August, 1956), pp. 391-409.

_____. "A Developmental Approach to Political Systems," World Politics, Vol. XVII, No. 2 (January, 1965), pp. 183-214.

Apter, David E. "A Comparative Method for the Study of Politics," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LXIV, No. 3 (November, 1958), pp. 221-37.

Diamant, Alfred. "Is There a Non-Western Political Process?", Journal of Politics, Vol. XXI, No. 1 (February, 1959), pp. 123-27.

_____. "The Relevance of Comparative Politics to the Study of Comparative Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 5, No. 1 (June, 1960), pp. 87-112.

Eulau, Heinz. "Comparative Political Analysis: A Methodological Note," Midwest Journal of Political Science, Vol. 6, No. 4 (November, 1962), pp. 397-407.

Halpern, Manfred. "Toward Further Modernization of the Study of New Nations," World Politics, Vol. XVI, No. 3 (April, 1964), pp. 157-82.

Lasswell, Harold D. "The Policy Science of Development," World Politics, Vol. XVI, No. 3 (April, 1964), pp. 289-309.

Lipson, Leslie. "The Comparative Method in Political Studies," The Political Quarterly, Vol. 28, No. 4 (1957), pp. 372-83.

Neumann, Sigmund. "Comparative Politics: A Half-Century Appraisal," Journal of Politics, Vol. 19, No. 3 (August, 1957), pp. 369-90.

Packenham, Robert A. " Approaches to the Study of Political Development," World Politics, Vol. XVI, No. 3 (April, 1964), pp. 108-20.

Reisman, David. "Research in Comparative Politics," American Political Science Review, Vol. XLVII, No. 3 (September, 1953), pp. 641-55.

Riggs, Fred W. "The Theory of Political Development," Contemporary Political Analysis, ed. James Charlesworth. Philadelphia: Free Press, 1967.

Riggs, Fred W. "The Theory of Developing Politics," World Politics, Vol. XVI, No.3 (April, 1964), pp. 141-71.

Sutton, F. K. "Social Theory and Comparative Politics," in Harry Eckstein and David E. Apter (eds.), Comparative Politics. A Reader. New York: Free Press, 1965, pp. 67-81.

Willner, Ann Ruth. "The Underdeveloped Study of Political Development," World Politics, Vol. XVI, No. 3 (April, 1964), pp. 468-82.