

POLITICAL MODERNIZATION FROM CONFUSION TO CLARITY

A. V. Manivasagar

1. A Movement from Simple to Complex

The present age may be called the age of modernization. Modernization has been taking place in every aspect of man's life-social, political, economic and cultural. It has become comprehensive concept aimed at capturing, describing and evaluating the profound qualitative and quantitative changes that have been taking place in human society from the sixteenth century onwards and which have given shape to a new epoch in the history of mankind. The process of modernization which began in Italy in the fifteenth century during the renaissance and spread to most of the West over the following five hundred years is now world - wide. It is apparent that people demand and are experiencing change at a pace and of a magnitude for which there are few, if any, historical parallels¹. Surely, the contemporary era's dominant theme is the quest for modernity.

The students of different disciplines take different perspective of

this comprehensive process. For economists, it is primarily economic and technological; for sociologists it is social, cultural and psychological; while for some others (not necessarily political scientists) it is political modernization. Each one looks at it from his own view - point and adopts a technique suited to his own field of study. But it is a fact that, the revolution of modernization involves the transformation of all systems by which man organises his society; the political, social, economic, intellectual, religious and psychological systems².

The concept of modernization describes certain core processes of social transformation. These core processes are attempted to be analysed by many eminent scholars, including Weiner, Apter, Learner, Black, Inkles, Bendix, Levy, Smelser, Eisenstadt, Nettle and others. Modernization according to these scholars is both a process and a product. As a process it is the movement from simple to complex aiming at a change from simple organisation of society and polity to a complex one.

In fact modernity has to be identified with the general spirit of man. The process of modernization begins with the awakening of modern spirit. The process of modern spirit. Modernity relates to the thinking pattern, to the attitudes, and to the values of man. So first of all there is intellectual modernization; in other words, modernization on the personality level. In every country the intellectual elites are the vanguard of the process of modernization.

Rationality is the core element of the modern spirit. It is against unexamined life and thought. It takes 'truth' as accessible to human reason and understanding. There is a new awareness that it is possible to seek a rational explanation of physical and social phenomenon. The modern man is characterized by the "non - acceptance of anything on faith and subjection of every thing to critical, rational scrutiny, a change oriented, forward looking attitude in contrast to a change resistant one"³.

Rationality generates a *liberal spirit*. This liberal spirit initiates man for the pursuit of truth. So it produces *scientific outlook* also as scientific rational enquiry is the instrument for the

discovery of 'truth'. Man learns to apply reason to understand every phenomenon in his surroundings. He is engaged in search for a new way of self expression. He is not satisfied by the dictates of authority. He is not prepared to believe the words of scriptures unless he testifies them. And so other worldliness loses its importance. He learns that man can be the prime mover of his destiny. He develops self - confidence. With this change of attitudes human endeavours are turned towards the betterment and development of life on this earth. There is systematic, sustained and purposeful application of human energies to control and regulate man's physical and social environment for various human purposes As Robert Sinai writes, "Man came to believe for the first time that it would be possible to rearrange society on rational principles"⁴. The fatalistic attitude is totally discarded. There lies the potential for activism and mastery of the environment. So there is a higher standard of living for the whole society. There is increased urbanization and spread of literacy. There is also the development of transport and communication technology. People are exposed to the mass media. With media exposure is associated wider social and political participation. A person according to Learner becomes

participant by learning to have opinions and make choices, "The more numerous and varied opinions, the more participant he is"⁵. His exposure to mass media brings him in contact of different kinds of realities.

All this results in *mobility*. Mobility is another characteristic of modernism. This Mobility is achieved on two levels - psychic mobility and physical mobility. Both of these result in social mobility and the static society is converted into a dynamic and mobile one with the advent of modernity. Learner through his classic study of the Middle - East has given much stress on this characteristic of psychic mobility.⁶ Mobility breeds *empathy*. Empathy is the capacity to see things as others see them. Empathy is a precondition of intergroup adjustment and harmony. Learner has identified *empathy*, *mobility* and *participation* as the personality attributes most conducive to modernization⁷.

So a modern man learns to have opinions and make choice. This makes him democratic also. He learns to think for himself and that there may be plurality of opinions. He comes to regard the opinions and views of others. Democratisation is thus a necessary

concomitant of modernization. On one side man recognises the necessity of relating means to ends, and on the other of integrating one's ends with these of others. For this purpose there is rationalization of ends and goals chosen by a society. The goal setting process has to be rationalized as well as the means and instruments of social action. This implies invariably the rationalization of institutional structure of a given society. The rationalization of political institutions results in *political modernization*. In the words of Bellah, "Modernization thus involves the rationalization of ends which means that the goals chosen by a society should be rational and subject of discussion"⁸.

Making them subject of discussion means the bringing of the whole society in the decision making process and thereby making it a democratic political community.

Individuality, initiative and free enquiry are therefore among the basic characteristics of modern outlook. It may be called *efficacy*. "Its essence lies in the awareness of men as being Self - potent individuals who have the power to change and direct their lives and transform society"⁹.

Modernity becomes a driving force for human creativity. It cultivates *dynamism*. Dynamism may be called the heart of modernization process. Change and innovation are thought to be the normal laws of life. "The first element in our definition of modern man is his readiness for new experience and his openness to innovation and change"¹⁰ so says Wood.

Modernism may also be described as that attitude of mind which tends to subordinate the traditional to the novel and to adjust the established and customarily to the exigencies of the recent and innovating¹¹.

The modern man becomes future oriented. Modernity stresses a growing emphasis on the present and future instead of the past. There is generated a belief in the progress of man. Learner argues "People come to see the social future as manipulable rather than ordained and their personal prospects in terms of achievement rather than heritage"¹².

From psychological viewpoint *self reliance and achievement - orientation* are the essential traits of modern man. Achievement criteria prevails over ascriptive ones. Recruitment to different

roles and activities is not determined in any fixed, ascriptive, kinship, territorial, caste or estate framework. The roles and positions are free floating. That is admission to them is not determined by the ascribed properties of the individual. Wealth and power are supposed not to be ascriptively allocated.

Universalism prevails in a modern society. Universalistic rather than particularistic considerations provide the normative basis for relations. The more modern a person, the more concerned he becomes with things which do not appear to touch him personally. He finds himself concerned with matters beyond the family and the village and the state, with matters which touch the whole world, indeed the Universe itself. Man - kind ceases to live as races apart, by recognising in society and politics its common humanity. Instead of local tie, universal commitments and cosmopolitan attitudes become more important

There is a greater and greater emphasis on individuality as a moral value and stress on the *dignity of the individual*. Modern man also has more awareness of the dignity of others and greater disposition to show respect for them. Identity is chosen and achieved, not ascribed and affirmed. So the values

of equality, liberty and fraternity come to be given primary importance. There is *spontaneous expression of abilities* and feelings. Modernization means the freedom of human spirit fettered for centuries by dogmatic principles.

In essence, modernization involves a revolution in the outlook of people and a general awareness that men are not creatures governed by uncontrollable cosmic forces but have it in them to guide and control the political destiny of the society in which they live.¹³

The essential effect of the development of rationalism in outlook is that secular values are given primary importance. Modernization leads in all systems to greater emphasis on *secularism* and there is secularization of the process of government and administration. There is an increasing emphasis on strengthening the material basis of life. Secularism, the result of scientific outlook, results inevitably in the weakening of religious beliefs and cultural dogmas.

Due to rational application of knowledge there is functional specificity instead of diffuseness. This specificity results in differentiation of social structures. So with modernization there

occurs the differentiation of social structures. The various aspects of society - economic, political, legal and moral - become increasingly discrete in relation to each other. The application of human energies to the control of social environment results in the transformation of all systems by which man organises his life and society. All the values and norms are changed. These mutual and interrelated transformations constitute the general process of modernization.

As achievement orientation prevails and ascriptive norms are rejected, because modern man is not satisfied with his position given in the society, there is a change in the social stratification system. Where active modification of the stratification system goes on, members characteristically become status conscious. They are aware of their position in the social system. They are aware of the advantages and disadvantages of a given status position which they might occupy. They are also engaged in role testing; they explore the legitimate limits of their roles.

In sum we may say that the effects of modernity are to be evidenced in each and every aspect of the social system. Eisenstadt has analysed these effects of the process of modernization in a very elaborate manner.

In the economic sphere modernity implies a very high level of technology. In ecological field modernization is characterized by an advanced degree of urbanization. Then there is the increasing size of organisational units both in economic and political field. Modernity implies increasing complexity and differentiation of all types of organisations. At last in the political field modernization is characterized by the continual spread of political power to wider groups in society; ultimately to all adult citizens. Modern societies are in some sense democratic. And these developments have been very closely related to the expansion of media of communication.¹⁴

II. Distinction and Specification of the Term

(A) *Westernization and Modernization*

Modernization is often confused with Westernization. So it becomes necessary to make out a clear distinction between the two. Some writers have equated both these terms in their interpretation while some have used both these terms interchangeably.

Eisenstadt comments "Historically, modernization is the process of change

towards those types of social, economic and political systems that have developed in Western Europe and North America from the seventeenth century to the nineteenth and have then spread to other European countries and in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries to the South American, Asian and African continents."¹⁵

Such definitions and interpretations suggest that the nations on their way to modernity adopt the same type of systems and institution in the social, economic and Political finds that developed in England, Western Europe and North America. But that cannot be true. There are so many countries in the third world as well as Russia, Japan and china that have modernized their political systems and political institutions but have not followed the models either of western Europe or North America. Russia, Turkey, Japan and India all have developed their own distinct models of modernization.¹⁶

Modernization is not Westernization. Modernization involves 'rationalization' while Westernization is simply to follow and imitate. Modernization implies the rationalization of institutional structure of a given society. The rationalization of political institutions results in political

modernization. Modernization is normally used in the sense that it is good and desirable. Westernization, on the other hand, is a process which the observer is free to approve, disapprove or remain neutral too.

While differentiating the two terms Srinivas holds, "The term 'Westernization' unlike modernization is ethically neutral. It does not carry the implication that it is good or bad, whereas modernization is normally used in the sense that it is good." ¹⁷

Apter has made it clear that in the beginning of the modernization process a country may seem to resemble any of the Western countries but it is not necessary that it will evolve in the Western pattern. He has taken the example of Guinea, Ghana, Mali, China and Indonesia and has concluded, "The important point is, however, that no matter which model they resemble, none will evolve in the Western pattern." ¹⁸

So modernization has to be distinguished from Westernization. Present day modernizing societies, governments and political systems are likely to develop forms different in kind from the countries of the West. The new

states are not bound to follow the paths similar to those of Western countries while modernizing their polity or economy. They are apt to evolve their own pattern.

But then what for the fallacy? There are several factors that induce one to confuse modernization with Westernization

- 1) Many of the new countries, the late comers in the field of modernization, tried to copy the model of the West. The reason has been their modernizing elites, mostly educated in the West and with a taste and liking for Western institutions and style of politics. India might have been put in the category of such countries, but for Gandhi, who tried to evolve a characteristic pattern of mass politics giving more stress upon consensus than competition. The constitutional structure and the institutions of Parliamentary form of government have been adapted from the West during the period of colonial rule. But they are not without some special characteristics of their own as 'democratic decentralization' and the institutions of 'Panchayati Raj'

2) Modernization has been studied primarily as an economic phenomenon bound up with industrialization. It is believed by some that modernization is industrialization and the concomitant effects of industrialization upon social structure, communications, world - view and the like. But economic development is only one aspect of this complex process. Modernization involves much more than economic change. The social and psychological aspects of modernization represent an important part affecting the polity.

3) The system of government is confused with the total political system and political process of a country while it is only a part of it. The countries that have adopted the parliamentary form of government are taken to follow the Western model. But here form is given priority in comparison to content. Westernization may denote only the transplantation of Western political concepts, structures and institutions in the developing countries of Asia and Africa, such as parliament, independent judiciary, press and political parties. But what shape these

institutions and structures take in due course of time depends on the course political modernization takes in a particular country or nation. In the words of Hugh Tinker: "The rise to supreme power of the U.S.S.R. and the emergence of political structures quite different from the Anglo American model in the other major countries - India, China, Pakistan, Indonesia, Brazil, Japan- make it obvious that the modern world has rejected Westernization".¹⁹

4) The effects of Western civilization were found in every part of the world. Many of the changes inherent in the process of modernization were brought about in a non - western country by contact, direct or indirect, with Western culture. Westernization has been the principal stimulating factor for modernization in these countries. Turkey has been an outstanding example where Westernization had been an effective instrument to facilitate modernization. Through the study of English language and literature people in underdeveloped countries come to learn about modern political values. Many Third world

countries have also been indebted to West for the ideas of constitutionalism and liberalism as well as for providing modern technology that played a great part in preparing the ground for the initiation of the modernization of politics.

(B) Tradition, Traditionalism, Modernity and Modernization

An analytical study reveals that there are differences as well as affinities between modernity, modernization, tradition, and traditionalism.

Modernization is the process leading to the state of modernity and the whole period through which this process goes on in the period of transition in the voyage from tradition to modernity. As contrasted to modernity, tradition has its roots in the immemorable past. It is a cumulative heritage of a society which permeates through all levels of social organizations, for example, the value system, the social structure and the structure of personality. Tradition implies that there is the recurrence in approximately identical form of structures of conduct and forms of behaviour Pattern and beliefs over several generations or for a long time.

Tradition means habits, customs, attitudes and ways of life which get

embodied in institutions and then tend to get frozen because of the stability and autonomous existence of these institutions.²⁰

Thus tradition implies continuity while modernity lays high value upon the new, the present as distinguished from the past. Tradition gives high importance to customs. So a traditional society is custom - bound whereas the modern society is change-oriented. In traditional society there are no inventions or innovations, no machine technology. It depends upon human or animal power instead of inanimate power. Faith instead of logic and rationalism are the basic value of traditional society. The people are fatalist and they give high value to religion. In it ascriptive criteria is applied for status in a hierarchical relationship. Nobody is equal to other. It is organised around particularistic relations with family, clan and caste as its locus of movements while in a modern society universalistic standards of relationships prevail. In a traditional society role relationships tend to be functionally diffused in a modern society relationships tend to be functionally diffused in the sense that all aspects of behaviour may be related to any other relationship. But in a modern society relationships tend to be functionally

specific. So there is no differentiation of the various sub systems of the society.

There is the absence of infrastructure of communication. There is also lack of mobility. There is no or little participation in the process of government. There is also no functional specialization and structural differentiation in the political and administrative field. The traditional man lacks empathy, mobility, curiosity and the desire to manipulate. He views the physical and social world around him as absolutely given and unchangeable. He is reluctant to form opinions and so there is no question for him to make choices. He is not interested in public affairs. He is not democratic. Submissiveness to authority is a general characteristic of traditional man. So traditional culture is authoritarian. It lays stress on hierarchical values while modernity gives importance to egalitarian values.

But traditionalism is distinct from tradition. It is an attitude of mind which shuns change, and which prefers to cling to the modes of behaviour stemming from immemorial prescriptive norms. It gives validity to antecedent values. It postulates a certain kind of rigidity that makes adjustment to changing conditions difficult. So traditionalism and not tradition is a hindrance in the

way to modernity. If a society has to be modernized, the very first task is to break and to do away with this traditional attitude of mind. There is often needed the stimulation of some external force to break through this traditionalism. It may be the shock of intrusion by some foreign power as in the case of Japan, or the contact with some modernized and developed culture as has been the case in concern of countries under colonialism. It may also be the humiliation of getting defeat in war with some modernized country as in the case of Turkey.

Tradition may be valued and preserved while a society goes through the process of modernization. For example the British, though highly modernised, are a tradition loving people. The desire to be modern and the desire to preserve tradition may operate concurrently in the new nations.

Sometimes traditional institutions and traditional factors may become instrumental in the process of political modernization. For example the caste communities of India. The traditional castes associations are changing their form and functions in the contemporary era. The most significant aspect however, is its capacity to organize the politically illiterate mass electorate,

thus making possible in some measure the realization of its aspirations and educating large sections of it in the methods and values of political democracy.²¹

It has been recognized that traditional factors which under some circumstances seem to create immobilities in social structure and minimize innovations, at other times can open the door to an entirely different range of behaviour. It is the essence of political modernization process to adapt the traditional institutions to the levels of functional achievement for the desired purposes.

Thus while tradition may be stretched and modified, a unified government may make great use of the tradition in its search for a consensual base to political authority and economic development.²²

(C) Politics of Modernization and Modernization of Politics

For proper evaluation of political modernization the difference between the terms 'politics of modernization' and 'modernization of politics' is to be examined. In the literature on modernization both these terms are

frequently used in an indiscriminate manner. But if we see them analytically, both these terms imply two different sets of meanings and two different types of happenings in the history of this process of modernization.

As far as politics of modernization is concerned, it does not take politics as an independent variable. The independent variables are the society and economy. When these are involved in the process of modernization in a country, they necessarily affect its politics. The sum total of these effects is signified by the term 'politics of modernization'. That is, to what stresses and strains the political system is put due to the new and increasing demands put upon it, and how does the political system adapt itself to the changing circumstances? How does the political system respond and react to the new demands put upon it and how far it proves itself capable to cope with the new challenges the modernizing society and economy pose for it? The answers to all these queries are covered within the scope of the term 'Politics of modernization'.

On the other hand, 'modernization of politics' takes politics to be a quite independent variable which may go

through the process of modernization at its own accord while the society and economy of the country may follow suit. It is the politics of the country that takes the lead to modernize itself and then steps are taken to reform and modernize the society and develop the economy. This term 'modernization of politics' is equivalent to 'political modernization'.

Thus 'politics of modernization' denotes the political implications of modernization. It does not entail within itself the necessary rationalization of authority, differentiation of political structures and expansion of political participation, while all these three are the essential components of political modernization. Huntington has made it clear in his analysis, "A basic and frequently overlooked distinction exists between political modernization defined as movement from a traditional to modern polity and political modernization defined as the political aspects and political effects of social, economic and cultural modernization."²³

The latter in actuality is 'politics of modernization' and not political modernization in its own capacity. There is the disintegration of the traditional political authority when the economy and society of a country is modernized,

but it does not imply significant movement towards a modern political system. Huntington writes further, "Social modernization in some degree is a fact in Asia, Africa, Latin America, urbanization is rapid, literacy is slowly increasing, industrialization is being pushed, per capita gross national product is inching forward; mass media circulation is expanding. All these are facts. In contrast progress towards many of the other goals which writers have identified with political modernization - democracy, stability, structural differentiation, achievement patterns, national integration - often is dubious at best. Yet the tendency is to think that because social modernization is taking place, political modernization must be taking place."²⁴

This error is the definite outcome of not differentiating between the terms 'politics of modernization' and 'modernization of politics'. In reverse fashion, a country may be politically highly developed, with modern political institutions, while still very backward in terms of modernization (Social, economic and cultural). India for instance, is the epitome of underdeveloped society. Yet in terms of political institutionalization India was far from backward. Indeed, it ranked

high not only in comparison with other modernizing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America, but also in comparison with many much more modern European countries.²⁵

So with respect to the terms 'modernization of politics' and 'political modernization' politics is an autonomous sub - system of society. The types of government and political institutions, the mechanisms for performing political functions are the result of deliberate choices by men, choices made in the context of ideas held about the ends of men in society.

III Political Modernization and Political Development

The advent and adoption of the characteristics of modernity in the field of politics of some country result in political modernization.

Rationalism results, at the first place, in the legitimization of authority. With it there is also secularization. Men become increasingly rational, analytical and empirical in their political action. Scientific attitude gives way to secularism. With secularization, the institutions of society in different functional areas resist subservience to religion and get a measure of autonomy.

There is revolt against the imposed political system and patrimonial authority is broken down or defied. It is sought that authority should be based on some rational principle. So sources of authority other than that found in the traditional society are searched and established. This source of authority is found from the ruled, that is the authority of the state to govern is derived from the people.

The political framework of modernization is essentially rooted in the changing sources of legitimization of authority.²⁶ It is characterized by the weakening of traditional elites and a traditional legitimization of the rulers and by the establishment of some sort of ideological and often also - institutional accountability of the rulers to the ruled.²⁷

In short, the legitimacy of the sovereign authority of the state is not derived from any supernatural sanctions but from secular sanctions. The authority comes to be based on the will of the people and its accountability to the citizens legitimizes it. So political modernization involves first a shift in the locus of authority. Religious, traditional and ethnic authorities are supplanted by a single, secular, national political authority. There is centralization of

authority. In this way there is political integration as well as national integration.

As secularism demonstrates the significance of human reason in political affairs, there is a greater emphasis on the rational, scientific and secular techniques of decision making. It means that people have right to solve their own problems. and they must have a right in the decision making process of the political system. Hence a modern state is invariably a democratic state. There is competition for taking part in the decision making process. Competitiveness is an essential aspect of political modernity.²⁸ People can take part in the decision making process only after they get hold on power. So there is competition for power. Government ceases to be a manifestation of power beyond man and out of the reach of ordinary man by basing itself on participation, consent and public accountability. There is "continual diffusion of political power to wider groups of society ultimately to all adult citizens, and their incorporation into a consensual moral order."²⁹ Modern politics is characterized by the continuous spread of political power to wider groups in society - ultimately to all adult citizens. ³⁰ Power ceases to have a

closed hierarchical character; the sphere of political action is broadened to the level of mass participation and begins to respond to the wishes of people which are articulated through various interest groups.³¹

So people become an active participant member of the political community. There is the growth of political consciousness. There is politicization of the masses. "If modernization is the central tendency of our times, is politicization that provides its driving force".³² Wider classes of people who were previously excluded from participation in public life, are mobilized in the political process. The process is completed in two phases. In the beginning the democratic politics is mainly elitist politics. By and by as masses become politically conscious and awakened about their right, duties and dignity as citizens of the polity, it becomes mass politics. There is a setting favorable to the development of representative institutions. More than anything else, the modern state is distinguished from the traditional state by the broadening extent to which people participate in politics and are affected by politics in large scale political units. ³³

Participation distinguishes modern politics from traditional politics. "Traditional Society" .. says Learner, "is non - participant It deploys people by kinship into communities isolated from each other and from a center. Modern society in contrast is participant society".³⁴ Even in non - democratic countries political participation in some form is allowed, even stimulated to lend legitimacy to the political system.

Riggs also declares, "Political development refers to the process of politicization; increasing participation or involvement of the citizen in state - activities, in power calculations and consequences".³⁵ "The new world political culture", says Almond and Verba "will be a political culture of participation".³⁶

This participation may be either democratic or in a form of totalitarian mobilization. It may be in the form of mass response to elite manipulation. But the key consideration is that subjects should become active citizens mass participation in politics increases the legitimacy of the political system and increases its effectiveness. Frey has also defined political modernity as "Changes in the direction of greater distribution and reciprocity of power".³⁷

The culmination of this process is in the participation of the people in the selection of their rulers, and also in the formulation of policies. It finds formal expression in the system of the process of elections. Involvement or participation of the citizens in the electoral politics helps in the legitimation to the democratic political system. The legitimacy of those in power would constantly be subjected to a testing process. The bonds between rulers and ruled would be frequently renewed through the electoral method.³⁸

Thus rationalization, secularism and democracy are the three basic features of political modernization. Thereby achievement orientation is prevalent in the political field also. System of established privileges and ascribed properties is not accepted in a modern polity. Egalitarian values instead of hierarchical values are given importance in the field of politics as well as society. So there is end of feudalism and the medieval structures. The remnants of feudalism have to be done away with. It is characterized by the weakening of the traditional elites.³⁹

Then as with the process of modernization individuality becomes the concomitant moral value, the identity

of the individual is asserted in the political field also. The individual rather than the group becomes the primary unit of the political structure. The state and the individual citizen are directly linked uninterrupted by intermediary agencies or groups. The state becomes an association of citizens and its sovereign government becomes an instrument of the general will of the entire people. There is greater linkage of the rulers and the ruled. For this purpose various kinds of democratic associations, organizations and institutions develop in the society. These various associations and organisations are all based upon choice not birth. The various interests of the modern plural society are articulated through these formal organisations. These formal organisations are an essential attribute of modern society and polity both. Political parties are most important of these organisations. These organisations are characterized by rationality, effectiveness and efficiency.

Political modernization also implies an increase in the capabilities of men for associating together and with this is facilitated the integration of citizens into a common political process. It may also be viewed as elite and mass integration, that is to fill in the gap

between the governing and the governed, and value integration, that is the minimum value consensus about the desirability of the goals and ends of the society as well as about the instruments and procedures for the achievement of the desired goals. The goals may be liberty or equality or social justice. The instruments may be socialism or liberal democracy.

Then there is the differentiation of structures and sub systems within the polity with the developing specificity of functions. As this process proceeds further, these differentiated structures and sub entities become more and more inter dependent and ultimately they are brought together into a framework of common interaction, thus causing the consolidation of the political community. New common symbols are evolved in which various groups of the society could find some sense of personal and collective identity. The diffused society is ultimately converted into a consensual mass society with a central political system. So in the political sphere modernization has been characterized by "growing extension of the territorial scope and especially by the intensification of the power of the central legal, administrative and political

agencies of the society."⁴⁰ In other words there is political integration.

This centralization of authority is in most cases preceded but in some cases followed by national integration and nation building. Nation - building is one of the key aspects of political modernity. There is the idealization of the nation state as the basic political unit. In the words of Pye, modernization among other things is characterized by, "A feeling for justice in public affairs, and above all else, on the acceptance in the political realm of the belief that the prime unit of the polity should be the nation - state"⁴¹.

The achievement of effective unity of the population within a state comes to be an unavoidable part of political modernization. People move from ethnic or linguistic primordial loyalties to national and federal citizenship. The old social units; tribes castes, villages etc. are subordinated to the national community. From the point of view of Organski 'integration' is the first stage of political development. He maintains that there are four aspects if this integrative process - establishing central political rule over all the territories and peoples within the boundaries; maintaining this

political rule in the face of ethnic antagonism, separatism and the likes; bringing about some degree of national economic unification and expanding the meaning of nation hood to engage the efforts and the loyalties of the mass of citizenry.⁴²

According to the views of Eisenstadt, in the political sphere there are several aspects of modernization. Firstly there is the development of a highly differentiated political structure in terms of specific political roles and institutions, of centralization of the polity and of development of specific goals and orientations. Secondly political modernization is characterized by growing extension of the scope of the central, legal, administrative and political activities and their permeation into all spheres and regions of society.⁴³

With political modernity are attached the values of liberty, equality, social justice and fundamental rights. equal rights of the people are assured. There is rule of law in every field. The judicial and regulatory techniques are based upon a pre - dominantly secular and impersonal system of law. Constitutionalism accepts the legitimacy

of the rule making function as a secular process but it sets legal limits to it. Bureaucracy is also a modern political phenomenon. Max Weber treats 'bureaucratization' as the very essence of the political modernization process.

A modernized political system is highly complicated. Political modernization multiplies the volume, range, and efficiency of official decisions. To meet the complex tasks placed upon them, the organs of government also become 'highly differentiated' and 'functionally specific'. This necessitates the development of modernized administration.

The significant process of modernization may be summarized as follows:

- (i) An increased centralization of power in the state, coupled with the weakening of traditional sources of authority.
- (ii) the differentiation and specialization of political institutions.
- (iii) Increased popular participation in politics and greater identification of individuals with the political system as a whole⁴⁴.

The significant ingredients of

political modernization may be summarised as follows -

- i. Political integration
- ii. National integration
- iii. Values integration and elite and mass integration resulting in an integrative political process
- iv. End of Feudalism
- v. Democratization
- vi. Secular values to be adopted in the field of politics.
- vii. Differentiation and Specification of political roles and structures
- viii. Development of different kinds of organisations and institutions
- ix. Rational distribution of human resources.

Lucien W. Pye has suggested that "the problems of political development revolve around the relationships between the political culture, the authoritative structure, and the general political process"⁴⁵. It denotes that the political system has three dimensions; structure, process and culture. Desirable changes in all three dimensions contribute to political modernization.

As democratization is the keynote of political modernity, the extent of democratization in all these three

dimensions has to ascertain the actual nature of political modernization in a country.

Political modernization is to be distinguished from political development. Political modernization is related to democratic procedures. Modern politics is necessarily democratic politics. It entails the politicization of the masses along with the different forms of integration as well as rationalization authority.

Development is concerned with making the authority more effective so as to be able to produce more political and economic goods to meet the ever increasing demands of the politicized masses. The central political institutions of the modernizing country should be able to generate authority and exercise it. For a successful process of political modernization it is necessary that there is development also. But many times these two may not go together. "What is interesting about this aspect of political modernization is that it may be inconsistent with political development. It may place too great a burden or load on the polity, reducing its efficiency in producing political outputs or bringing about its downfall" ⁴⁶

With modernization there is the

mobilization of the masses. There are more and more demands for participation in the decision making process. Authority has to be made broad-based. With this broadening base there must be an increase in the capabilities of the authority so that it may carry out the policies and plans for the welfare of the people successfully. "the concept of political development deals with the capacity of the political system capacity is also closely associated to governmental performance and the conditions which affect such performance" ⁴⁷.

Growing political consciousness initiates political modernization. It broadens political participation and multiplies demands. There must be effective and capable political authority to meet these demands and to mobilize support to process these demands in the form of output of government decision-making for the welfare of the participating community. There is no greater challenge to political modernization than meeting the demands brought by increased popular participation in politics. ⁴⁸.

Development lies in striking a fine balance between demands and supports. The society must have political institutions capable of innovating policy and absorbing increased political

participation. The demands for participation require the dispersal of power; for innovation of policies there is required concentration of power.

Modernization is concerned with the forms and structures of political system and its underlying propensities, that is political culture. Complexities, differentiation, democratization and relative autonomy of these forms and structures along with the secularization of political culture are properties of political modernization. But these differentiated structures may stand paralysed in the absence of capabilities. Development is concerned with the problem of performance. The measure of development is the welfare a political system can give to its people through effective rational policies and decisions. Modernization puts more and more stresses and strains on the political system while development consists in coping with these stresses and strains successfully.

Modernization is concerned with 'who' and 'how' of politics while development is concerned with 'what' of politics. It may also be said that development consists in state building while nation- building is an essential feature of modernization. State -

building is commonly associated with significant increases in the regulative and extractive capabilities of the political system, with the development of a centralized and penetrative bureaucracy.⁴⁹

Political stability is the indices of political development while modernization many times entails instability, violence, insurrection and coups and counter coups, that is 'political decay', using the phraseology of Huntington⁵⁰

Huntington has put forward the concept of 'institutionalization' as a feature of political development. Institutionalization is a means of taming and containing social pressures and forces continuously being infused in the political processes as a result of social-mobilization. Equality of political participation is one of the chief indices of political modernity. Development lies in the growth of political institutions to incorporate, this growing participation. So organizational skills are a pre-requisite for development.

As Claude aptly opines, "Effective political organisations must be consciously sought lest the forces unleashed by modernization bring uncertainty, instability or political decay

..... A rapid increase in political participation and social change when coupled with imperfect integration and weak political institutions seems likely to produce instability"⁵¹.

References

1. Joseph La Polombara "Distribution and Development in Modernization" in Myron Weiner ed., *Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth*, Princeton University press, Princeton, 1967, p. 252.
2. M.Halpern "Towards Further Modernization of the Study of New Nations", *World Politics* XVII, I October 1974, p, 174.
3. A. R .Desai, "Need for Revaluation of the Concept", in his ed.,*Essays on Modernization of Underdeveloped Societies*, Thacker and Company, Bombay 171, p.461.
4. L. R. Sinai, *The Challenge of Modernization*, London, Chatto and Windus 1964, p.18,
5. D. Learner, *The Passing of Traditional Society*, The Free press, New York, 1958, p. 17.
6. As quoted by S. Mulay and R. Ray in *Towards Modernization*, National Press: Delhi 1973, P. 2.
7. D. Learner, *op. cit.*, P.51.
8. R. Bellah, *Epilogue to Religion and progress in Modern India*, The Free press, New York, 1965, p.22.
9. S.P. Aiyar, "Modernization of Indian Society" in his ed. *Modernization of traditional Society*, Macmillan, New Delhi, 1973, p.5.
10. R.C.Wood, "The Future of modernization" in Myron Weiner ed., *Modernization: The Dynamics of Growth*, princeton University press, princeton, 1967, p. 5.
11. C.E. Black, *The Dynamics of Modernization*, Harper, New York, 1967, p. 170.
12. D. Learner, *op. cit.* pp. 45 - 46.
13. P.G.Mavlankar, "Liberalism and the Modernization of India" in S.P.Aiyar ed., *op. cit.*, p. 29
14. S.N.Eisenstadt, *op. cit.*, P.29

15. Ibid., p.1.
16. D. Learner, op.cit., pp.48 - 49
17. M.N. Srinivas, *Social Change in Modern India*, Berkeley, California University press, 1965, p. 52.
18. D. E. Apter, *Some Conceptual Approaches to the study of Modernization*, Prentice Hall, Englewood, New Jersey, 1968, p. 195.
19. H. Tinker, "Political Theories and political Realities" in A.R. Desai ed., op.cit., p. 581.
20. O.W. Wolters, *History, Culture and Region in South East Asian Perspectives*, ISEAS, Singapore, 2000, Chap. 1
21. D. Rudolph, "The Political Role of India's Caste Associations", in C.E. Welch ed., *Political Modernization*, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, 1967, p. 127.
22. J.L. Finkle and R. W. Gable eds., *Political Development and Social change in Transitional Societies*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1971, p.3.
23. S. P Huntington, *Political Order in Changing societies*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1968, p. 35.
24. Ibid.
25. S. P. Huntington, "Political Development and Political Decay" in C. E. Welch ed., op. cit., p. 227
26. Y. Singh, *Modernization of Indian Tradition*, Thomson Press, Delhi, 1973. pp 158 - 59.
27. S.N. Eisenstadt, "Modernization: Growth and Diversity", *India Quarterly* vol. XX, No.I, pp. 17 -18.
28. G. A. Almond and J.S. Coleman, eds., *Politics of the Developing Areas*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1960, p. 533.
29. S.P. Aiyar, op. cit., pp. 5-6
30. S.N. Eisenstadt, "Modernization; Growth and Diversity" op. cit., pp. 17 - 18.
31. Y. Singh, op.cit., pp. 158 - 159.
32. R. Kothari, *politics in India*, Orient Longman Ltd., Delhi, 1970, p.1.
33. S.P. Huntington, *Political order in Changing Societies*, Yale University press, New Haven, 1968, p. 36.
34. D.Learner, op. cit., pp.48 - 50.
35. F.W.Riggs, "The Theory of Political Developnemt" in J. C. Charlesworth ed., *Contemporary Political Analysis*, The Free Press, New York, 1967, p. 139.
36. D.A. Almond and S.Verba, *The Civic Culture*, Princeton University press, Princeton, 1963, p. 4.
37. F. W. Frey, "Political Development and Communications in turkey" in L. W. Pye ed. *Political Development in Modern Japan*, Little Brown. Boston, 1972, p.301.

38. R.A.Scalapino, "Elections and political Modernization in Pre - War Japan, R.E.Ward ed., Political Development in Modern Japan, Princeton University Press, Princeton, (Paperback edition) 1973, p. 249.
39. S.N. Eisenstadt, "Modernization: Growth and Diversity", op. cit., p. 17
40. A.R.Desai, op. cit., p. 461.
41. L. W. Pye, Aspects of Political Development, Boston; Little Brown, 1965, p. 8.
42. A.F.K. Organski, The stages of Political Development, New York, Knoff 1965, pp. 8-9.
43. S.N. Eisenstadt "Modernization Growth and Diversity", op. cit., pp.17- 18
44. C.E. Welch, "The Comparative Study of Political Modernization" in his ed., op. cit., p. 7.
45. L.W. Pye, "The concept of Political Development" in J.L. Finkle and R. W. Goble ed., op. cit., pp. 50 - 51.
46. K.D.Schweinitz Jr., "Growth, Development and political Modernization" in World Politics, Vol. 22, No .4, July 1970, p. 530.
47. L. W. Pwie, "The Concept of political Development", op. cit., P. 50.
48. C. E. Welch, "political Modernization", op. cit., p. 8.
49. G. A. Almond and G.S. Powell, comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach, Amerind Publishing Company Pvt. Ltd., new Delhi, 1972, pp. 35 - 36.
50. S.P. Huntington, Political Order in Changing Societies op. cit., p. 1.
51. C.E. Welch, "Modernization and Political Institutions" in his ed., op.cit., pp. 195 - 205; Han Sung - Joo ed., Changing Values in Asia. The Impact on Governance and Development, ISEAS, Singapore 2000.

* ————— *