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2.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit aims introduces you to political modernization as an approach to studying comparative politics. It will examine some of core features, assumptions and limitations of the political modernization approach. After going through this unit, you should be able to:

- Discuss the evolution and origin of political modernization
- Examine the various approaches and perspectives of political modernization

*Dr. ChakaliBramhayya, Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science & Human Rights, Indira Gandhi National Tribal University (Central University), Amarkantak, Madhya Pradesh
2.1 INTRODUCTION

It is not very easy to give a precise meaning of term political modernization. However, the term is generally used to refer to changes in political attitudes and the transformation of political institutions. It is the process of transmutation of a traditional political system into a modern system. In the West, changes in political culture and political institutions occurred over a long period, resulting in the development and performance standards through the rational utilization of resources. Modern society, as it emerged in the West, is characterized by science and technology, social interdependence, urbanization, literacy, social mobility etc. In politics, modernization referred to the transition from the traditional political system to the modern democratic system.

Political modernization emerged as a major approach in comparative politics in the late 1950s. It is concerned with changing the characteristics of the political system and social life in diverse spheres. It refers to the changes in political structure and culture characteristics, transformed by modern ideas like liberalism, secularism, transparency industrialization. It is also concerned with change in the outlook, political culture, and rural and urban social life. This process, it was said, involved, among other things, the ending of the dominance of religion/church and the establishment of a secular and central political authority.

The political modernization approach, however, lost its steam by the end of the 1960s as a result of challenges emerging from within and from scholars in the non-Western world. Nevertheless, with the onset of the Third Wave of democratization since the 1980s and the growing interdependence of nations since the 1990s, there has been a revival of interest in political modernization. Some of the feature of the modernization process such as differentiation, secularisation, rationalization, economic development and its linkages with sustainable democracy are gaining significance in comparative analysis. The unit examines the core features and assumptions modernization approach. It also examines some of the limitations of this approach and its contemporary significance.

2.2 MODERNIZATION THEORY: EVOLUTIONARY AND FUNCTIONAL

In the 1950s, modernization theory began to affect the research agenda of several disciplines of social sciences, including political science. This occurred as a result of the intellectual ferment in the discipline and the insights based on advances in understanding of individual and group behavior, drawing on psychology, sociology, and economics were incorporated into the theoretical domain of politics. It also occurred because of the historical circumstances of the post-World War years. The United States of America had emerged as a superpower after the Second World War, while Britain, France, and Germany...
had grown weak. America emerged as a world leader, especially after implementing the Marshall Plan to reconstruct and rebuild the war-ravaged Western Europe. In the 1950s, America started dominating the affairs of the world. At the same time, there was the spread of the communist movement under the leadership of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union extended its influence to East European countries and China and Korea in Asia. America wanted to contain the spread of communism. The disintegration of the European colonial empires in Asia and Africa had given birth to many new nation-states in the post-War period. The newly emerged independent nation-states were faced with two alternative development models, the Socialist and the Capitalist models, to promote their economy and consolidate their independence. In such historical circumstances, it was natural that American political elite encouraged their social scientists to study the ‘new’, the ‘emerging’, the ‘underdeveloped’ or ‘developing’ nations to promote their economic development and political stability so as to avoid losing them to the Soviet communist bloc (Chirot 1981, p. 2.61-262). With the support and patronage from the American government and private foundations, political scientists, economists, sociologists, psychologists, anthropologists, and demographers ventured into studies on non-Western societies, especially those that were emerging out of decolonization.

Much of the research on development of the non-Western societies was influenced by two theories of modernization—the evolutionary and functionalist theories. The evolutionary theory explained modernization in terms of a transition from traditional to modern society. This theory was an outcome of the Industrial Revolution and the French Revolution which destroyed the old social order and laid the foundation for a new social order. The Industrial Revolution resulted in rising productivity with the advancement of science and technology. The new order was a new factory production system with intensive division of labour and the take-over of the world markets. The basic path of modernity is known as increasing differentiation and scale. Societies most successful at developing an intensive division of labour were able to become highly productive. The process of division of labour accelerated with the advancement of science and technology and changed the nature of the political system as well.

On the other hand, the French Revolution created a new political order based on liberty, equality, fraternity, and parliamentary democracy. The classical evolutionary theory assumed that human society invariably moves from a primitive to an advanced stage. Thus the fate of human evolution is predetermined. The evolution from a simple, primitive society to a complex, modern society is a constant process that will take centuries to complete. It imposed a value judgment on the evolutionary process. The movement toward the final phase is good because it represents progress, humanity, and civilization. Underlying the evolution theory is the assumption that the rate of social change is slow, gradual, and piecemeal, that is, it is evolutionary, not revolutionary.

Another part of the theoretical heritage of the modernization school is the functionalist theory of Talcott Parsons, whose concepts include system, functional imperative, homeostatic equilibrium, and pattern variables. Parsons was initially a biologist, and his early training greatly influenced his formulation of a functionalist theory. For Parsons, human society is like a biological organism
and can be studied like an organism. To understanding Parsons’s work, the organism illustration is very crucial. The different parts of a biological organism correspond to the different institutions that make up a society. Just as the parts that make up a biological organism such as the eye and the hand are interrelated and interdependent in their interaction with one another, the institutions in a society such as the economy and the government are closely related to one another. Parsons used the concept of system to denote the harmonious coordination among institutions. As each part of a biological organism performs a specific function for the whole, the same way each institution performs specific functions for the stability and growth of the society. Parsons formulated the concept of ‘functional imperatives’, arguing that there are four crucial functions that every society must perform; otherwise, the society will die. These four are called AGIL functions (for adaptation, goal attainment, integration, latency).

1) Adaptation: to the environment-performed by the economy
2) Goal attainment: performed by the government
3) Integration: linking the institutions together performed by the legal institutions and religion
4) Latency: pattern maintenance of values from generation to generation performed by the family and education (Alvin Y. So: 1990:20)

2.2.1 Parsons Pattern Variables

Parsons has formulated the concept of ‘pattern variables’ to distinguish traditional societies from modern societies. Pattern variables are the key social relations in the cultural system, the most important system in his theoretical framework. For Parsons, there are five sets of pattern variables. The first set is affective versus affective-neutral relationship. In traditional societies, social relationships tend to have a preference for personal, emotional, and face-to-face interaction. In modern societies, social relationships have an affective-neutral, which means impersonal, detached and indirect. The second set of pattern variables is the pluralistic versus universalistic relationship. In traditional societies, people are inclined to join together with members of the same social circle. In modern societies, people are bound to interact with unknown people in their day to day life, and they tend to interact using established standards due to the vast population. The third set of pattern variables is collective orientation versus self-orientation. In traditional societies, loyalty is often owed to the family and community. In modern societies, self-orientation stresses encouragement to be individual, develop personal talent, and build a career. The fourth set of pattern variables is ascription versus achievement. In traditional societies, a person was evaluated by their ascribed status, the social status of a person assigned by birth or assumed involuntarily later in life. For instance, the recruitment process depends on whether the employer is a good friend or the applicant’s relative. In modern societies, a person is appraised by his or her achieved status, like educational qualifications. During job recruiting, the employer cares more about the applicant’s qualifications and past job experience. The fifth and final set of pattern variables is functionally diffused versus functionally specific relationships. In traditional societies, roles tend to be
functionally diffused. For example, the employer’s role is not just to hire employees; but also involves the team member’s training through apprenticeship and being the guardian of employees take care of livelihood and welfare. In modern societies, roles are functionally specific. The employer has limited responsibility to the team member, and their relationship hardly ever extends beyond the professional field (Alvin So, 1990, 21-23).
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Note i) Use the Space given below for your answer.
ii) Check your answers with the model answers given at the end of the unit.

1) Explain the evolutionary theory of political modernization.

.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................
.................................................................................................................................................

2.3 POLITICAL MODERNIZATION APPROACH

The modernization approach in comparative politics can be traced to the evolutionary explanations of the social change in 19th century Europe. The French philosophers and founders of modern sociology Auguste Comte and Emile Durkheim, the British philosopher Herbert Spencer, Max Weber and Karl Marx, gave different explanations of the transformation from pre-industrial to industrial society. The modernization theory has long been divided into two major streams. The first is the Marxist description, which argues that economy, politics, and culture are intimately associated since economic development determines a society’s political and cultural characteristics. The second, Weberian version, maintain that culture shapes the economy and political life. Despite a continuing debate between the two streams, they have the same opinion on a central point, that the socio-economic change follows consistent and relatively expected patterns. Thus they imply that crucial social, political and economic characteristics are not randomly related; they tend to be closely connected. Two elements that were common in their explanations of social change were the belief in continuity and progress. The change was not only continuous but also progressive. For these thinkers, change implied advancement and improvement from agriculture to industry, from feudalism to capitalism, from traditional to modern. This kind of change involved two sets of processes, increased complexity and greater specialization of human organization and activity. These processes were described in terms of greater differentiation in society. The industrial capitalist societies of the West supposedly have achieved greater differentiation than other societies. A transforming society, in other words, was the one that acquires most of the characteristics common to most developed countries.
2.3.1 Differentiation

French philosopher and sociologist Emile Durkheim has propounded social differentiation and strongly advocated the idea of division of labour in society. Social activities have been divided among various institutions. Division of labour was extended due to communications, urbanization, and population. Differentiation has been defined in terms of more significant heterogeneity and institutional specialization in society. The family played many roles in traditional societies. In contrast to that, modern societies have specialized institutions for education, socialization. The role of the family has been restricted, and new institutions have played numerous roles in modern societies. The specialization of political roles has been reflected in the modern polity as per the analysis of neo-evolutionists. S. N. Eisenstadt (1966) has argued that structural differentiation has affected stratification. The modernization process has led to fragmentation. Military leaders, intellectuals, bureaucrats, political élites, and entrepreneurs have played a pivotal role in the process of political modernization.

2.3.2 Secularisation

Societies have become more rationalized due to secularisation. Secularisation enables the individual to differentiate between sacred and not sacred. Finally, it will lead to rational scrutiny. Max Weber, a German sociologist, was the pioneer in developing modernization theory based on social action. Social action has been distinguished between actions determined by reason and actions determined by habit or emotion (Weber 1965). Weber’s bureaucracy system was based on rational government. The rational-legal authority has combined the idea of means and ends based on rules and regulations. Greater rationality has been supported by technological and scientific knowledge. Political modernization has been associated with institutions, which will contribute to the development of human knowledge.

Rustow has defined modernization as a rapidly widening control over nature (1967). Barrington Moore has equated modernization with the process of rationalization of social behaviour and social organizations. Modernization has resulted from increasing control over nature. To understand the significance of the political modernization approach, it is essential to know the salient features of the traditional societies (Higgott 1978, Smith 2003) whose institutions and values were considered as obstacles to political modernization.

2.3.3 Cultural Modernization

Rationalization and secularisation have resulted in changes in the dynamics of cultural modernization. It has been recognized and described by Talcott Parsons as pattern variables. It has been associated with values, and people make judgments about their society. Social changes help to understand the dynamics of territorial communities, social organizations, the family and occupations. Further, Parsons has argued that modern societies represent universalism. Modern society also makes judgments at universal criteria irrespective of social relationships.
Further, as we saw, Parsons has contrasted ascribed status with achieved status. Ascribed status means implied the inherent qualities of the individuals. The achieved status means acquired qualities of the individual like educational qualifications. Individuals attain status in modern society due to their educational qualifications. In traditional societies, individuals will acquire status by inheritance. A person occupies the office in the ascriptive society based on the hereditary principle, whereas bureaucrats are appointed based on merit and educational qualifications. Parsons has analyzed cultural patterns of affectivity with neutrality. Affectivity leads to emotional feelings and sentiments among the people. Neutrality leads to personal relationships. Finally, he has contrasted diffuseness with specificity. Diffuseness implies a complex web of interconnections (Smith 2003). Specificity enables the social system to diffuse relations between employer and employee, landlord or tenant. Individuals play multiple roles in modern societies. Specificity indicates the division of social relations and relative independence. Diffuse relations enable the individual to play multiple tasks in society. These variables indicate the transition and progress of modern society. Finally, these developments have played a vital role in the development of the political modernization approach.

2.3.4 From Tradition to Modernity

In the 18th and 19th centuries, political modernization was associated with the emergence of the national-state and industrialization. In the latter half of the 20th century, political modernization came to refer to the transformation of traditional or feudal and semi-feudal political systems to modern democratic systems. Political modernization describes the political system in terms of changes in social, economic and cultural aspects. Early political modernization scholars have argued that economic development leads to cultural and social change, which in turn leads to changes in the political behaviour of citizens. Thus, there is a correlation between political and economic factors. As countries progress and modernize economically, the transition takes place from agriculture to industrialization. Industrialization leads to urbanization which in turn results in better access to media, information and education. It leads to the emergence of the middle class that takes an active part in the political decision-making process.

Karl Deutsch (1961), the American political sociologist, building on Parsons’s work, developed the concept of social mobilization. He regarded social mobilization as a vital component of political modernization. Social mobilization implies changes in society and the transition from traditional to modern as countries progress towards industrialization, urbanization creating a conducive atmosphere for citizens to participate in politics. Education, social networks, urbanization were considered to be crucial aspects of social mobilization as they created political awareness among the citizens. Citizen’s awareness, in turn, have raised demands for the introduction of various welfare schemes for the holistic development of the citizens.

Seymour Martin Lipset (1959) has argued that modernization will lead to the emergence of democracy and its consolidation in the developing world. As countries develop economically, they witness the rise of the middle class, which
actively participates in civil society and politics. Further, he has argued that education contributes to the empowerment of the citizens. It has been evident that educated citizens have actively participated in politics and decision-making. Governments will be implementing various welfare schemes and providing sops to the educated middle class. This process will be leading to the emergence of more robust democracies in the contemporary global world.

It was however the framework evolved by Gabriel A Almond, the head of the Committee on Comparative Politics that heralded a number of studies on political modernization. In the Politics of Developing Areas (1960), Almond presented his functionalist framework that relied on modernity-tradition dichotomy and input-output functions of Easton’s political system.

In Almond’s framework, all political systems had these things in common:

1) There are political structures. Comparisons could be made according to the degree and form of structural specialization. Almond rejected the state/non-state distinction: political functions take place in all societies, though they might be discharged by very different structures.

2) They have the same political functions. Comparisons could be made based on what structures perform these functions and how regularly they do so. A main task of political theory is to identify these functions. Almond, like David Easton, divided the functional elements of political systems into “inputs” and “outputs.” The political inputs were (a) political socialization and recruitment; (b) interest articulation; (c) interest aggregation; and (d) political communication. The outputs were (a) rule making; (b) rule application; and (c) rule adjudication.

3. All political structures are multifunctional. The ‘degree of specificity’ could be compared. The degree of ‘political modernity’ or ‘political development’ was essentially to be determined by this degree of specificity.

As we can see, Almond’s preference for tradition - modern dichotomy and linear path to development were built into the framework. In fact, he made this clear when wrote that “The political scientist who wishes to study political modernization in the non-Western areas will have to master the model of the modern, which in turn can only be derived from the most careful empirical and formal analysis of the functions of modern Western polities”. He drew his categories from the experience of the ‘advanced’ countries. For example, it was evident that the categories of rule making, rule adjudication, and rule application mapped almost identically onto the Western legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government.

With the Committee on Comparative Politics (CCP) that was headed by Almond receiving generous support from the US government and private endowments, Almond’s functionalist framework and studies on political modernization received a big boost in comparative politics. Several members of the CCP such as Lucian Pye, Myron Weiner, Joseph La Palombara, Robert Ward, Sidney Verba, Leonard Binder, and James Coleman came out with a number of studies dealing with political modernization themes. With several universities also getting into similar studies, political modernization emerged as the broad approach to study developing countries in comparative perspective in the 1960s.
2.4 CRITIQUE OF POLITICAL MODERNIZATION APPROACH

The political modernization approach in comparative politics has been challenged in the latter half of the 1960s. It has been argued that underlying the categorization of states as traditional and modern is the implicit prescription that the developing countries have to adopt the characteristics of the political systems of Western Europe and the United States. Apart from this charge of ethnocentrism, modernization theory has also been challenged for its excessive emphasis on the correlation between political and economic development. Further, dependency theory has studied and explains the political systems of few Latin American countries that have criticized modernization theory for neglecting external factors that affect economic and political development.

2.4.1 Dependency Theory

Dependency theory has criticized the political modernization approach and argued that economic development might undermine social mobilization and democratic political system instead of promoting them. Dependency theory has pointed out that the country’s development can be explained based on its historical role in the economic development of the global world. Scholars who studied Latin America pointed out that in the economic relations between the highly industrialized developed countries and predominantly primary good producing underdeveloped countries, the terms of trade have always been in favour of the economically developing countries in the world. They have therefore argued that integration into the world economy is not suitable for developing countries. It indicates that stable economic growth will not be possible unless they overcome their dependence on developed countries. In his *The Development of Underdevelopment*, Andre Gunder Frank (1970) studied Latin American countries and showed that these countries have been trapped in the cycle of economic underdevelopment and that their integration with the world economy has immensely benefited the developed countries rather than Brazil and Chile. When financial investment is affected in the global world, these countries have also suffered.

However, in the early 1980s, the dependence theory has been discredited due to various reasons, prominent among them being that its forecast of underdevelopment trap, Argentina, Brazil and few other developing countries have emerged economically strong in the 1970s and 1980s.

2.4.2 Critical Variable Approach

Critique also came from scholars working within the American universities and reached its apogee in the essay written by Dean Tipps in 1973. In this essay he was critical of the two broad approaches that modernization studies were pursued. The first was the *critical variable* approach, which equated modernization with some other singular factor, such as industrialization, rationalization, or differentiation. Some advocates of this approach had equated...
modernization with industrialization (Marion Levy, for instance) and others had used “modernization” to indicate the social and political consequences of industrialization. Since this substitution of terminology spawned needless confusion, Tipps suggested that it would make more sense to drop the word “modernization” and instead use the more specific term.

2.4.3 Dichotomous Approach

Tipps and other social scientists also became critical of the other more common variety of modernization theory, the dichotomous approach. Dichotomizing theories of modernization, as we noted earlier, posited an evolutionary relationship between the ideal-types of ‘tradition’ and ‘modernity’. This approach was criticized at three levels: (i) ideological, (ii) empirical, and (iii) methodological.

1. The Ideological Critique: dichotomous tradition was highly criticized since it was a product of an ethnocentric worldview. Social evolutionists have developed a dichotomous approach during the late nineteenth century. Critics have condemned the explicit racism of the theory. Thus, political scientists have criticized the ideology and the terminology of the dichotomous approach towards orientations. Scholars have argued that “modern” means being Western without the onus of dependence on the West. Modernization theorists have analyzed non–Western societies according to the prevailing socio, economic, political and cultural conditions of the developing countries (Bendix, 1967, Rudolph and Rudolph, 1967, Tipps 1973). The dichotomous approach has been shaped on the lines of tradition-modernity contrast and enabled the political modernization scholars to have an analytical outlook on modern political systems. The ideological critique of modernization theory has addressed the cognitions, motivations, and purposes. Analyses of the ideological bases of modernization theory will facilitate the prediction of its empirical shortcomings. Thus, the ideological critique has to be supplemented by other critical perspectives.

2. The Empirical Critique: Theories of political modernization has been criticized for analyzing the transformation of societies as a result of processes of change (Bendix, 1967, Collins, 1968, Nisbet, 1969, Tipps 1973).). Political cognitions and modernization have extensively focused on indigenous aspects of culture and social structure. Modernization theorists have ignored the significance of practical aspects and external sources or influences on the political system. As Huntington has pointed out, “modernity and tradition are essentially asymmetrical concepts. The modern ideal is set forth, and then everything which is not modern is labelled traditional” (Huntington, 1971).

3. The Metatheoretical Critique: The final critique is methodological, or ‘metatheoretical’, and it has focused on conceptualizing the political modernization approach. Modernization is a multifaceted process involving changes in all areas of human thought and activity (Huntington, 1968: 32). Durkheim has condemned the developmental theory of Auguste Comte. Social scientists have criticized the theoretical and methodological underpinnings of political modernization (Tipps, 1973).
2.5 POLITICAL ORDER IN THE THIRD WORLD COUNTRIES

Samuel P Huntington, in his seminal work *Political Order in Changing Societies* (1968), has posed challenges to the political modernization approach. Huntington has analyzed that political development and economic modernization are not the same but have distinct processes. Further, instead of leading to stable democracies, rapid social changes and economic development will lead to the decay of the political institutions. Modernization has witnessed that it has encountered challenges in the early stages of economic growth. Socio, economic changes will result in higher aspirations that the political institutions are unable to meet. This will lead to the decay of the political system (Huntington 1968; Sokhey, 2011). Huntington has therefore argued that a stable authoritarian system is better than an unstable democratic political system. Some scholars have argued it has undermined the significance of the political modernization approach in democratic political systems.

2.5.1 The Process of Democratization

Modernization acts as a catalyst in the process of the democratization of societies. As discussed above, societies have become more rationalized and secularized in the process of modernization. Industrialization incorporated the division of labour, which led to massive production, leading to economic development. Economic prosperity creates room for democratization as economic freedom creates pressure on the political system for political freedom and rights. The industrial revolution gave stimulus to capitalism, which created a business class. The business class wants more control on taxation and property rights and is hard-pressed for a representative, limited and accountable government. Thus rationalization, secularization and industrialization resulted in democratization. Substantive democracy focuses on creating an environment for the involvement of all sections of the society in the democratic processes.

It has delineated the correlation between the policy realm and academic theories. In their *The Civic Culture* (1963), Almond and Verba have detailed the prerequisites for democratic systems. In his *The Stages of Economic Growth*, Rostow suggested a policy framework designed a policy to prevent the spread of Communism to South Vietnam and Indonesia. Rostow argued that policies for economic development are the prerequisite for the successful functioning of democratic political systems. In his *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (1991), Huntington has pronounced that democracies will flourish in stable political systems. However, economic growth may not be the single factor responsible for establishing democratic political systems (Sokhey, 2011).

In *The Logic of Political Survival*, Bruce Bueno de Mesquita (2003) has analyzed the types of political regimes and their implications for foreign policy. Free and fair elections, freedom of the press, human rights, and civil liberties have immensely contributed to establishing democratic political systems. It has been recommended that incentives should be given to the political leaders to establish
Political modernization means the discarding of feudal and traditional structures and cultures. It is also becoming free from religion and church domination by establishing secular political authority. It is the process of transforming the traditional political system into a modern one. Change in political culture and political institutions has led to the development and improved performance standards. Political modernization has played a vital role in democracy, industrialization and economic growth in the contemporary global world. The political modernization approach has explained the political outcomes and processes in the political systems.

Further, the analysis of political modernization has been explained with the help of the duality of structure. The political modernization approach had lost its credibility in the 1970s as military and authoritarian regimes swept through most of the developing countries. It was the dependency theory that came to the fore. However, there has been a revival of political modernization. There is now being acknowledged that political and economic changes have a vital role in determining the social structures and social values. The secularisation process has consequences for the political system, political recruitment and political behaviour of the individual. Economic growth and forms of democracy are therefore being redefined. Democracy and economic growth have to be analyzed based on the freedoms in society and the political system. Political modernization will be leading to democratization which will enrich the citizens.
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2.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Check Your Progress 1

1) Evolutionary theory has shaped the political modernization paradigm that dominated studies on non-Western countries in the 1950s. It explained political modernization in terms of a transition from traditional to modern society. This theory was an outcome of the Industrial Revolution and the French Revolution. These two revolutions destroyed the old social order and laid the foundation for a new one.

Check Your Progress 2

1) Dependency theory argued that economic development might undermine social mobilization and the emergence of democratic political system.
theory has pointed out that the country’s development will be explained based on its historical role in the economic development of the global world. According to dependency, development and underdevelopment are two sides of the same coin and that the development of one led to the underdevelopment of the other.

2) Various scholars have explained the process of democratization in their seminal works. Huntington’s The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century (1991)” has delineated that democracies will flourish in stable political systems. Policies of economic development are the prerequisite for the successful functioning of a democratic political system. Economic development will be leading to democratization.