

B.A. (Hons.) Political Science

Semester-IV

CORE COURSE

**Paper-VIII : Political Processes and
Institutions in Comparative Perspective**

Study Material : Unit 1–5



SCHOOL OF OPEN LEARNING

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

Editor : Dr. Mangal Deo

Dr. Shakti Pradayani Rout

Department of Political Science

Graduate Course

Paper-VIII : Political Processes and Institutions in Comparative Perspective

Contents

	Pg. No.
Unit-1 : Forms of Government	
(a) : Unitary and Federal System	Dr. Santosh Kumar Singh 01
(b) : Regimes Types: Democratic, Authoritarian, Populism and Totalitarian	Dr. Junjun Sharma Pathak 09
Unit-2 : Electoral Systems: Definition, Procedures, and Types of Election System	Dr. Robert Mizo 20
Unit-3 : Parties and Party Systems	Pawan Kumar 31
Unit-4 : Nation-State	Dr. Tanvi Kulkarni 37
Unit-5 : Gendering Comparative Politics: Institutions and Processes	
(a) : Political Representation	Megha 51
(b) : Women in Conflict and Peace	Megha 61

Edited by:

Dr. Mangal Deo

Dr. Shakti Pradayani Rout



SCHOOL OF OPEN LEARNING

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI

5, Cavalry Lane, Delhi-110007

(a) Unitary and Federal System

Dr. Santosh Kumar Singh

Introduction

Government is one of the important components to run the state, and its constituent parts. It is government which performs major functions of the state. It makes laws and policies to conduct the various affairs of state and daily life of the people. The government has many forms as it has been mentioned by the Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Leacock etc. Plato has mentioned three folds of classification—perfect state, imperfect state and state of ignorance. Whereas Aristotle has classified the forms of government on the basis numbers with sovereign power and the aim of government. According to him the best government is which, work for the interest of people. It became perverted when the government work for their interest. Polybius classified the government into three forms monarchy, aristocracy and democracy.

Leacock’s classification of government is generally accepted. He said there are two major forms of government, despotic and democratic. A despotic or a dictatorship government means where the will of one person prevails, whereas the democratic government means the will of people prevails and sovereignty lies in the hands of people rather than one person. If we try to do the classification of modern form government, it can be formed on the basis of social, economic, philosophical and historical factors. We can observe that democracy in contemporary era have different shades—Britain, USA, France, India, Canada, Germany, South Africa.

What is Government?

The term Government comes from the term govern, which stands for ‘to rule, guide, govern and direct. The term has historical root. It is commonly describing the government is Monarchy, Oligarchy and democracy. All these terms have roots in the Greek. There is no universal definition of government. According to the *Merriam-Webster dictionary* government stands for ‘the body of persons that constitutes the governing authority of a political unit or organization: such as officials comprising the governing body of a political unit and constituting the organization as an active agency’ⁱ. *Britannica* dictionary has defined the government as ‘the political system by which a country or community is administered and regulated’ⁱⁱ. On the other hand according to *Blackwell dictionary* has defined as ‘The government’ usually refers to the rulers, that group of people who are in charge of the state at a particular timeⁱⁱⁱ.

On the basis of various meaning, it can be said that the term government represents a form of system which exercise control over a society through law and order. At the same time, it can be it can be a way of exercising power. Government exists to operate the various

elements of state. As it has been mentioned by the *Soltau* that government means ‘all those individuals, institutions, and mean which help in expressing the will of the state and give it concrete shape’. In another words *Garner* has said that ‘government is a collective name for agency or organisation through which the will of the state is formulated, expressed and realised’. *C.F Strong* has mentioned ‘if we want to make and enforce the law the state must have sovereignty, without this state couldn’t exist.’^{iv}

The term government mostly used in four ways. The way as body which is charged with the sense of responsibility to govern. Another way as a machinery or engine of state. It is a state’s machinery with out this state could not exist. Thus, the government is an important organ of the state and it is vested with the rights to exercise sovereign power over the people of the state. To perform these functions the government can be divided into three organs—Legislature, Executive and Judiciary. The primary function of the legislature is to perform the function of law making for the state and people. The executive main function is to enforce the law. The major function of the government is run the state, make rules and laws for the state, decision making and policy formulation Whereas the judiciary major function is to interpret the application of laws to specific cases.

Major forms of Government

In contemporary era there are majorly two forms of government i.e., Unitary and Federal. The formation of these two forms of government is based on the model of division and concentration of power and the relationship between the Union and State or local bodies, government. The country like India, USA, South Africa, Canada, Australia has federal system. Whereas the country like Britain, Japan, Italy, and France has adopted unitary structure of government.

1. Unitary Government

Unitary government is a form of government under which all the powers lie in the hands of one central government. The major power is concentrated in the hands of central government and local or state government given required powers to perform the basic activities. The local or state government perform the functions as per the central government. It can be said that the local government operates only the way which directed by the central government. The power and the role of local government depends on the wishes of central government. As it has been mentioned by the *Dicey* under unitary form of government ‘the habitual exercise of supreme legislative authorities by one central power’. The central government have the only power to make the law for entire state and enforce the law either by self or transfer to the local authorities. The main features of the unitary government are;

- (a) *Power in the hands of Central Government:* In the unitary form of government all the power concentrate in the hands of central government like in Britain the power lies in the hands of central government i.e., Prime Minister, same as in the case of France all the powers are kept in the hands of president. The law-making authority is not available to any other body or the institution except that the power transferred and delegated by the central government to the state or local government. In France

according to 1958 constitution the central government is having all the powers and responsibility to define and implement the nation's policy. The parliament has only the power to make and pass the law. The France president also head of the state and head of the executive, supreme commander of military and determined the policy after the consultation with council of ministers.

- (b) *Laws, Rules and regulations:* In the unitary government the power is centralised in the hands of central government. Thus, it is not required to distribute the power between centre and state government. Due to this, the written rules and constitution is also not required to divide the powers and allocate the functioning. The written rules can be written like France and unwritten like Britain accordance to the people. The Britain has a unitary form of government hence, both Houses of Parliament—the House of Commons and House of Lords have the power to make law for the whole country.
- (c) *Local or state government follows the guidelines of central government:* As all the powers are in the hands of central government, it can do all the things as per its own choice and interest. There is no interference from the local government, whose duty is only to follow the instructions of the centre. The administrative and other departmental works are done by local government as per the direction made by central government, for example in Britain the Prime Minister and Council of minister gives the directions to the local body to do the work as more efficient manner.
- (d) *Flexible and easy to adapt environment:* In unitary government, due to power stays in the hands of central government, it helps the government and administration to take the decision according to changing time. The central government is not dependent on the assent of the local government, for example at the time of Covid-19 France, Britain government and administration has taken extraordinary decision. In unitary government the central government have the power to amend the constitution according to need and requirement. As it has been mentioned by the *E.B.Schulz*, 'the principal advantage of unitary government is its flexibility and the matter of distributing powers on the territorial basis.'^v
- (e) *Uniform Administration:* In the unitary government the power vested in the Centre government, that is based on the principle of centralisation of power. In such political system the hegemony of decision-making power and function lies in the hands of central administration. According to *C.F. Strong* under the unitary system the supremacy lies in the central parliament. The status of central parliament governs all the people like the British House of Commons passes all the laws and govern the local bodies. Moreover, centralisation of power is also the core idea in unitary government. In such a system, the local governments dependent on the central government. It is subordinate to the central government in all the aspects.

2. Federal Government

A federal state represents several sovereign states combine together and form a big state or on the other hand when a big state reorganises itself divide into several state under one umbrella.

As Dicey has said ‘A federal state is intended to reconcile national unity and power with the maintenance of state rights.’^{vi} A federal state is a union of states as it has been mentioned the article 1 of the Indian Constitution that India is a union of states. The federal state and government are a product of two kinds of forces—centripetal and centrifugal. Centripetal means when independent states agree to join hands to create a new state, the Australia and USA is the best example of such federal state. On the other hand, centrifugal means when unitary government transform into federal government. Under this system, the unit demand a large measure of autonomy which can be only provided in federal state. India is a very good example of centrifugal federal state.

In a federal system, the written and unwritten constitution performs major role. In the federal state the relationship between centre and unit defines in terms of constitution. In such situation it plays pivotal role to define the power and functions of centre and the state i.e., unit. The distinct feature of the federal government is division of power between central government and several state governments. In USA the sovereignty lies in its constitution. If any new law passed by the centre or state, it tries to match with constitution. It should not violate the basic principles of constitution. In unitary feature centre can pass any law to protect and promote the interest of people but in federal state, all the law tries to see the interest of states along with the people. The main features of the federal government are;

- (a) *Delegation and distribution of power:* In a federal state, the government comprises at least at two or more levels in a given territory. All of them performs activity through some common institutions and the power given to them in a shared basis. It can be said that in a federal government the powers distributed and delegated between the centre and state (units) and many other local governments too. It is one of the most essential features of the federal government. In federal state, the constitution which works as a sovereign over the both central and the state government. For example, in America, the central government have some power which is different from those 50 state powers. Both centre and state work on their defined spheres of functions. The central government work on the area related to national importance which is related to the nation as well as people, for example, the foreign affairs, diplomacy, trade, international negotiations and treaties etc. whereas, the state and local government works related to state affairs like local and state level issues of education health, sanitation road etc.
- (b) *Written and Rigid constitution:* In federal government, the power is distributed and divided between the central and state government. Thus, at this situation it become essential and binding to define the powers in a written and enacted constitution. The written document can only give the effective distribution and division of power. The unwritten constitution may generate and bring some misunderstandings, confusion and disagreements between the central and state governments. As it can be observed in the case of USA, India and Canada have written constitution.

In the federal system of government, it has been said that the written constitution is

rigid. It is due to protect the nature of federal structure. The central and state government together have the power to amend the written constitution. Moreover, it is due to maintain the stability and nature of federal state. Under this mutual consent between centre and state, the method follows to amend the any part of constitution related to federal structure require special majority i.e., 2/3rd majority. For example, in America if there is any amendment in the constitution required by the government related to the federal structure. The amendment follows two stages, at the first stage it requires 2/3rd majority of both the houses (Senate and ...) or the convention called by the congress on the demand made by 2/3rd members of the state assembly. At the second stage, the passed amendment either approved by the 3/4th state legislatures or by special convention in 3/4th of the state. It is only after passing through both the stages the amendment incorporated in the constitution.

- (c) *Anchoring role of Judiciary*: Judiciary plays pioneering role to protect and promote the federal nature of state. It is judiciary which protects and interprets the constitution. In India and USA, the judiciary utilises the power of judicial review over the laws of centre and state government. The judiciary not only interpret or protect the constitution but also solves the dispute between centre and state or state or state affairs like in India the Supreme Court have soled the issues related to river.

In federal state, there is always various issues evolves like, the boundary, resources, powers, actions etc. In such situation, the role judiciary very important to solve the disputes between centre and state. As it has been mentioned by the J. S. Mill ‘the constitutional authority of central and regional government alike should be precisely and clearly defined but the power to decide between them in any case of dispute should not reside in either of the government, or in any functionary subject to it, but in an umpire independent in both.’^{vii} In this regard, it can be found that the Judiciary performs key role in USA, Canada, and India.

- (d) *Dual Administration and Citizenship*: A federal state featured by the dual administration—at the centre government for the people of federation and other at the level of state government. The nature of functioning of administration at the centre and state level government is totally independent but it also works as a mutual support basis on the subject of national interest. For example, to fight with the Covid-19 the USA, Canada and India central and state government is incorporating to overcome from this global pandemic. In the federal structure of the government the citizens have to follow two sets of laws—central laws and the state laws.

Moreover, in federal government each person gets individual citizenship of state and centre. In other words, it can be said that people of federal state get double citizenship—one is common union citizenship of whole nation and another is the state as unit of which the person is resident. For example, in Australia, America and Canada the dual citizenship can be found. In USA the people enjoy the citizenship of USA as well as the state.

- (e) *Bicameral legislature*: In a federal state, the legislature at the central level establishes bicameral legislature. In one house—the people of central government are given representation to centre, while the other house represented by the units of the federation. The USA and Canada, have bicameral legislature. In USA the Senate i.e., Upper House represents the states where as the house of representative represent centre. In USA, the people of the state have been given equal representation in the house of representation and the 50 states have been given equal representation.
- (f) *Equality to all the unit states*: The federal system of government follows one key principle is to treat all the state or units as equal basis. It never gives special or extra preference to any state on the basis of its size, population, resources etc. It is due to this requirement all the states given equal seats in one or two houses of the central legislature for example, in America Senate all state represented by two members either the state is large in size or population. As *K. C Wheare* mentioned that the framers of federation must ensure that all the units can maintain their independence within the sphere allotted to them and work the federation. Principally, it can be said that the federal government takes neutral or middle path between the centre and the unit affairs. The system is supported by the method of distribution of power between the central and state governments.

An Analysis

In the contemporary world, almost all the countries have adopted the democratic form of government. In which most of the states have followed either the unitary or the federal form of government. If we can do the analysis of both the forms of government, we may find some merits and demerits are there. It can be understood under different points, these are:

- (a) *Stable and totalitarian government*: If we analyse and compare the unitary and federal form of government it can noticed that the unitary government is more strong and powerful in compare to federal government regarding to take the decision and policy making. There are chances that the unitary government can turn into a totalitarian of dictatorship. It is due to the power, which is kept in the hands of centre and there is no check on the activities of government. There are high chances of misuse of power. For example, it can observe that the Pakistan, many times the government overthrown by the military government. In Pakistan many times military overtaken the government and established the military government.

The division of power between the centre and state is a weakness for both the central as well as the state government. The central government find difficulty to implement the policies, programs and the decisions without support from the state government. On the other hand, state government also find the difficulty to implement the schemes and policies with support from the central government. As *Gettlell* has said that the proper adjustment for the central government is always source of problem its majorly due to some sectional and local fractions are always present in the state.^{viii}

- (b) *The nature of constitution:* The Constitution have very important post in democracy and in the Unitary or the federal form of government. In unitary form of government, the constitution is flexible. It is easy to amend by the central government. Whereas, in the federal form of government the constitution is rigid and not easy to do amend that is due to maintain the equitable relationship between the centre and state. As we can see the America's constitutional amendment and Britain's constitutional amendment. It can be easily noticed that USA has not witnessed only few constitutional amendments whereas, the Britain has experienced constitutional amendment.
- (c) *Administration and governance:* The administration plays very important role in both the forms—unitary and federal government. In unitary government, administration is flexible. The flexible constitution ensures to fulfil the demands and need of the people according changing time. The unitary system also adapts the situation according to the social needs and environment. It is due to the system that provides for the creation of a powerful central government with full discretion to use its power and amend the constitution according to the requirement. As it has been mentioned by the *Gettell* that unitary system for its uniformity and freedom from repetition, wastefulness and extravagance. But the unitary government is suitable only for the small or homogeneous states. For large state where multicultural system where multiple language, religion, and regional diversity. In such situation, federal government will be the suitable government. In the unitary system, due to the existence of single executive and legislature for the whole state makes dominance of administration of administration by the bureaucracy.
- (d) *Conflict and the Stability in the state:* A strong desire for the unity among the people is the first and prior condition for the formation and success of federal government. Thus, the idea of 'unity in diversity' is become hall mark for the successful federal government. The diverse interest of the federal units create conflict with the unit and national interest. Many times, it creates conflict and unhealthy competition between the regions. For example, the regional loyalties, racial, linguistic and religious issues.

The unitary government is suitable for small and single identity in terms of language, culture and ethnicity. For big state like India, USA, China, Russia or multi-cultural state like India its not suitable due to government is located in centre and face problem related to state as a national basis. Due to its concentration on the central issue, it fails to satisfy the issues and needs of local people. Apart from this, the local government don't have much power and administrative agencies to solve the local problems.

Conclusion

The era of globalisation has established and changed many things. Now, all the forms of government—unitary or federal government trying to protect and promote the voices of individual with the model of good governance. Both the forms of government have their own

positive and negative points. It's the nature of state which decides the best form of government—unitary or federal. In modern world, most of the countries are trying the mixed model like unitary feature with the federal government—unitarian federalism. For example, India according to constitution *Article 1* India is 'union of states' but in practice it is more quasi federal—the centre is more powerful than the states. It's due to power providing to the central government to take the national decision whereas autonomy to the states to solve the local issues.

The principle of 'unity in diversity' or the 'union with autonomy' in actual practice is always source of individual identity and protection to units in the system of federal government. Federal system is most suitable system for the large state in terms of size, population and diversity—it protects and promotes the interest of people in terms of language, culture, religion, race and the class. The centre cannot be powerful and strong without cooperation and support from local or state government. Thus, most of the modern states are trying cooperative and centralised federal system for providing goods and services to people and federation as whole.

References

- i Merriam-Webster, 2021 accessed from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/government>
- ii Brogan, Hugh (2021), Government, accessed from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/government>.
- iii Bealey, Frank (1999) Government, The Blackwell Dictionary of Political Science: A User's Guide to Its Terms, Blackwell Publishing: Oxford, P-147
- iv Strong C F (1972), Modern Political Constitutions; An Introduction to the Comparative Study of Their History and Existing Form, New York: Macmillan Company.
- v Schulz, E.B (1961), The Essentials of Governments”, prentice Hall: London
- vi Dicey, A. V (1915), Introduction to the study of the law of the constitution, Macmillan Publication: London.
- vii Mill, J. S (2008), Considerations on Representative Government, Ingram short title: London
- viii Gettell (2015), Readings in Political Science, Arkose Press: Warsaw

(b) Regimes Types : Democratic, Authoritarian, Populism and Totalitarian

Dr. Junjun Sharma Pathak

Introduction

Understanding the nature of regimes has been a great challenge not only due to the changing nature of parameters to characterise a regime but also due to the presence of multiple and overlapping variables. Nevertheless, understanding the nature of regimes is crucial since it guides us in our understanding of how government functions, facilitates better governance and ensure human rights.

This chapter will look into the nature of different regime types followed by a discussion on the challenges of the classification of regimes. We will also study the basis of classification that has been used to characterise political regimes. For, this purpose this chapter will focus on the number of people ruling, and the nature of power the state holds concerning its subjects and political institutions as the two broad parameters.

The next section will highlight the characteristics and the nature of democratic, authoritarian, populism, and totalitarian regimes. It would enable us to understand the differences and also the overlapping characteristics between these regime types. So, by the end of this chapter, we should be able to get a glimpse of the basis of the classification of regime types and understand in detail the nature of various kinds of regime types.

As we proceed to explore the nature of various kinds of regimes, it is necessary to briefly discuss what we understand by terms such as the state, government, and political regimes or political systems. We often use these terms interchangeably, especially terms such as the state and the government. However, let us discuss the meaning of these terms briefly for a better understanding. The state could be defined as an organised political community, with a definite territory, sovereignty, and a government. While the government is the agency that acts on behalf of the state. Political regimes can be defined as “the formal and informal structure of state and governmental roles and processes” (Siaroff 2013:2). It represents a set of processes, norms and culture that determines how the government functions. It refers to the pattern of interactions between the various institutions, structures, the government and the civil society of the state.

Understanding the Nature of Political Regimes: Its Challenges and Objectives

The earliest tradition of investigating regimes could be traced to 4. Century B.C. Thinkers like Plato and Aristotle have contributed greatly to the tradition of studying regimes. The modern state and rise of the Westphalian state have introduced several changes into how we

look at a modern state. The emergence of liberal democratic states, the constitution and the factors such as freedom of expression and speech, the spectrum of political and social rights have greatly shaped the nature of regimes a country may have. However, with the process of decolonisation and cold war politics in the nineteenth and twentieth century, the classification of regime types have become much complex. However, the process of classification has not been bereft of criticisms, since many of these classificatory schemes have been considered Eurocentric privileging the west, with oversimplified realities of many Asian and post-colonial states.

Basis of Classification: From Number of Rulers and Nature of Authority Exercised

Two major variables which have been employed to understand the nature of regimes have been: the number of people ruling (who is ruling) and secondly how the ruling body exercises power over the governed. In the case of the second criteria, power has been a major basis of classification and a yardstick to investigate the nature of the relationship the state may hold concerning its political institutions. The nature of the relationship shared between the centre and the units determines whether the state is a unitary or a federal state. Also, regimes may be classified based on the relationship between the executive and the legislative therefore it could be a parliamentary or a presidential form of government.

Before we proceed to understand the contemporary nature of regime types let us look at how regimes may be classified based on the number of people who execute political power.

<i>Type of Regime</i>	<i>The number of people who rule and the nature of rule</i>
Monarchy	It is a rule by one person. In such a kind of regime the monarch is the head of the state. The nature of such regimes could vary from constitutional, to symbolic to an absolute monarchy (examples may include Nepal, Jordan or medieval Europe, Britain)
Dictatorship	One (examples may include Germany under Hitler’s and Italy under Mussolini, or in the current times North Korea)
Oligarchy	Rule by a few, often by the wealthy class. It is a kind of rule where a certain class of people assumes rule over several aspects of a regime (for instance South Africa under the apartheid regime)
Aristocracy	Rule by few, such regimes are characterised by a rule by the small ruling class. (examples of such regime types could be ancient Greece)
Democracy	Many (Examples of Democracy may include the United States and India)

Next, after we have seen how we can classify regimes based on the number of people who rules, we can classify regimes based on the government executes power and holds power as mentioned below.

Type of Regime	Its relationship with power and its execution
Totalitarian	Absolute control over every aspect of life and governance (examples may include Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Greater German Reich)
Autocratic	Such a regime is also very controlling, however, it is less controlling than a totalitarian regime (French empire under Napoleon Bonaparte, Chile under Pinochet)
Authoritarian	Such a regime is also very controlling, however, it is less controlling than a totalitarian regime (some examples may include People's Republic of China, Jordan, Turkey)
Constitutional	Under such regimes the amount of power exercised by the state is controlled by rules that are laid out in the constitution and any abuse of power is ensured by a system of check and balances.
Democracies	Under such a regime the source of power lays with the people. The elected representatives of the people are responsible for exercising power on behalf of the people. Democracies may be direct or indirect.
Populism	Such political movements/ regimes claim to represent the will of the people and demonstrate opposition to the elites

After we have understood the various existing kinds of regimes based on the number of people ruling and its relationship with power, this section would specifically deal in detail, the nature democratic, authoritarian, totalitarian and populist regimes.

Democratic Regimes: Nature and Characteristics

It refers to a political system characterised by the rule of the people. Democracy is represented as a form of the regime in which people elect their representative. The word Democracy comes from Greek Word *Demos*, meaning the people. It refers to a kind of political rule, where the supreme power is vested with the people. In fact, some of the earliest references for Democracy is traced to ancient Greece. For, instance many of these ancient Greek city-states, had certain institutions in place which was democratic in nature. In Athens a few could elect their representatives or officials, thereby having an element of election and a system where rule by the majority was an acceptable form of political process and it is considered due to the level of mass participation by the masses (Heywood 2019:183). Both of these examples demonstrate traces of democratic processes. Although, democracy at that time is not like the current nature of democracy. The way we need to understand is the position of the individual with regard to the community.

Prevalence of democratic practices would be traced to the Indian subcontinent as well with early social and political formations. Some of the prominent institutions would be traced to 6.B.C, where a few people could exercise their participation through the *Sanga's* and

panchayats during the era of the *Mahajanapads*. However, the nature of democracy then and the modern notions of democracy varies today.

As we begin to move away from the ancient period, we see that as the political, cultural and economic changes begin to take place, so did the nature of state and nature of political regimes. For instance, the nature of political regimes in the medieval period was greatly influenced by the events such as the Renaissance in Europe and eventually the treaty of Westphalia 1648 which formalised the notion of a modern state with territorial sovereignty as one of the fundamental aspects of a state (Heywood 2019: 124). Eventually, other many significant events in the United States such as the passage of the Bill of Rights 1789 were landmark developments for the growth of democratic ideals. The French revolution in 1798 too played a significant role, which led to the establishment of the constitutional monarchy after abolishing the Ancient regime, is considered to have laid some of the most fundamental aspects of modern liberal democracy.

The 20th century was one of the most eventual periods in the context of the rise of democratic regimes. The impact of the First World War with the victory of the Allies was a period when democratic regimes received more legitimacy. However, the peace between the interwar period and victory of the allies was short-lived, due rise and popularity of authoritarian regimes. For instance, the rise of Nazism in Germany and Mussolini in Italy, are some of the most striking examples of authoritarian regimes in the 20th century. The cold war period too saw a period when the struggle between the communist and the capitalist bloc influenced the nature of political regimes in many countries. Also, other political developments such as the prominence of Stalinism in Communist USSR, demonstrates how authoritarian states turned totalitarian in nature. Having, mentioned that, the upcoming sections would provide a comparative analysis of how the nature of authoritarian regime may differ from totalitarian regimes.

However, post-cold war, the dissolution of USSR, the decolonisation process and civil rights movements, had impacted the gradual demise of non-democratic regimes. Many former colonies of the imperial powers were to grant political autonomy/ sovereignty in lieu of cooperating with their war efforts of the imperial powers. For instance, India was promised independence if India were to cooperate with Britain in their war efforts against the axis powers. Representative governments started becoming more popular. Even today, many countries are making transitions concerning the nature of political regimes they have. However, one of the greatest challenges of democracy remain, that true democracy is a distant possibility. Appropriation of democracy by vested interests and populist regimes have taken away the real essence of the objective of a democratic political system.

The next section will discuss some of the major characteristics of a democratic regime. The nature of a democratic regime is usually determined by the position of an individual with respect to the community, civic and political rights.

When we speak of democracy in an everyday language, we refer to the rule of majority

as one of the basic principles of democracy, which implies the rule of the people. Universal Adult Franchise and voting rights do constitute the core of any democratic regime. However, majority rule does not naturally imply that a state may be democratic. A true democracy, especially in countries with diverse ethnic and religious composition has to ensure the concerns of the ethnic and religious minorities.

Political Pluralism is one of the most important aspects of a democratic regime. In modern- day democracies and especially in states with a complex societal composition and multiple institutions, political pluralism becomes a crucial characteristic of a well-functioning democracy. One of the basic features of a democratic regime is the free formulation of preferences through freedom of association, information and communication (Linz 2000:58)

Democracies usually guarantee certain inalienable rights to their citizens. Freedom of speech and expression, Religious and Cultural Freedom are some of the rights.

Political Freedom is another major characteristic of a democracy, which is marked by the presence of civil liberties, mass participation, freedom of media and press. The election of leaders either directly or indirectly is one of the core features of a democratic regime.

Equality before the law and equal opportunities irrespective of caste, gender, or religion is a fundamental feature of modern democracies. For democracies to be real there has to be equality of opportunities in not just political, but social, educational and economic sense (Gillin 1919: 704)

Economic freedom, the right to practice a profession of choice and the absence of absolute state control over economic activities have also been a part of liberal democracies.

Mass political mobilisation is a fundamental aspect of modern democracies since representatives compete in elections for the purposes of governing (Boix and Stokes 2011:9). Since political participation and freedom of expression may form a crucial feature of democracies, therefore it is often marked by the presence of civil society groups.

However, it should also be noted that no democratic regime offers absolute rights or political freedom. Often, and at many instances rights as qualified in nature and not absolute. For instance, one cannot hurt the sentiments of other communities in the name of freedom of speech or make derogatory remarks against women. However, it is also true that many at times a lot of these provisions in a democracy are misappropriated. Alan Siaroff (2013: 117), identifies a few factors which make some countries more democratic than others and they are political pluralism, level of economic development, nature of development, the role of the military, population, homogeneity, socio-cultural and regional factors too.

Democracies could be of two types, which are direct and indirect democracy. In a direct democracy, people elect their representatives directly and govern directly, for example, Switzerland. On the other hand, indirect democracy people elect their representatives, so often called representative democracy. In representative democracies, people elect their leaders in indirectly and it is effective as long as the relationship between the governed and

the government is fulling and reliable (Heywood 2019:181). Representative democracies could be parliamentary, presidential, liberal and illiberal too. Democracies may be characterised by a dominant one-party system and also a multi-party system. India has a representative form of democracy, characterised by a phase with a one-dominant party system in the immediate post- independence days, and also with time saw an emergence of regional parties and coalition politics. The American system has the feature of a two-party system with the Republicans and the democrats. Britain can be characterised as having a multi-party system, however since 1920 there have been two major parties, the labour party and the conservative party have dominated politics. However, the one-party system is not the same as a pure one-party system, which exists in countries like the Peoples Republic of China. In a one-party dominant system, one party predominates over the rest, whereas a pure one system is characterised by a single party, which is non-democratic (Siaroff 2013:202)

We have discussed how different regimes differ from each other based on the number of people who rule and the nature of power they wield over the political, economic, social and cultural sphere of the state and its subjects. By now it is already evident that there is no strict categorisation of any regime as such, but only an identification of some more prominent characteristics of these political systems. However, democracies are also not without their pitfalls, often democracies have assumed oligopolistic characteristics and also rivalries between political parties and opposition creates disharmony too (Heywood 2019: 184). Also, there are different theories of democratic thought which explore various forms of democracies such as pluralist, liberal, substantive, deliberative (Hilmer 2011: 605-607).

A critical analysis of each of these regimes types, as in when we look at the actual functioning of these political systems we may see that certain countries with a democratic set up may not be as democratic as it may seem to be as enshrined in the constitution. For instance, one of the major criticisms around democracy, apart from Aristotle's understanding of democracy as mobocracy is that it is a form of oligopolistic form of government, in which a few rules over the entire state of affairs in the name of the people.

Authoritarian Regimes: Nature and Characteristics

Authoritarian regimes are characterised by governments which has a strong command overpower, often a centralised power structure. Such regimes are characterised by limited political freedom. Under such regimes, political rights, freedom of religion and political pluralism are very limited. Also, there may be overlapping of judicial, executive and legislative functions of the state. Even today, many authoritarian regimes may have features of a democratic system and a democratic system may have features of an authoritarian regime. As, discussed earlier each of these regimes may have variations and may often overlap with the characteristics of other regimes, however political scientists have classified authoritarian regimes as oligarchic or autocratic, or rule by a one-party or the military.

Alan Siaroff (2013:243-245), lists different kinds of authoritarian regimes which may range from traditional, military, theocratic, to electoral authoritarianism. The traditional

authoritarian regimes are the ones that are based on a patron-client relationship. Bureaucratic military apparatus is those which sustain themselves through and within the bureaucratic structure. Competitive authoritarian regimes are those regimes that have democratic structures, but authoritarian in their functioning. Also, as discussed in the previous sections, authoritarianism in its extreme form takes the shape of a totalitarian state. Some of the fundamental characteristics of authoritarian regimes are discussed in the section below.

Authoritarian regimes have a very controlled power structure; it usually has a centralised power structure. It is not just political power that is centralised, even economic power may be highly centralised. In authoritarian regimes or non-democratic setup, a lot of the rules are left to the rulers to decide and not independent bodies (Linz 2000: 59)

One of the core aspects of an Authoritarian regime is that it lacks political pluralism. Such regimes lack a spirit to accommodate any opposition or presence of alternate institutions. Authoritarian regimes are less tolerant of diverse ethnic and religious composition.

Most often, such regimes sustain on use of violence or coercion. Any non-adherence to the dictates of state may invite very harsh punishments. Secret killings, arrests become a common feature, for instance, Nazi Germany during Hitler's reign was based on an extensive spy and surveillance system and often resorted to force to suppress any opposition or alternative thinking.

It is often marked by an indefinite rule by one political power, often maintaining its position through abuse of power. Such leaders often come to power not necessarily people elect them or grant consent but often occupy positions of power through coercion and even populist propaganda. Such leaders remain in power by disseminating fake information, with total control over mass media and freedom of speech. Therefore, controlled media and freedom of the press is another feature of such regimes.

Authoritarian regimes are characterised by limited civil liberties and attempts are made to control civil liberties.

Lack of mass mobilisation and mass participation in political affairs become a dominant feature of many authoritarian regimes due to the use of severe coercion and state repression.

History had examples of many authoritarian regimes, however, with the end of second world war, many countries moved away from authoritarianism to democracy. Factors such as the use of force or coercion alone have not been able to hold such regimes in power although it has been a crucial factor, for instance, Pol Pot was ousted out of power after killing two million Cambodians (Gandhi and Przeworski 2007: 2).

Factors such as the end of decolonisation, end cold war, fall of Soviet acted as a catalyst for the shift away from authoritarian regimes. Arab Spring in 2010 was another event which began in Tunisia and spread to many countries such as Libya and Egypt challenged the authoritarian regimes. However, even today we have many authoritarian regimes such as North Korea and the Peoples Republic of China exist.

Totalitarian Regimes: Nature and Characteristics

Totalitarian regimes are characterised by extreme state control over both private and public life of the people. R Fine (2001) states that it is a form of modern dictatorship in which state power is concentrated in a single party; state exercises its control over almost every aspect of life of the people, there is use of terror which is often exercised by a secret police services and most importantly use of an official ideology which is often irrefutable.

Historically, the concept of a totalitarian state may be traced back to the writings of several political thinkers who mentioned the idea of an absolute state. However, totalitarianism is believed to be a fairly modern phenomenon which can be traced to the rise of Germany under Adolf Hitler, Italy under Mussolini and Soviet Union under Stalin is also an example of the same. Some of the recent examples of such regimes are North Korea under Kim Jong-un.

Some of the major characteristics of the totalitarian regimes are as follows:

Absolute control over every aspect of life: Totalitarian regimes are marked by the state's presence in determining most aspects of life of the citizens. For instance, such regimes determine not only the nature of political rule and political rights but also exercises complete control over the economy, educational, cultural life, morals and attitudes.

The concentration of power in a single party: Totalitarian states are characterised by the concentration of political power in a single party. In such a system one party rules the political system with a strong ideological base which is indisputable. It does not show tolerance towards the presence of opposition and the existence of any alternative political party. Therefore, the use of state repression and violence becomes a distinct characteristic of such regimes.

Complete control over the economy: Control over the economy is one of the most fundamental features of a totalitarian regime. Totalitarian regimes are marked by absolute control and command over the economy of the state concerned. The state decides all the major economic decisions, the planning, the distribution and also the nature of economic competition. The model of economic planning in the erstwhile Soviet Union is one such example that was characterised by a very rigid system.

Mass Surveillance: Since, totalitarian states attempt at controlling the political, economic and cultural aspects of life it relies heavily on the use of mass surveillance. Such regimes are characterised by the presence of secret police service, use of technology for surveillance and even concentration camps. Nazi Germany is considered as one of the greatest examples in history which embarked on a very massive surveillance programme to control the population.

Repression of freedom of speech and criticism: Another feature of a totalitarian regime is the absence of freedom of speech and opinion. In such regimes, criticisms against the government are responded to with heavy repression. The state has control over the media, newspapers and also controls the circulation of any knowledge. Most sources of information are often state controlled and act as a mode of propaganda. Censorship of the press is a common feature of such regimes.

Use of force and violence: Use of violence and force to suppress any opinion that may criticise the actions of the state are another fundamental feature of such a regime. Force is often used to crush dissent, suppress opposition, and also garner obedience of the masses.

The distinction between totalitarian and authoritarian regimes:

As we can see in the preceding sections above that factors such as the use of force, lack of political freedom, the concentration of political power, use of force are overlapping characteristics for both a totalitarian regime and as well as authoritarian regimes. Then the question here that arises is then, what is the difference between a totalitarian and an authoritarian regime?

One of the fundamental features and also a difference between a totalitarian and an authoritarian regime is that a totalitarian regime attempts to control every aspect of life, both public and private. It attempts to not only control the economic and cultural life of the state but also shape or even manufacture certain attitudes, beliefs and a particular ideology as desired by the state. On the other hand, authoritarian regimes, although characterised by a strong concentration of power, use of force or lack of freedom, it does not attempt to control every aspect of life as it does under a totalitarian regime. There is some degree of freedom although marked by an absence of any accountability.

Populism: Nature and Characteristics.

What do we understand by the term Populism or Populist regimes? We can notice in recent times that this term has begun to be widely used to characterise a certain type of politicians and leaders, who are identified as figures with a wide mass appeal and influence. These public figures are often charismatic in nature and have been able to demonstrate their influence over the masses. However, we know that most leaders are influential and do have a mass appeal. In that case, does being popular and being populist similar, or is it different?

This term is widely contested as it was representing completely, since it may represent a variety of movements, ideas, and beliefs in a different political, economic and social context. Cristóbal and Kaltwasser (2017:4-5), mention four kinds of approaches that explain what populism could mean; the popular agency approach speaks of populism as a positive force for the mobilisation of people in a democracy. Then the Laclauan approach, which is rooted in critical studies considers populism as an emancipatory force. It is based on the notion that liberal democracies need to change into radical democracies and it is populism which can induce mobilisation for change to include the neglected segment of the society. Another approach speaks of populism as a political strategy, characterised by the emergence of strong charismatic leaders who have connection with the masses. The last approach states populism as a 'folkloric' which parties and leaders use to garner attention of the masses and the media. These scholars argue that each of these approaches has its individual merits and demerits.

Despite contradictions in assigning a single definition of the term, populism can be said to have the following characteristics:

Firstly, populism has been identified as a political movement or those leaders which highlight or claim to represent the common people and the will of the common people. They claim to represent the real needs of the people.

Secondly, one of the most fundamental characteristics of populist regimes or movements is that the claim of the leaders to represent the will of the people is majorly juxtaposed against the elites or even the ruling establishment in case of those trying to capture power.

Most importantly, we realise that being popular is not exactly identical to being a populist.

As discussed populism is not a single movement or one set of beliefs. It has its own set of implications in different political, social and economic contexts. Many movements in Asia, Europe, and America have been termed populist, however, they may not have similarities, for instance, many right-wing parties can be populist while even left-wing parties could be populist too. Venezuela's late President Chávez, Donald Trump in the United States, the Bolivian Government of left-wing populist Evo Morales are a few examples of the same.

Populism is identified with its set of negatives and positives. For instance, many populist leaders are identified with unfulfilled promises since such promises are made in a haste to capture the attention and support of the people. However, populism can also be identified as a people's participation in influencing the decision making in both political and economic sphere, since; many of the populist movements are often mobilisations at the grassroots as well.

Summary

In the end, we need to understand that there is no strict mode of classification of regime types. Political scientists have classified regimes based on the nature of the relationship between the ruler and the ruled, civil and political liberties, the relationship between various organs of the government.

We have learned that political regimes could be classified based on the number of people ruling, such as Monarchy, Dictatorship, Aristocracy, Oligarchy to Democracy. We have discussed the characteristics of authoritarian, totalitarian, democratic, and Populist regimes. One of the most important aspects we need to keep in mind is the nuanced difference between totalitarian and authoritarian regimes, although both may have similar features as well.

The process of decolonisation, especially after the post-cold war has introduced complex changes in many Asian and African countries, therefore new modes of classification become a necessity for a more meaningful study of the various political systems across the world.

References

Boix Carles and Susan C. Stokes (2011), in *Overview of comparative politics*, in Robert E. Goodin(ed.) Oxford Handbook of Political Science.

Cristóbal and Kaltwasser (2017), *Populism: A very Short Introduction*, Great Britain: Oxford University Press.

Gandhi, Jennifer and Adam Przeworski. 2007. "Authoritarian Institutions and the Survival of Autocrats." *Comparative Political Studies* 40, no. 11 (November): 1279-1301.

Gillin, L. J (1919), "Origins of Democracy", *American Journal of Sociology*, 24(6):704- 714.

Heywood, Andrew (1997), *Politics*, Macmillan, London.

Hilmer, D, Jefferey (2011), 'Modern Democratic Thought', in Ishiyama, J. T. and Breuning, M. (eds.) *21st Century Political Science: A Reference Book*. Los Angeles, Sage: 605-614.

Juan J. Linz. 2000. *Totalitarian and Authoritarian Regimes*. Boulder: Lynne Reiner, pp.1- 63.

R. Fine (2001), 'Totalitarianism Impact of Social Thought' in *International Encyclopaedia of the Social and Behavioural Sciences*, URL; <https://www.sciencedirect.com/topics/computer-science/totalitarian-regime>

Siaroff, Alan. (2013). *Comparing Political Regimes- A Thematic Introduction to Comparative Politics*. Toronto, University of Toronto.

Electoral Systems: Definition, Procedures, and Types of Election System

Dr. Robert Mizo

Outline

- Introduction
- Representation
- Elections and their Functions
- Electoral Systems
 - Majoritarian Systems - First Past the Post
 - Proportional Representation
 - Mixed Representation
- Theories of Voting
- Women and the Electoral Process

Introduction

Elections are often thought to be at the heart of any political system. Some see them as nothing short of democracy in practice. They are the means through which people elect their rulers, control their governments, and replace incompetent leaders. Elections are based on the foundational concept of representation - a concept with multiple interpretations. Elections facilitate the process of choosing representatives by the people to govern over them. There are many ways in which elections are conducted known as electoral systems. There is no consensus on which electoral system is the best as all of them have their own advantages and weaknesses. The study of electoral systems constitutes a pertinent part of comparative political analysis.

This chapter begins with a discussion on the theories of representation to understand the competing interpretations of the concept. The chapter then looks into the concept of elections and the functions they render in political systems. The chapter then leads to a comparative analysis of the various electoral systems namely, majoritarian systems, proportional representation systems, and mixed representation systems. The chapter goes on to study the various theories of voting to understand the underlying determinants of peoples' voting behaviour. The chapter closes with a brief discussion on the issue of women and electoral participation.

Representation

Representation is the act of standing in legally on behalf of a larger unit of people. It is defined as a relationship through which an individual or group stands for, or acts on behalf of, a larger body of people (Heywood 2013). Representation is an integral part of modern democracy as it forms the link between the government and the governed. Representatives articulate the views of the people and secure their interests. Parallel with the growth of democratic ideas, representation came to mean representation of the wishes of citizens, directly or indirectly through mediators.

Representation has generated debates and questions historically. In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the debate centred largely on the question of who should be represented. Thinkers argued over if representation should be restricted to those having the competence, education and leisure, to vote and think seriously about politics (propertied men) or if representation be extended to all adult citizens. Limited representation gave rise to a plural voting system in which people had different degrees of enfranchisement based on their social and economic standing. The widespread acceptance of the principle of political equality in the 20th century via the practice of universal adult franchise established representation of all adult citizens. Representation is more than just voting and elections; politicians become representatives not merely because they are elected to office. Representation involves questions about how one person can be said to represent another, and what it is that he or she represents. Is it the views of the represented, their best interests, the groups from which they come, or what? (Heywood, 2013).

There are various theories of representation which throw light to the above questions. *The Trustee model* of representation stems from Edmund Burke's understanding of a representative as one who acts on behalf of others using his or her superior knowledge, education, and experience. The meaning of representation is to serve one's constituents by the exercise of 'mature judgement' and 'enlightened conscience' (Heywood, 2013). Representation is a moral duty which requires the more fortunate to act in the interest of those who are less so. Once elected, the representatives should think and decide for themselves what is best for their constituents because the mass of the electorate are incapable of articulating their best interests.

The Delegate model of representation sees the representative as a delegate - a conduit conveying the views and interests of others. Here, the representative does not have the capacity to act according to his own judgement or preferences. He or she only behaves in exact accordance with the instructions emanating from their constituencies. Those supporting the delegate model such as Thomas Paine usually seek mechanisms to ensure that politicians are bound as closely as possible to the views of the represented. These could be in the form of 'frequent interchange' between representatives and their constituents through regular elections and short office terms. Additionally, radical democrats have advocated the use of mechanisms such as initiatives and recall to keep the politicians under the direct control of the voters.

The Mandate model of representation sees elected representatives and political parties as having secured the command or consent to govern from their voters. This model assumes that by winning an election, a party gains a popular mandate that authorizes it to affect policies or programmes contained in its election manifesto. This model places the onus of representation on political parties and therefore necessitates party unity and discipline.

The Microcosmic model of representation or descriptive representation is based on the idea that the government should constitute a microcosm of the larger society by including members drawn from all groups and sections in society. The government must have representatives from all social classes, gender, age and so on, and in numbers that are proportional to the size of the groups in society at large (Heywood, 2013). The body of elected representatives must resemble the whole society as much as possible and hence this model is also known as the resemblance model. The idea behind this model is that only a person belonging to a particular class can best represent that class.

'Division of labour' representation approach underlines a division of labour between representatives and the electorate. Representatives are elected to look after the interest of the voters, redress their grievances, support appropriate legislation, report on outcomes, and be accountable for their actions. Representatives on the other hand expect their voters to continue supporting their work through votes and other means.

Elections and their Functions

Election is the action of choosing for an office or position usually by vote. Haroop and Miller define elections as a 'formal expression of preferences by the governed which are then aggregated and transformed into a collective decision about who will govern, who should stay in office, who should replace those who have been thrown out' (Bara, 2012). The reason intrinsic connection between the representative process and elections and voting. Elections are a necessary condition for political representation in modern circumstances. For Joseph Schumpeter, democracy is an institutional arrangement as a means of filling public office by a competitive struggle for the people's vote. He equates democracy with elections by defining democracy as a means for people to have the opportunity of accepting or refusing those who are to rule them. There are different forms which elections can take. These forms depend on the offices which are subject to the elective principle, the width of the franchise, the nature of voting, and whether the elections are competitive or not.

Elections play various important functions in a democracy. Elections are the principal source of political recruitment. Political parties nominate members for elections to public office based on the candidates' charisma, oratory skills, good looks, and winability. Elections are therefore platforms through which politicians are recruited.

Elections also make governments directly in states such as the USA and France where political executives are directly elected. Elections influence the government formation in parliamentary forms of government where a single party gains a clear parliamentary majority. In proportional representation systems, governments are made or unmade through post-election deals.

Elections provide representation in that they are the means through which public demands are channelled to the government. However, elections have limited capacity of ensuring that mandates are carried out other than the opportunity to not elect the incumbent in the next election. Of course countries with the use of recall and initiatives are better able to ensure that the mandate of the people is respected by the elected representatives.

Elections influence policy by deterring governments from pursuing radical and deeply unpopular policies. Elections can be seen to directly influence policy when a single issue dominates the election campaign. The extent of influence elections have on policy however is limited. Other factors such as the state of the economy rather than electoral considerations have more direct influence of policy.

Elections are also educational for the electorate as the campaigning process provides abundance of information about parties, candidates, the current government's record and policies, the political system and so on. However this largely depends on the availability of free and impartial information. Candidates and parties usually seek to persuade the electorate, rather than educate them, and they may have incentives to provide incomplete and distorted information.

Elections help foster legitimacy for governing party or parties and winning an election amounts to having mobilized active consent of the masses. This is one of the reasons why we observe even authoritarian regimes holding elections, albeit non-competitive. Elections are used to justify a system of rule but those in power.

Elections can also be seen as the vehicle through which elites are strengthened. They may be used as a mechanism to manipulate and control the masses by utilising political discontent and opposition. Elections give citizens the impression that they are exercising the power over government.

Electoral Systems

An electoral system is a set of rules that governs the conduct of elections. It also includes the methods of converting votes into seats in a political system. These rules vary in several ways: Voters may choose between candidates or between parties. Voters may either select a single candidate, or rank candidates in order of their preference. The electorate may or may not be grouped into electoral units or constituencies. Constituencies may elect a single member or several members. The threshold needed to elect a candidate varies from a plurality (maximum votes) to 'absolute' majority, or a quota of some kind (Heywood, 2012). Electoral systems are divided into two broad types namely majoritarian representation or first-past-the-post system and proportional representation systems. This is primarily based on how votes are converted into seats.

Majoritarian or first past the post systems

Pure majoritarian systems can be defined as those which require the victorious candidate to hold at least 50 per cent +1 of the votes cast (Evans 2012). Pure majoritarian systems might

result in undemocratically limiting the number of competing candidates to two. In majoritarian systems, larger parties typically win a higher proportion of seats than the proportion of votes they gain in the election. This is particularly true of the first past the post systems where in the victory of a candidate is determined by a plurality of votes i.e., the largest number out of a collection of numbers, not necessarily an absolute majority. Majoritarian systems are thus usually most criticised for their representative functions. Invariably, majoritarian systems distort popular preferences in that party representation is not proportional to electoral gains. The system is largely unfair to small parties and parties with evenly distributed geographical support, and benefits disproportionately larger parties and those with geographically concentrated support. There are several kinds of majoritarian electoral systems followed in different countries as discussed below.

Single-member plurality (SMP) system or ‘first past the post’ are commonly used in the UK (House of Commons), the USA, Canada and India. In these systems, the country is divided into single-member constituencies, usually of equal size, and voters select a single candidate. In order to win the seat, a candidate needs only to achieve a plurality of votes or poll more votes than any other counterpart. This is usually referred to as the ‘first past the post’ rule. The advantages of this system is that the electorate has a clear choice of potential parties of government. It establishes a direct link between representatives and constituents, ensuring responsibility and accountability. Governments formed through this system can claim to have a clear mandate from the electorate, albeit through plurality support. The disadvantages of this system are plenty, too. The system wastes many votes. Those votes cast for losing candidates and those cast for winning ones over the plurality mark are effectively unaccounted for in determining the result of the election. It under-represents small parties and ones with geographically evenly distributed support (the ‘third-party effect’) thereby distorting electoral preferences. It offers only limited choice to voters because of its duopolistic (two-major-parties) tendencies. Further, the system undermines the legitimacy of government because governments often enjoy only minority support, producing a system of plurality rule.

The second ballot system is another type of majoritarian electoral system. It is used in France, Austria, Chile, and Russia. Similar to the single member plurality system, the country is divided into single-candidate constituencies and voters vote for one single candidate of choice. To win the seat on the first ballot, a candidate needs an overall majority of the votes cast i.e., at least 50 +1 per cent. If no candidate gains a first-ballot majority, a second ballot is held between the leading two candidates. This system has several advantages. It broadens electoral choice in that voters can vote with their hearts for their preferred candidate in the first ballot, and with their heads for their second favourite candidate in the second. In this system, candidates have to broaden their appeal as wide as possible because their winnability is dependent on majority support. This system engenders a strong and stable government. The weaknesses of this system are that it still distorts preferences and is unfair to ‘third’ parties. Run-off candidates tend to abandon their ideological principles to gain short-term popularity, or as a result of deals with defeated candidates. Conducting a second ballot is cumbersome

and may strain the electorate's patience and interest in politics.

Alternative vote (AV) or supplementary vote (SV) systems are yet another type of pure Majoritarian system. These are used in Australia (House of Representatives (AV)), and the UK (London mayor (SV)). As in the other majoritarian systems, here, too, there are single-member constituencies. Votes are cast on the basis of preferential voting. In AV system, voters rank the candidates in order of preference while in SV, there is only a single 'supplementary' vote. To win, candidates must gain at least 50+1 per cent of all the votes cast. Votes are counted according to the first preferences. If no candidate reaches absolute majority, the candidate with the least vote is eliminated and their votes are redistributed according to the second (or subsequent) preferences. This continues until one candidate has a majority. In SV, all candidates drop out except the top two. This system has the advantage of being less wasteful of votes. Here, the outcome of the election cannot be influenced by post election deals between candidates as in the second-ballot system. Conversely, the system is still not much more proportional than the SMP system, and so is still biased in favour of large parties. Also, the winning candidates may enjoy little first-preference support, and have only the virtue of being the least unpopular candidate available.

Proportional Representation Systems

Proportional representation systems are defined as those electoral systems which are designed to ensure as far as possible that the number of legislative seats captured by a party are in proportion to the votes they receive in an election (Evans 2012). In principle, this system holds that parties should be represented in an assembly or parliament in direct proportion to the overall electoral votes cast for them. The percentage of their legislative seats equals their percentage of votes. For example, in a pure system of proportional representation, a party that gains 45 per cent of the votes would win exactly 45 per cent of the seats (Heywood 2013). The probability government formation by a single party is generally less under proportional representation systems. This system of election is known to promote multiparty system and coalition government. However, full proportionality is not always guaranteed under the system as there are many hindrances which impede a simple vote-seat ratio despite the fact that it provides a more proportionate allocation as compared to plurality or majoritarian systems. There are several types of proportional representation systems as discussed below.

One of the prominent proportional systems is the *Single-transferable-vote (STV)* system. This is followed in the Republic of Ireland and the UK (Northern Ireland Assembly). Here, the country is divided into multi-member constituencies with each usually returning between three to eight members. Political parties may field as many candidates as there are seats to fill for each constituency. Electors vote preferentially as done in the alternative vote system. To win a seat, candidates have to achieve a quota, which is the minimum number of votes required to be elected. This is determined by the Droop formula i.e., $(\text{the total number of votes cast divided by number of seats to be filled} + 1) + 1$. For example, if a constituency has 4 seats to be filled and 1,00,000 votes are cast, the quota required to win a seat will be $1,00,000/(4 + 1) + 1 = 20,001$. The votes are counted according to first preferences. If not all

the seats are filled, the bottom candidate is eliminated. His or her votes are redistributed according to second preferences and so on, until all the seats have been filled (Heywood 2013).

The advantage of this system is that it can ensure highly proportional outcomes. The system fosters intra party competition which means that they are evaluated based on their records and their stands on bi-partisan issues. Constituents have the option of choosing which representative to approach for their grievances. This system is criticised for making it difficult to ensure a strong and stable government. It is also argued that intra-party competition may be divisive and may have a negative impact on policy making. This system also may allow members to evade their constituency responsibilities because there is no direct link between the candidates and their voters given they are from multi-member constituencies.

Another proportional system is known as *the Party-List System* which is popularly used in Israel, many European countries including Belgium, Luxembourg and Switzerland, and the European Parliament. In this system, either the entire country is treated as a single constituency, or, a number of large multi-member Constituencies in the case of regional party lists. Political Parties compile lists of candidates in the fray in descending order of preference and place them before the electorate. In this system, electors vote for parties, not for candidates. Parties win seats in direct proportion to the votes they gain in the election. They fill the legislative seats from candidates on their party list in descending order. In some cases, a 'threshold' may be imposed to exclude small, extremist, parties from representation. Germany, for instance, requires a minimum of 5 per cent vote threshold. (Heywood 2013).

This system has several advantages. It is fair to all parties, large or small, because it is the only system that is potentially a pure proportional system. It fosters debate, negotiation and consensus as a large number of smaller parties find representation in this system. The system encourages a sense of belonging to the nation or the region rather than just the constituency. Women and minority candidates have better chances of being elected provided they feature on the party list. Conversely, it is argued that the existence of many small parties can lead to weak and unstable governments. Further, this system fosters no link between the representatives and their constituents rendering accountability difficult to be fixed. Electors have no direct tool in removing corrupt or unpopular candidates if they are well placed within the party. This system engenders the heavy centralisation of parties as leaders hold power in drawing up party lists and members are bound to maintain loyalty to rise up on the list.

Mixed-member proportional (MMP) system or additional member system (AMS)

In addition to the above types, there are electoral systems which blend proportionality and majoritarianism. The Mixed-member proportional system and the additional member system are examples of the same. Such systems are used in countries such as Germany, Italy, New Zealand and the UK (Scottish Parliament and Welsh Assembly). In this system, a proportion of seats are filled by the Single Member Plurality system using single-member constituencies.

This proportion differs from country to country - 50 per cent in Germany, but more in Italy, Scotland and Wales. The remaining seats are then filled using the party list system as discussed above. Electors cast two votes: one for a candidate in the constituency election, and the other for a party as in the list system. Seats are allocated to winning candidates of the constituencies and then by candidates on party lists in proportion to their vote shares.

This system presents a balance between the need for constituency representation and electoral fairness through the party-list process. The system still retains the possibility of a single-party government due to its hybrid nature. The system allows the flexibility to electors to choose a constituency representative from one party and yet support another party to form a government. There are some disadvantages of the system. The practice of single-member constituencies as in SMP prevents the achievement of high levels of proportionality. The system creates two classes of representative; one limited to constituency duties and accompanying insecurities, the other enjoying higher status and the prospect of holding ministerial office. Because the size of the constituencies are much larger than in SMP systems, adequate representation tends to suffer. This system also presents the problem of party centralisation given their power to decide not only who has the security of being on the list and who has to fight constituencies, but also where on the list candidates are placed (Heywood, 2013).

Theories of Voting

What factors shape voting behaviour in electorates? There are short-term and long-term factors influencing voting behaviour. Short-term factors are specific to a particular election such as the state of the economy, the personality and public standing of party leaders, the style and effectiveness of the parties' electoral campaigning, and the nature of the media's coverage. All these factors function within the larger more long-term parameters set by psychological, sociological, economic and ideological influences on voting. There are several theories of voting which help us understand them better.

Party-identification theory sees voting behaviour as a product of the psychological attachment voters have with parties. Voters identify with a party, in that they extend long-term support to regard the party as 'their' party. Voting is an exercise of partisan alignment and, not a result of calculation influenced by factors such as policies, personalities, campaigning and media coverage (Heywood, 2017). Party identification model stresses on early political socialization, holding the family as the principal means through which political loyalties are forged which are then reinforced by group membership and later social experiences. This model sees people's political culture and interests shaped by party identification.

The Sociological model holds that voting behaviour reflects the economic and social position of the groups voters belong to. People vote on the basis of their class and group interests rather than any psychological attachment to a political party. The most significant social alignments that determine voting patterns are class, gender, ethnicity, religion and

region. These groupings reflect divisions and tensions within society. Many analysts see the sociological model is best understood as an 'interest plus socialization' approach to voting (Heywood, 218) because socialisation plays a limited but significant role in forging party allegiances.

Rational-choice model offers an individualistic explanation to voting behaviour. This theory sees voting as a rational exercise through which individuals vote for parties or candidates in accordance with their personal self-interest. Partisan alignment or class belonging does not influence voting behaviour. Voting is a means to an end; a commentary on the performance of the party in power. Voters are active participants and behave like consumers making choices amongst the available policy options (Heywood 219). It must be pointed out that the rational-choice theories of voting are criticised because they abstract the individual voter from their social and cultural contexts. People's ability to assess their self-interest comes from the broader socio-economic class they belong to.

The dominant-ideology model underlines the extent to which individual choices are shaped by a process of ideological manipulation and control (Heywood, 219). This model argues voters as individuals or groups interpret their political position depending on how issues have been presented to them - through education, by the government and, above all, by the mass media. They hold the media capable of distorting the flow of political communications, both by setting the agenda for debate and by structuring preferences and sympathies. Consequently, if voters' attitudes conform to the tenets of a dominant ideology, parties will be unable to pursue policies that fall outside that ideology. Thus, far from challenging the existing distribution of power and resources in society, the electoral process tends to uphold it. The weakness of this theory lies in the fact that by overstating the process of social conditioning, it takes individual calculation and personal autonomy out of the picture altogether.

Just as we have seen the major theories which determine the patterns of voting behaviour, research has also found several reasons why people decide not to vote at all. Most common reasons are modernisation, social change, and general dissatisfaction with political parties and governments. Those who see modernisation as a reason for voters' non-participation argue that as countries arrive at sophisticated levels of economic development, post-industrialism, achieved widespread education and free media, citizens tend to question the value of voting as they are aware of alternative ways of influencing decision making. Social change in the form of liberal reforms in religious or class structures have lessened the social demarcation or cleavages which earlier determined political participation. The socio-political reasons which pushed people to vote are being erased due to social change. Declining voters' turnout is also linked to people's disillusionment with political parties and governments. People in many countries see no value in their vote as they have no faith in any of the parties who are seeking to represent them. Party dealignment is rife in many countries; people are no longer attached to parties. People's faith in governments as their representatives are also seen to be on the decline which explains partly the non-participation among voters.

Woman and Electoral Participation

Women's participation in the electoral process warrants attention in the study of electoral systems in order to get a holistic picture of the subject. Many feminists contend that women have been systematically excluded from the electoral processes historically. Women's suffrage which is universal today has been achieved as a result of vigorous movements in the USA, United Kingdom, France and other western liberal countries. It was only in 1894 in New Zealand when women were enfranchised for the first time. This was followed closely by Australia. Norway and Finland granted the right to vote to women in 1914 while the USA and United Kingdom granted franchise to women as late as 1920 and 1928 respectively. The above timeline of women's enfranchisement shows how late and slow the progress of democratisation has been.

Women's participation in elections and representation in legislatures is yet to be guaranteed in many political systems, especially the developing world. While legislatures across the globe remain highly gendered, voting and participation of women in politics is yet to be normalised in many countries. The mere presence of franchise for women has certainly not equalized participation in elections and politics between men and women. The truth remains that women are underrepresented in elections and parliaments across the globe and even the little who participate are unable to reach the top tiers of government machinery. Women's participation in leadership roles within political parties are also limited and shadowed by their male counterparts. While gender parity in political participation seems to have been achieved in Scandinavian countries, post-colonial societies are yet to close the gap by a big measure.

Financial independence and education are two factors that enhance political participation of women. Researches show that these factors have helped increase voter turnout among women on par with that of men in many democracies. Different countries have adopted strategies to enhance women's participation in the electoral processes. More than hundred countries have adopted gender quotas in legislative assemblies where seats are reserved for women candidates. These include Argentina, Pakistan, and Rwanda among the developing world to name some. Despite these efforts, women's participation in elections and, by extension, in the political process still remains limited in many developing countries.

Conclusion

Elections are central to democracies; even the most illiberal among them hold on to the practice. Elections are methods of ensuring representation of which there are many models as seen above. Electoral systems are also varied in methods and nature. The major ones are the majoritarian systems, the proportional representation systems, and the mixed representation systems. Countries choose to use any of the above systems in accordance to their political philosophy and suitability. The above three systems also have further variations within them. Electoral systems determine the nature and extent of representation of the people in their governments. While one would argue that proportional systems are more democratic and

representative than the majoritarian systems, it was seen that each system has its own set of advantages and disadvantages. Voting behaviour of people have been theorised into several models. Major factors that determine citizens' voting behaviour range from party-identification and class alignment to rational choice and dominant ideology. While universal voting rights today are taken for granted, the fight for the same has been a long and arduous one especially when it comes to women's suffrage movements.

References

A. Heywood, (2002) 'Representation, Electoral and Voting', in Politics. New York: Palgrave, pp. 223-245.

A. Evans, (2009) 'Elections Systems', in J. Bara and M. Pennington, (eds.) Comparative politics. New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 93-119.

J Bara (2009) 'Voters, Parties and Participation' in J. Bara and M. Pennington, (eds.) Comparative politics. New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 229-258.

Pushpa Singh (2019) 'Political Representation, Voting and Electoral Systems in Comparative Perspective' in P. Singh and C. Sharma (eds.) Comparative Government and Politics, New Delhi: Sage Publications, pp. 239-257

Parties and Party Systems

Pawan Kumar

Introduction

In the modern times party and party system has become an indispensable part of political society irrespective of the type of regime. It has become one of main pillars of modern representative democracy without which modern democracies would cease to exist. It promotes maximum and effective participation of the people in the political processes of the country. Though a universal phenomenon, there is no one definition of parties that can capture its essence in true sense of terms. The meaning of a party is flexible and can be explained in different ways depending upon the focus of the approach, which makes it a complex and multifaceted concept. However, in all these understandings the underlying idea about the party remains the same i.e. it is a group or organization that is directed towards promoting a particular goal or interest, primarily of attaining political power. It is this nature of political party that it aims to capture power, which makes it unique in the political system and keeps it apart from other organizations and groups. This becomes the basis to distinguish a political party from other groups in the political system. In a representative democracy parties function as a link to connect citizen and the state. It helps in communicating people's needs and aspirations to the state and also helps the state in reaching out to the people to ensure that they reap the benefits of the policies and programs formulated by the state. Thus parties help in developing and maintaining a close connection between the state, government and the people.

Basis of Party

The basis of a party can be manifold. These bases of party formation may be categorized within two broad categories-locus (location) and focus (orientation). Based on these there are different variants of parties whose basis may be defined in terms of ideology, interests, issues and individuals. As parties represents the interests of the people, the basis of a party varies with different interests that it claims to represent varying from social, economic, political and cultural. One may find parties based on religious faith, ethnic or racial connections, caste or class. Parties may also have a historical basis as parties come up when there are historical changes. For, example extension of franchise led to the growth of political parties. Economic condition of a country also affects the nature of party system. In a developed economy the party competition and the issues that the parties raise and the principles on the basis of which they organize themselves will be very different from a economy that is underdeveloped or developing. Another important factor shaping the nature of parties is ideology. Parties are also organized on the basis of the ideology that they follow. Some parties are categorized as 'leftist' parties and some as 'rightist' depending upon the ideology that they adhere to. The

'leftist' or socialist and communist parties attach themselves to the socialist or communist ideology that believes in bringing about change in the status quo which they believe is based on exploitation. The 'rightist' parties follow the rightist ideology and try to maintain the status quo which they believe would benefit the existing ruling elite. However, it is also possible that parties do not have any ideological commitments and hence ideology may not play an important role in the nature of party system. The political parties of USA like the Democrats and the Republican, for example, are not based on ideology. Parties in this case are based on issues.

Historical Perspective of Party and Party System

The history of party system is very old. If we look at the early Hebrew history their political interests were based on the struggles of a national party, functioning quite autonomously by excluding foreign influences, a party that borrowed ideas and sought support from Egypt and also from some more civilized states of Western Asia. Parties have been an expression of political life and also the reason for its growth. From the very early time development has depended on party. It has been part of almost all countries and all types of regimes and political systems. Political parties and party system became an indispensable part of modern democracy. Today one cannot understand democracy and its working without party and party system. Edmund Burke explained parties in the following words, "a body of men united, for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some particular principle upon which they are all agreed." So for Burke all parties have same interest i.e. to promote national interest. The only difference between them is in the way they choose to promote this national interest. This definition of party, which was given in the eighteenth century, promotes the idea that parties are driven towards the larger goal of achieving the national interest in the interest of the state and that too in a more or less united form. However, the picture that we have today about the parties is like a mutually antagonistic groups working against each other and promoting the idea that all other parties are harming the national interest and the state and only their party is committed towards promoting national interest in the justifiable manner. Hence, contemporary circumstances seem to defy this classical definition of party, given by Burke. Max Weber's definition better captures the contemporary practice of party system. He understands party as "a voluntary society for propaganda and agitation seeking to acquire power in order to provide channels for its active militant adherents to realize objective aims, or personal advantage, or both." Schumpeter arguing on the same line believes that the first and foremost purpose of a political party is to capture power and for this it tries to dominate on other parties. Edward C. Smith and Arnold J. Zurcher defined party as "a body of voters organized for the purpose of influencing or controlling the policies and conduct of government through the nomination and, if possible, the election of its candidates to office." So what we see is that the more recent conceptualizations of party highlight that in the contemporary politics parties are not so much concerned about any ideology rather they act more like a machine continuously working to perform the same job of attaining power.

The history of party system can be understood with an historical account of the party

system in Britain and America as these two countries have earliest expression of parties in their historical development and they represent the most popular and stable democracies in the world. If we understand party as a group of people having same ideological belief then it may be argued that parties were there since the time of Queen Elizabeth I (1558-1603) when her special powers were challenged by the Puritans. However, the actual expression of parties and its development can be seen in the seventeenth century when in 1673 Lord Denby became the chief advisor of the King of Britain, Charles II and made a group in the House of Commons that would always be in support of the King, which has also been called as 'court party'. In the same fashion, Lord Shaftesbury formed a group which would always criticize the King and the party that supported the King, which has been called as 'country party'. Later on these parties were called as Tories and Whigs respectively. In the nineteenth century the Tories got the name of the Conservative Party as it was argued that this party was committed towards conserving the good qualities of the present system and the Whig Party came to be known as the Liberal Party. With the advent of twentieth century and rise of socialist ideology Labour Party came into being. However, it must be noted that with the advent of Labour Party the two-party system in Britain did not end as the growth of Labour Party also led to the decline of Liberal Party.

The first political party in America came into existence in 1789 with the name Federalist Party. The American party system, from the beginning was dominated by two-party system, though there is no mention of parties in the American Constitution. One of the founding fathers of the American Constitution, George Washington was of the opinion the party system creates divisions and enmity. There was also a fear of faction which was expressed by another founding member of the Constitution, James Madison, who had warned of the dangers of a faction becoming extremely powerful which led to the inclusion of the system of checks and balances in the Constitution. At the time of constitution making the opinions were divided. There was a Federalist Group led by Hamilton who was in favour of more centralization of power and on the other hand there was Anti-Federalist group led by Jefferson who wanted to limit this centralization of power. Later on this Anti-Federalist group was renamed as Democratic Party. Gradually the Federalist Party lost its base and declined. In 1854 a new party called Republican Party was formed that came up as group that opposed the slave culture in America. This party won election in 1860 and Abraham Lincoln became the President. Since then American politics is governed mainly by a two-party system-the Democratic Party and the Republican Party.

Though parties have a long history, the systematic theorization of parties and party system started only in the twentieth century. The first phase of this theorization can be associated with the works of Alexis de Tocqueville, Molisei Ostrogorski and Robert Michels during the period of 1906-1949, which is also considered as the pre-behavioural era. Tocqueville was concerned about strengthening the civil society which he thought was possible only by mass political parties and associations. He divided the parties into big parties, that are ideology based and small parties that are interest based. Ostrogorski highlighted the growing importance of parties in modern democracies. Michels was more concerned about the organizational aspects of parties. He argued that every party is

oligarchical in nature, in line with his theory of 'iron law of oligarchy'. Parties, according to Michels, function like an organization where few dominate many.

The second phase of the theorization can be associated with the works of Maurice Duverger, Sigmund Neumann and Anthony Downs during the period of 1950-1965, which is marked by the behavioural turn making the study of party and party system empirical drawing linkages between electoral politics and party system. Duverger focused on the structure of party-its organization, membership and leadership on which basis he categorized parties as caucuses, branches, cells and militia. According to him party system is greatly affected by electoral system. Neumann distinguished between parties that strengthen democracy and parties that weaken democracy. He called the former as 'parties of representation' and the latter as 'parties of integration'. Downs believed that party politics is at the center of democracy. He compared parties in democracy with entrepreneurs and argues that as entrepreneurs seek profit or maximize profit in economic transactions and work on the basis of an economic rationality similarly parties work towards maximizing votes and win elections and function on the basis of a political rationality.

The third phase of party system is marked by the post-behavioural era from 1966 onwards which brought the rational choice approach at the center of the studies on parties and political processes. It is marked by the party model building and party typologies perspectives. The party model perspective theorizes parties as cleavage, catch all, consociational, cartel and conservancy models. Lipset and Rokkan have highlighted the cleavage model wherein parties have worked towards mobilization of masses and integrating the communities. Cleavage means the socio-economic differences between different groups of the society based on their consciousness. Otto Kirchheimer highlighted the declining role of ideology in the parties which he argued led them to resort to the 'catch all' strategies. 'Catch all' parties are generally large parties that focus on concrete action and reach out to different groups of people by sticking to their working class clients. Arend Lijphart advocated the consociational model of party system as he believed that this model is based on cooperation of the elites. He arrived at this understanding after having examined the structure of society and behavior of elites. Peter Mair along with Richard Katz devised the 'cartel model' mainly to understand the relationship between civil society and the state. These parties are able to restrict other parties to come to power because of their financing and power of the state and hence try to keep themselves in power as long as they can. They are mostly depended on state resources so they do not allow the entry of other parties to power. The 'conservancy model' mainly represents the Green Parties. These parties were non-conventional parties that believed in intra-party democracy without any elite dominance or leadership. These parties were also called 'challenger parties' as they demanded fundamental changes in the governance process and complete transparency in the political processes.

Types of Parties

Party and party system is a reality of almost every state of the world, though the nature and structure may vary from one-party, two-party or a multi-party model or sometimes even a mixture of these. Today political parties work at different levels local, regional or national. They may be ideologically based or neutral. Giovanni Sartori has rightly argued that parties

can be categorized and studied as witness parties (those not interested in maximizing their votes), ideological parties (those interested in votes through indoctrination), responsible parties (those who do not compromise on policies for maximizing votes), responsive parties (those who focus on winning elections), and purely demagogic irresponsible parties (those whose only concern is vote maximization). Types of parties or typology of parties depend upon various factors ranging from socio-economic divisions in the society, religious and cultural diversity and political and legal framework. Maurice Duverger had classified party system into single, two and multi-party system and argued that all party systems fall within one of these classifications. Sartori has provided a more detailed and systematic account of party system by explaining different categories within single party systems and how pluralism and atomism affect the understanding of two-party and multi-party systems. He also came up with the model of 'competitive' and 'non-competitive' parties. Sartori argues that in one party system the aspect of competition is almost absent. He divided the single party system into three sub-variants. When political power is concentrated in only one party and no other party is allowed to exist it is monopolistic. This type of party can function as a totalitarian, authoritarian or pragmatic party depending upon the degree of arbitrariness. Totalitarianism is when the degree of coercion is very high and the policies are arbitrary and destructive for the opposition groups. It is more like a dictatorship. In authoritarianism the element of coercion is less and other groups have little autonomy. So it is less arbitrary than totalitarianism. It is pragmatic when coercion and arbitrariness is very low and other groups enjoy freedom and autonomy to function. There can be another variant of single party system which is hegemonic party which functions as the most powerful party and other parties exist like subordinates and do not question its hegemony.

According to Sartori the two-party and multi-party system are characterized by what he calls 'polarized pluralism'. This means that different parties exist with antagonistic ideology and approach and sometimes some of the parties oppose the system questioning its legitimacy. One may find irresponsible opposition where the focus is only on opposing the ruling party and quarreling with them which deviates the attention from real issues. In this kind of system one may also find that the ruling party is focused on mainly making tall promises to the voters.

It is also possible that in a political system there is extreme polarization which is the characteristic of an 'atomised' party system. In this kind of system no single party is in a dominant position but they have only that much influence so that they can bargain with each other. This kind of party system has fragmented leadership and has very little influence on other parties.

With all these classifications of party and party system Sartori was trying to reflect upon how parties all over the world function and that they may function in very different ways depending upon the context in which they function. However, with all these differences in actual functioning of parties Sartori was of the opinion that they are certainly not factions rather they are a medium of expression between government and the people. Sartori's classification is an improvement in all the previous classifications in the sense that all the earlier classifications were mainly based on numbers whereas Sartori tried to draw a connection between number of parties and ideological distance. To summarize Sartori's

classification, we see that he has provided a sevenfold typology of party and party system—single party-system like that of USSR, hegemonic party system like that of Mexico, two-party system like that of USA and Britain, predominant party system like that of India, limited or moderate pluralism like that of Italy and Switzerland and atomized party system like that of Malaysia.

A recent typology of parties is provided by Richard Gunther and Larry Diamond who have classified parties on the basis of organizational, programmatic and strategic criteria. They have divided parties as elite based parties, mass based parties, ethnic parties, electoralist parties and movement parties. They believe that this classification of parties better captures the diversity of party systems in democracies.

Conclusion

The evolution of parties and party systems show that its nature has transformed over time. The variation is also based on the context in which it exists. Various authors have come up with their own ways of understanding these variations and the diversity of party system all over the world with some focusing on numbers while others on ideologies and still others on the relationship between the two. Some thinkers like Mahatma Gandhi, M. N. Roy, Vinoba Bhave and Jayaprakash Narayan have talked about party-less democracy as they believed that the existence of parties and party system would malign the politics with the ill effects of power. However, thinking about party-less democracies in the present time is nothing but utopian. Parties and party system today has become an indispensable part of any political system. It has become a major force in bringing about changes and political transformations in the working of present democracies. With globalization and growing importance of information technology, parties have become very competitive. Parties have become an integral part of a functioning democracy and it is the mechanism through which the responsibilities of the political leaders are enforced. They help in uniting and stabilizing the political process by bringing together different interests and thus function as an important link between the government and the citizens.

References

G. Sartori, *Parties and Party System: A Framework for Analysis*, London, Cambridge University Press, Vol 1, 1976.

Sigmund Neumann, "Towards a Comparative Study of Political Parties", in his (ed.), *Modern Political Parties: Approaches to Comparative Politics*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1956.

Maurice Duverger, *Political Parties*, New York, Methuen, 1954.

S. K. Choudhary, *The Changing Face of Parties and Party Systems: A Study of Israel and India*, Palgrave MacMillan, 2018.

Dictionary of American Politics, 1968.

Nation-State

Dr. Tanvi Kulkarni

Introduction

The modern nation-state has evolved as a political unit of human organisation over the last five to six centuries. The fundamental idea behind the formation of the nation-state comes from the fact that human beings are social creatures and have preferred to live in organised communities. In its earliest form, the nation-state emerged from the state as a simple organisation. Over centuries, the simple state evolved into more complex forms of organisation. The world today is composed of states and nation-states.

The state is regarded as the most significant political actor in the world. Covering a myriad of functions in our life, from the maintenance of law and order, and conduct of foreign relations to the provision of political goods including basic amenities (like water, electricity, fuel) and security, the state manifests itself in numerable ways. The attribute that makes the state a preeminent and predominant entity is sovereignty – the absence of a legitimate higher authority in the domestic and external affairs of the state. State and sovereignty are mutually-constitutive concepts and the nature and origin of the concept of sovereignty is closely associated with the nature, origin and the evolution of the modern nation-state.

Many different models of political structures and units existed before the emergence of the modern nation-state. For instance, the empires, kingdoms, city-states and territorial states. These systems, which were sine qua non to human civilizations in historical times, were gradually subordinated with the birth of the modern sovereign state system. This chapter discusses the concepts of state and nation-state, and looks at the evolution of modern nation-states in varying forms, from the historical Western European context to the post-colonial context. The final section examines some of the challenges and debates concerned with the modern nation-state in contemporary times.

What is the State?

The concept of 'state' is central to political science and there are many scholars have defined state in different ways.

Aristotle, the ancient Greek philosopher, defined the state as a community or association of persons, which aim at certain good. It is a union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self-sufficing life, by which we mean a happy and honourable life. The state is however not any ordinary community or association, but it is the highest of all communities (supreme). The state that Aristotle was talking about is the rudimentary city-state (polis) that existed in Greece, like Athens. As states evolved, their definitions also changed.

The Swiss jurist, Bluntschli defined the state as the 'politically organized people of a definite territory.' The US president Woodrow Wilson modified this definition to say that state 'is a people organized for law within a definite territory.'

According to the American political scientist, Dr JW Garner, the state is "a community of persons, more or less numerous, permanently occupying a definite portion of territory, independent, or

nearly so, of external control, and possessing an organized government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience.”

For Professor Harold Laski, state is “a territorial society divided into governments and subjects, whether individuals or associations of individuals, whose relationships are determined by the exercise of this supreme coercive power.” Andrew Heywood defines the state as a ‘political association that establishes sovereign jurisdiction within defined territorial borders.’

These definitions show that there are two perspectives of the state. Narrowly defined, the state is seen to be different from the public or civil society; however it encompasses institutions that are responsible toward public life and funded through public taxes (such as the institutions of government, the courts, the military, nationalized industries or social security system). In this view, the state’s main concern is domestic order with regards to the actors that live within its territory. From this perspective, the state has fiscal monopoly (from taxing citizens) and demands obedience from the people. The state therefore becomes an instrument of coercion and domination. Broadly defined, the state concept is characterized by four features or elements:

1. A defined territory
2. A permanent population
3. An effective government, and
4. Sovereignty

The above broad definition of the state was first found in the 1933 Montevideo Convention on the Rights and Duties of the State (Article 1). Here, the emphasis is on the ability of the state to protect its territory and population from external attacks. Brenner brings the narrow and broad views together to define ‘statehood’ as the capacity to simultaneously protect against external attack and maintain domestic order.

Elements of the State

As stated above, the state has four core elements: Population, Territory, Government and Sovereignty.

Population

At its most fundamental level, the State is a human institution. It can be sustained only through people. Therefore, we cannot imagine a state with people. There is no fixed size of population that makes a state. Some states like Austria and Switzerland have a very small population whereas states like India, China and the Brazil have a very large population. Territories like Antarctica cannot be called as a state because it is not populated. The quality of the population is also important. To be strong, a state needs a healthy, intelligent and organised population. A state may be composed of homogenous or heterogenous populations in terms of attributes like religion, ethnicity, race and language, but can become citizens by virtue of inhabiting the territory of the state.

Territory

Just like population, a state cannot exist without a defined territory. Territory determines the jurisdiction of the state’s authority. A population without territory cannot be called as a State. For instance, The Jews were scattered in different parts of the world and they became a State with the creation of Israel in 1948, which had a defined territory. The territory of one state is separated from that of another by borders. A state may have a contiguous or non-contiguous territory. For instance,

the US has non-contiguous territory, that includes the Hawaii island and Alaska. Some states have very small territories, like San Marino or Lesotho, whereas others like Russia, China and Canada have very large territories. The territory of a state can sometimes pose advantages or disadvantages in terms of security, and resources.

Government

The government is the agency which makes, enforces and protects the rules of conduct and organisation for the everyday running of the state. The government protects the population, territory and interests of the state through institutions and security mechanisms. The government determines policies, implements laws, regulates day-to-day affairs, promotes welfare and also ensures obedience from its population toward the state. It is therefore the implementing body of the state. In the absence of government, a state would be directionless and lacking cohesion and collective action. It is through the government, that the state expresses its will. There are various forms of government that run the state, like democracy, autocracy, monarchy or theocracy, to name a few.

Distinction between State and Government

State	Government
State is composed of four elements	Government is one element (agency) of the State
State cannot exist without territory	A government can exist without territory
State enjoys ultimate power (sovereignty)	Government powers are limited and delegated
State is long-lasting	Government is temporary
State is an abstract idea	Government is a real body
Citizens do not have rights against their state	Citizens can have rights against their government

Sovereignty

Sovereignty is the element or feature that distinguishes the state from all other forms of political units. States are autonomous and independent actors because they exercise sovereign jurisdiction over a defined territory and population. In other words, sovereignty makes a state. Sovereignty is the supreme power by which the state commands and exerts political obedience from its people. According to Jean Bodin (1530–96) who first theorised about the concept, sovereignty is ‘the absolute and perpetual power of a common wealth’ that guarantees the state political and social stability. Sovereignty indicates the absence of a higher authority in either domestic or external affairs of the state. Therefore, there are two levels at which the state exercises sovereignty – internal sovereignty and external sovereignty. Internal sovereignty is the state’s monopoly of authority inside its territorial boundaries. The state enjoys ultimate control over its people, institutions and affairs. External sovereignty implies the absence of any external control or legitimate higher authority on the decisions and policies of the state. It determines the state’s relationship to other states and international actors. External sovereignty means that the state is independent and its will is not affected by the will of any other external entity.

What is the Nation-State?

The terms state, nation and nation-state are often confused as meaning the same thing; they are sometimes used interchangeably. However, the three concepts are separable and analytically different in political science. The state is defined in terms of a set of institutions and relationships of governance closely connected to, but analytically distinct from society. The nation consists of people, who have a shared history, language or identity. Such national communities might find themselves contained within states or divided between them. R. N. Gilchrist observes that nation-state is the state looked at from a certain point of view, viz. that of the unity of the people organised in one state. A nation-state is basically a national community which has obtained or been granted self-determination over their own affairs.

Nation, Nationality and Nationalism

The word 'nation' is derived from the Latin word 'natus', meaning 'to be born.' The English 'nation' therefore comes from its Latin counterpart 'natio' meaning birth or blood relationship. By implication, a nation in its most crude meaning is based on common origin. According to Barker, "a nation is a body of persons inhabiting a definite territory and thus united together by the primary fact of living together on a common land." Ramsay Muir says that, "a nation is a body of people who feel themselves to be nationally linked together by certain affinities and cannot tolerate subjection to others."

However, nations are complex phenomena that are shaped by a collection of cultural, political and psychological factors. According to Heywood (2004), "culturally, a nation is a group of people bound together by a common language, religion, history and traditions. Politically, a nation is a group of people who regard themselves as a 'natural' political community, usually expressed through the desire to establish or maintain sovereignty". And "psychologically, a nation is a group of people who are distinguished by a shared loyalty or affection, in the form of patriotism, although people who lack national pride may still nevertheless recognize that they 'belong' to the nation" (Heywood 2004). In reality, all nations comprise a mixture cultural and political characteristics. It is difficult to delineate definite elements of a nation. However, broadly they include objective and subjective factors like common history, common geography or territory, common race, common religion, common language, common values, customs and traditions, shared economic interests and political aspirations.

Nationality and nationalism are concepts associated with nations. Nationality is a group of people, sharing historical or cultural backgrounds, or racial characteristics, who desire to live together as a community. It is the shared psychological sentiment which is generated in a group of people who belong to a common race, common history, common geography or territory, common language, common religion, shared customs and traditions, common economic interests, and common hopes and political aspirations. People of a nationality may share some or many of these attributes but they must have a sense of unity. They must feel that they have something in common which differentiates them from other people. Nationality is a cultural term. Nation is basically a political term and cultural only incidentally. A nation is a people organised and united. The goal of a nationality is to establish a nation. For instance, the Jewish nationality created the Jewish nation.

Nationalism is a politico-psychological concept. It has been a powerful political force in modern times leading to the birth of several nation-states in Asia and Africa. In simple words, nationalism means a feeling of oneness with the cultural heritage, customs, traditions, institutions and all other

aspects of one's nation. It is the political consciousness of belonging to a group and a force that holds a people together in a defined territory, against external aggression. Classical nationalism, that emerged in nineteenth-century Europe, has been strongly associated with liberal ideas and values. To be a nationalist meant to be a liberal, and vice versa. Modern nationalism is characterised by movement of a nationality aiming at achieving independence and to form a state organization of its choice. It commits to the principle of national self-determination and its goal is therefore the construction of a nation-state. In more contemporary times, nationalism has become a complex and deeply contested political phenomenon. It is often conflated with the term 'patriotism,' which is literally, love of one's country; a psychological attachment of loyalty to one's nation or country.

Defining the Nation-State

A nation-state is an autonomous political community in which the political and cultural identity of people coincide, or in other words where citizenship and nationality overlap. The Italian political activist, Giuseppe Mazzini, who advocated for the unification of Italy in the 19th century, proposed "every nation a state, only one state for the entire nation". Most modern states are nation-states, in that, thanks to classical nationalism, the nation has come to be accepted as the basic unit of political rule. Indeed, one of the most significant impact of nationalism has been to establish the nation as the key unit for political authority, resulting in the nation-state becoming accepted as the most basic and even legitimate form of political organization. However, the ideal nation-state (where the state and nation overlap exactly) is not a reality, as all states are, to some degree, culturally and ethnically heterogeneous. Even then, the global system is imagined as a community of nation-states. The term 'nation-state' is often erroneously used interchangeably with the 'state' in public as well as sometimes academic discourses.

Many modern nation-states are not mono-national units, that is 'one nation, one state.' They are characterized by cultural heterogeneity (multi-ethnic, multi-racial or multi-religious entities), in varying degrees. In other words, they are composed of multiple nationalities, for instance, USA, Canada, Switzerland and India. Therefore, modern nation-states are often confronted with problems of minorities. In the US, this problem has been addressed over a period of two hundred years, through the emergence of a distinct "American" identity whereby racial, linguistic and religious differences have become secondary. The Swiss nation has endured despite the use of three major languages (French, German and Italian), in addition to many local dialects. In Canada, however, there is a strong Québécois nationalism, which is based mainly on language differences between the French-speaking Quebec region and the predominantly English-speaking parts of Canada. In Northern Ireland, divisions between Catholics and Protestants that has given rise to rival nationalisms. India is a good example of a nation-state with multi-nationalities. India has been able to maintain national integration on the basis of civic nationalism (that is, nationalism shaped by common political values and aspirations as enshrined in the Indian Constitution).

Evolution of the Nation-State

The earliest 'States' in their centralized and elaborated form were born in Western Europe in the 15th and 16th centuries. The Peace of Westphalia (1648) is understood to be the founding moment of the modern notion of statehood; it established states as sovereign entities, and therefore as the principal actors on the world stage. International politics was therefore designed as a 'state system.' The state system gradually expanded from Europe to North America in the 17th and 18th centuries, and in the 19th century, it spread to South America and East Asia. It was in the 20th century that the state system

became truly global given the process of decolonization in Asia, Africa, the Caribbean and the Pacific and the formation of nation-states in these regions.

The transition from the medieval systems like empires to the modern state system was neither spontaneous nor peaceful. Several historical transformations crucially impacted the formation of the modern nation-state.

1. Emergence of the Territorial State

For large parts of the time, medieval Europe was governed by empires. People were governed by two sets of authorities, namely the Church (religious) and empires (political). In contrast to the modern state, which has supreme sovereignty over its territory, medieval authorities had to negotiate and fight over their claims as to how a particular territory should be run. There was overlapping authority between religious and political powers, that led to complex organization of territory. There was social and political hierarchy in the society – at the top stood God, and under God, the Pope and the Emperor. The Church owned property and was thus a major economic and political player in its own right, but it also functioned to provide the Emperor with religious legitimacy: if God was at the top of the hierarchy of identities, and the Pope right under Him, it was crucial for political authorities to get the Pope's blessing. The transformation from the medieval to the modern system was significant in that it re-organised both, the key principle of governance (from overlapping authority to territorial sovereignty) and the way in which political identity was understood. Political authorities gained ground compared to the religious ones. It meant that the state became more secular and that this secularity was played out in interstate relations as well as domestically.

2. Renaissance and Reformation

The birth of the territorial secular state was closely linked to the religious wars that haunted Europe in the wake of the Reformation. The epistemological basis of modern state lies in the intellectual traditions of Renaissance and Reformation movements in Western Europe which advocated the idea of modernity based on individualism, autonomy and separation of political and religious sphere (former as public and the latter as private). Medieval Europe was characterized by conflicts and instability caused by a tussle for power, wealth and authority between political authority i.e. kings, and religious authority i.e. Church. The Protestant reformist movement against the corrupt practices of Catholic church, too made a dent in the Christian commonwealth and weakened the political power of religious authority. Backed by patron political powers, the religious conflict culminated into thirty years' war from 1618 to 1648 which was concluded with the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. This treaty marks a historical watershed juncture in the history of evolution of modern states by establishing a separation of political and religious spheres and by according higher and more elaborate powers to secular political authority over the religious one in the matters of state politics.

3. The Treaty of Westphalia (1648)

The Treaty of Westphalia, also called as the Peace of Westphalia brought an end to thirty years' war between Spain, Dutch and Germany in 1648. The treaty played an important role in designating essential features of a modern state: *Defined territorial boundaries, population*, in terms of 'citizens' and 'others', *sovereignty and governance*, that claimed monopoly over legitimate exercise of force and being the highest decision-making entity within its territorial jurisdiction, and *recognition* of the state as a sovereign over its claimed territory. Skinner (1978) captures this understanding of modern state adequately as, "political apparatuses, distinct from both ruler and ruled, with supreme

jurisdiction over a demarcated territorial area, backed by a claim to monopoly of coercive power, and enjoying a level of support or loyalty from their citizens”. However note that, “Westphalia was the beginning of a long historical process that, through twists and turns, moved towards the sovereign territorial state; it was not a complete break from one day to the next” (Osiander, 2001).

4. Social Contract Tradition and the notion of Sovereignty

The French Philosopher Jean Bodin emphasized the necessity and merit of a single authority (that derives its power from God) which possesses unified and uncontested legislative powers, responsible for war and peace, currency, administration, judicial appointments and so on, in contrast to what Christendom and feudalism of medieval times had in place. English philosopher Thomas Hobbes in his classic text ‘Leviathan’ expanded the concept of an absolute sovereign authority borne out of a hypothetical social contract which authorizes the sovereign to rule on behalf of individuals by providing a system of peace, security and stability, otherwise precarious because of an anarchic society comprising of rational self-preserving individuals seeking to maximise their survival potential through self-ordained measures. Sovereign was entrusted with absolute powers like waging wars, raising taxes etc. and only legitimate recourse to rebellion against it by individuals as group was deemed plausible when their life was threatened. English philosopher John Locke’s conception of a hypothetical social contract, on the other hand, evoked an element of ‘natural rights’ to limit the legislative power of the sovereign by declaring protection of natural rights of life, liberty and property as fundamental to the continuation of this social contract. Locke also argued that people have a right to overthrow the government if it rules arbitrarily and ineffectively while endangering individual’s natural rights. People could choose new legislators once this happens. This idea of tacit contract informed by consent and reciprocal obligations and duties laid the foundation of modern democratic states. These ideals are well-reflected in the American Declaration of Independence (1776), the French Revolution and the ‘Declaration of the Rights of Man and the Citizen’.

By placing sovereign authority in people, and declaring certain rights as inalienable, the era of modern democratic states was ushered into international politics. However, the degree of centralization of authority considered vital for governance differed in different states. For example, in the US, the federal authority was limited by rights of the constituent units, unlike France, which adopted a more centralized form of governance. These states concretized the understanding of modern state as conceived during Treaty of Westphalia, encompassing territory (border), population, sovereignty and governance systems (also recognition).

5. Birth of Nationalism

The French and American revolutions in the 18th century were a major shift in that “the beheading of the monarch, either concretely or symbolically, and the introduction of popular sovereignty, accelerated the disintegration of hierarchies between different categories of people” within the state (Anderson, 1991). “Nationalism as a modern ideology put emphasis not just on equality within the state, but also on commonality, such that citizens would see themselves as bound by a deeper sense of identity, community and belonging. The nation became in Benedict Anderson’s words an ‘imagined community’, ‘a deep, horizontal comradeship’” whose members shared a common social, cultural and political identity (Anderson, 1991: 7). “Nationalism was connected to popular sovereignty and eventually democracy, and therefore to the idea that the legitimacy of the sovereign state was based not on divine or monarchical inherent rights, but on the government’s ability to rule according to the values, interests and identity of the people” (Anderson, 1991).

The shift to a concern with societal cohesion also implied a change in how territory was considered. As nationalist movements worked to install a common identity amongst the members of ‘their’ nations, territories could no longer be shifted around with no concerns for the status of the people and nations who lived there. This made territorial acquisitions less attractive as a hostile population would resist the ‘occupier’, but it also provided justifications for the political centre to nationalise, coercively if necessary, those on its territory.

The growth of nationalism, however, has not been a uniform process and was shaped by contextual factors. For western Europe, decline in authority of church and end of religious crusades paved way for state nationalism premised on common racial, religious or linguistic identity of its masses. In case of America, it was primarily a collective consciousness of people resisting exploitation by a wealthy elite foreign government. The French and American revolutions affirmed the concepts of liberty and equality which became the cornerstone of modern nationalism. The theories of self-determination and nationalities resulted into break down of empires in Eastern Europe giving rise to specific nationalities premised on common identities. In Asian and African states, it has been primarily the experience of exploitative foreign government which led to the development of colonial nationalism. While colonial nationalism gained consciousness in response to the colonial rule of an, it also adopted some of the means and institutions of western European states under the influence of modernity discourse.

The concept of state became institutionalized and internalized also through various symbolic and necessary functions performed by the state. Demarcation of boundary, including maritime boundary through precise map-making and protection from external aggressions and control over border movements involved management of external relations by the state. Internally, the discourse of modern nation-state was strengthened by symbolic practices like respecting national flag and singing the national anthem.

Type of state system	Dominant traits	Economic sustenance mode	Territorial understanding	Administrative institutionalization
Empires	War-making capabilities, Exaction of tributes along trade routes, shifting territorial boundaries according to invasions and rebellions, Rudimentary governance structures and institutions, limited administrative authority over distant parts of empire maintained by coercion than administration.			
Feudal States (between 8th and 14th Century)	Over-lapping jurisdiction of competing authorities, disintegrative tendencies among various feudal factions comprising states, tussle between Catholic church and feudal kings over supremacy of decision-making power, Agriculture and sub-contracting of land, Feudal economy, vassals offered loyalty and homage to lords and kings in return for privileges, urban centres primarily on accumulated capitals. Territorial states existed but sub-contracting of land within the state over varying hierarchies involving kings, nobles, clergy, peasants etc.			
Estates Polity e.g. Northern Italy and Flanders	Cause of public prerogatives, collective or estates-based assemblies, parliaments, diets and town councils as ruling bodies as contrast to individual rule. Trade and manufacture. Mostly, cities and town based. Impersonal ruling structures, power dualism between rulers and estates over rights of representation.			

Absolutist States (between 14th-16th Century) e.g. France, Spain and England	Monarch versus Barons over rightful authority, consolidation of states into absolute monarchies (divine right of king to rule) and constitutional monarchies (rule of law codified), Authority of the church reduced. Unified, single, sovereign rule of monarch over a given territory. Permanent and professional standing army and bureaucracy began to emerge, Centralized, indivisible rule, tendency of homogenization within the state. Money rent, trade, commerce, mercantilism. Consolidated territory corresponding to a unified system of administration.
Modern States	Westphalian system of states emergence of international law though in a minimalist sense, industrialization, market economy coupled with agriculture, Capitalism. States with fixed boundaries preferably culturally homogenous population within the fixed territorial limits to be governed through a uniform administrative system. Representation of citizens, Impersonal bureaucratic rule, modern modes of law making, execution and adjudication, new means of surveillance and categorization of citizens were devised.

Based on David Held's (1993) "The Development of the Modern State", in Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben (eds), Formations of Modernity, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Theories and Types of State

The nature of state remains contested despite several scholarly attempts at its conceptual and functional analysis. Though understood in terms of its essential characteristics, one must remember that state ultimately is an abstract idea representing a network of agents and institutions and the inter-related processes and values rooted in shared social understanding and conventions. A conceptualisation of role and essential functions of state, therefore, has varied in different theoretical paradigms. David Held (1993) has postulated following four variants of modern states:

Type of State	Important Features
Constitutional State	Restrictions on state actions in rule formulation and execution in the form of standardized rules and codes in order to curtail state despotism, optimism in individual capabilities to strive for common good.
Liberal	Derived from classical liberal theory, individual's private life to be independent of state regulation, constitutionalism, advance of capitalist system of market economy and institution of private property.
Liberal Representative State	Power to elect and remove members to public offices, channelling of public grievances through them and public accountability of the officers. Essentially a democratic state.
Single Party State	Prevalent in Soviet Union, China and some eastern states, single party rules the polity; candidates are drawn through public elections.

Based on David Held's (1993) "The Development of the Modern State", in Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben (eds), Formations of Modernity, Cambridge: Polity Press.

Within the broader umbrella of liberal theories of state, the social reformist or social democratic state originated in 19th century. This state undertook a positive obligation on itself to intervene in society and undertake measures to deal with structural problems like poverty and inequality. Such 'welfare state', especially in the 20th century, premised conceptually on 'positive liberalism', followed a 'cradle to grave' approach. The State's role proliferated to include providing and regulating common access to public resources and amenities like public education, healthcare, provisions for women and elderly etc. These Social democratic states in Western Europe expanded for a while, both in numbers and in mandate, but started contracting in 1970s with a huge rise in oil prices which was exerting additional pressure on already strained state systems in terms of its economic affordability and viability due to increasing welfare mandate.

The 'New Right perspective' or neo-liberal theory of state which gained momentum in 1970s (U.S. administration under the president ship of Ronald Reagan and Britain under Conservative government of Margaret Thatcher), argued for minimalist intervention on the part of the state so as to allow maximum possible liberty to the individual to pursue his/her own self-interest. Inspired by Frederick Von Hayek and Milton Friedman, it stressed on individual initiative, liberty and responsibility as the drivers of growth and development. It re-emphasized the values of laissez faire state popular in early liberalism, though in practice led to more bureaucratization of state in these countries. Both these perspectives—social democratic and New Right recognize individual as the vantage point or rational of the state but propose different ways to facilitate it.

The Marxist understanding of state is open to interpretation as Marx himself did not provide a theory of state. In a general sense, however, the Marxist analysis through its 'materialistic conception of history' not only challenges the liberal view of state as a neutral arbiter but also considers it as a part of the problem itself.

In its view, a state, through its coercive power maintains and defends class domination and exploitation (Heywood 2004). It does not exist independently of the underlying economic base and therefore acts as a tool of exploitation in the hands of capitalists by defending and legitimizing their concerns through the legal mechanisms like upholding contract, institution of private property etc. Marxist understanding challenges the liberal notion of state as common good, capable of acting in collective interest impartially, and stressed on coercive power of the states. The image of democracy and liberal politics then only undermine rise of class consciousness and revolutionary potential of the proletariat class. Modern Marxists like Gramsci, however, explained the apparent legitimacy and popularity of the 'bourgeoisie state', not just by its use of coercion but also by it eliciting 'consent' by evoking ideational hegemony.

Post-Colonial State

The state in Western Europe was premised on modern institutions like rule of law, property rights, impersonal bureaucracy etc. and therefore enjoyed legitimacy, unlike the colonial states where the rulers were detested by the native population. These colonial powers exported the colonial rule to their colonies in Asia, Africa and the Pacific, where they attempted to superimpose their own conceptions of the nation-state without. The existing traditional, religious and political milieu of these colonial states often offered resistance to such imposition, thereby undermining the support need for such structural transformation. Having been drained of their resources during by their colonisers, in the post-independence period, these erstwhile colonies struggled to catch up with the European states in

terms of material and economic capabilities. However, in some new states like India, the maintenance of the colonial bureaucracy and security institutions like the police and armed forces, helped organise capital and resources for national development and keep private individuals away from gaining too much control of state power.

The Western European model of 'state-system' became a legacy for state-making in Asia and Africa despite the differences in their geopolitical and cultural settings. The state model was also coveted because it gave sovereignty and a legitimate basis for participation in the international system. And so, the post-colonial state attempted to replicate the modern nation-state of Europe through various domestic contestations and confrontations. Sudipta Kaviraj argues that this resulted in contextual variations in the state prototypes that emerged in post-colonial societies. Whereas the European state was 'developed' in terms of state legitimacy, governance and, political and economic institutions, the post-colonial state was under-developed, where the state power of state contested by the societal classes. Government institutions became fragmented and remained under-developed. According to Mohammed Ayoob, what took Western European 200 years to achieve modern statehood, the post-colonial state has attempted to achieve in about 50 years. This attempt to emulate a long historical evolutionary process in a short period of time resulted in the post-colonial states facing crises of legitimacy and governance. Many post-colonial states like Myanmar, Bangladesh, Ghana witnessed military coups that ousted the civilian government. In such states like Somalia, Sudan and Colombia non-state militias, criminal gangs and local strongmen exercised violent and coercive power over the population. The socio-economic discontinuities and ruptures that had been introduced by colonialism, resulted in economic, political, social, cultural, ethnic and racial conflicts in the post-colonial state and problems of internal security. Many states in Asia and particularly in Africa are characterised as 'weak' or 'failed'. The nexus between the ruling elite and international capital, facilitated by the neo-liberal reforms undertaken in several of these countries since late 1970s also caused further impoverishment by causing huge economic inequality in these states.

Security State

The previous sections enumerated and reflected on modern variants of Westphalian state and accounted for their variations depending on the contextual historical and socio-economic premises of states in different parts of the world. This section will look at the evolving understanding of 'Security State', as one of the forms that liberal democratic and welfare states are turning into. The security state of today is distinct from the authoritarian states under the Nazi and Fascist rule in Europe in the 20th century. Those were ultra-nationalist projects that tried to assimilate civil society into the state as a corporate body commanding absolute authority through repressive and coercive police force, militarism and national-racial ideology (Hallsworth and Lea 2011). The neo-liberal economic reforms and the advent of global capitalism has made state 'retreat' in several quarters and has resulted into states abdicating some of their welfare responsibilities. This has opened up the space for private enterprises to turn these 'responsibilities' into 'services' available to those who can afford them. There is increasing privatization of education and healthcare – originally conceived as

public goods in the state system. This withdrawal of state from key sectors, however, is not necessarily a decline of the state system. Rather, in certain quarters, it is even accompanied by a surge in the coercive powers of the state, for example, in the UK and the US.

The new security state, is distinct in that it entails a change in philosophy and perspective towards crime control, security functions of the state and centrality of 'state of exception' (Agamben 2005) as normal state. Halls worth and Lea characterise the rise of security state in three areas: 'transition from welfare to workfare and risk management; new measures to combat terrorism and organized crime; and the blurring of warfare and crime control'. In the wake of the 9/11 attacks on the US and the rise of trans-national terrorism, the new security state has increasingly capitalized on the logic of securitization and has incorporated higher levels of surveillance, censorship and control in the name of law and order maintenance. There is a blurring of the line between 'internal' and 'external' security and threats. This culture makes the citizenry conscious of their activities, speeches and actions and induces them to practice self-censorship so as to avoid wrongful incrimination by the state, even when such acts do not constitute a 'crime' in normal sense of the word. The new security state, for instance, looks at certain sections of the population (illegal migrants, poor unemployed people, refugees, prostitutes, beggars etc.) as 'risky' and that must be ever-watched for an 'inherent disposition towards crime.' This is evident in the social and urban planning techniques to create 'safe spaces' (Hughes 2007) like increasing surveillance and exclusionary spaces (deployment of CCTV cameras in residential and commercial neighbourhoods, creation of 'gated societies', restriction on access to places like public parks etc). 'Crime' is segregated from its socio-economic basis (thereby, putting the idea of welfare policies, rehabilitation and family support structures as useful remedies on back foot) and presented in a sanitized form that can be handled only by more coercive actions and techniques. Burgeoning links between trans-national offenders like drug cartels, terrorists and smugglers with local communities have contributed to a perceived bias against surplus populations. The new security state addresses this through increasing use of pre-emptive criminalization measures and extra-ordinary laws like sedition in the name maintenance of public order.

Globalisation has not only changed the 'external contexts within which states operate' but also 'the very nature of states' (Guehenno 2010). The impact of globalisation, is rather multi-faceted. On the one hand, it has not only facilitated an inward-looking nature of crime control by states through more coercive and disciplining practices but it has also incentivized an internationalization of crime management efforts. For example, setting up of international tribunals to handle instances of crime against humanity, genocide, ethnic cleansing perpetrated by non-state informal militias and criminal gangs, conventions to curb the rise of international terrorism, collective security and collective defence arrangements etc. Globalisation, has further intensified the competition among states, not only in terms of military technology and capability but also in dimensions like development and environmental protection. However, while the jury is still out on the actual transformative potential of globalisation in altering the nature of modern state or in giving rise to new forms of state systems, there is consensus that states are not the only significant players in global affairs. Although the State is still very relevant in the modern world system, its interaction with global forces and technology is often shaped by a multitude of factors giving rise to contextual variations in states' strength, potential and interests in regulating them.

Conclusion

States are the most significant form of political organisation and association in the global society of human beings. It is a historical entity which has evolved through the ages since the fifteenth and

sixteenth centuries. The state has four core elements: a defined territory, a permanent population, an effective government, and the capacity to enter into relations with other states. Sovereignty, both internal and external, is the most important underlying element of the state. The nation, on the other hand,

The state and nation are separate concepts. Nations are group of people bound together by a common language, religion, history, geography, values, traditions and aspirations. When the nation overlaps with the state, forming a bond between citizenship and nationality, it becomes a nation-state. From the early 19th century onwards, the birth of nation-states transformed the state-system, reconfiguring political power in the world and giving states domestic cohesion and sense of identity in a way they previously did not have.

The nation-state has however been challenged by forces within and outside the state. Globalization has been understood to be the biggest challenge to state sovereignty. According to some scholars, these forces have transformed the nature of the state, giving rise to the greater competition between the state and the 'market' state and given rise to the 'post-modern' state and 'post-sovereignty governance'. However despite growing claims about the decline of the state, there is growing evidence of the return of state power. This has occurred as a response to new security threats, the increasing use of the state as an agent of economic modernization and through an emphasis on state-building as a means of promoting social and economic development.

References and Bibliography

- Agamben, G. (2005) *State of Exception*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago
- Anderson, B. (1983) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso Publication: London.
- Buzan, B. and Hansen, L. (2009), *The Evolution of International Security Studies*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Clark, I. (2000), "The Security State" in Held, D. and McGrew, A. (eds.) *The Global Transformations Reader*, Polity Press: Cambridge, pp. 177-188.
- Geoff, E. and Suny, R. G. (1996) *Becoming National: A Reader*, Oxford University Press: New York.
- Guehenno, J. M. (2010), "The Impact of Globalization on Security", *Survival*, 40 (4), pp.5-19.
- Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2004), *Comparative Government and Politics: An Introduction* (6th edition), Palgrave MacMillan: New York
- Hague, R. et al (2017), *Political Science: A Comparative Introduction* (8th edition), Palgrave MacMillan: New York.
- Hall, J.A. (1989), *States in History*, Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Hallsworth, S. and Lea, J. (2011), "Reconstructing Leviathan: Emerging Contours of the Security State", *Theoretical Criminology*, 15 (2), pp.141-157.
- Held, D. (1992), "Democracy: From City-states to a Cosmopolitan Order?" *Political Studies*, XL, Special Issue, 10-39.
- Held, D. (1993) "The Development of the Modern State", in S. Hall and B. Gieben (eds), *Formations of Modernity*, Polity Press: Cambridge.

- Heywood, A. (2004), *Political Theory: An Introduction*, 3rd edition, Palgrave Macmillan: New York, p. 81.
- Heywood, A. (2011), *Global Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.
- Huggins, R. (1997), "The Nature of the State", in Axford, B. et al (eds.), *Politics: An Introduction*, Routledge: London, p. 214.
- Hughes, G. (2007) *the Politics of Crime and Community*, Palgrave Macmillan: New York.
- UNDP, (1994), *Human Development Report*, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 24-25.
- Kaviraj, S. (2003), "A State of Contradictions: The Post-Colonial State in India", in Q. Skinner and B. Strata (eds.) *States and Citizens*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Leander, A. (2004), "Wars and the Un-making of States: Taking Tilly Seriously in the Contemporary World", in S. Guzzini and D. Jung (eds.), *Contemporary Security Analysis and Copenhagen Peace Research*, Routledge: London.
- Mingst, K. (2003), *Essentials of International Relations*, 2nd Edition, W.W Norton and Co: New York.
- Opello, W. and Rosow, S. (1999), *The Nation-State and Global Brown*, Oxford University Press: Oxford, pp. 259–68.
- Reiner, R. (2007), *Law and Order: An Honest Citizen's Guide to Crime and Control*, Polity Press: Cambridge.
- Renan, E. (1996), "What is a Nation?" in G. Efev and R. G. Suny (eds) *Becoming National: A Reader*, Oxford University Press: New York, pp. 42-55.
- Skinner, Q. (1978), *the Foundations of Modern Political Thought*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Tilly, C. (1975), *the Formation of National States in Western Europe*, Princeton University Press: Princeton.
- Tilly, C. (1990), *Coercion, Capital and European States, A.D. 990-1992*, Cambridge MA Wiley Blackwell: Oxford.

(a) Political Representation

Megha

Introduction

Political representation of women was not always a problematic area. One common reason was that people generally were in agreement that women have no place in the political sphere. However, there was yet another reason for this. It was assumed that women do not have their separate autonomous identity and hence they were already represented through their husbands, which meant that they do not require any separate representation. So initially the issue was not of political rights of women, but of separate identity of women. Feminist movements had to fight for creating “politically relevant identity of women” and then they started to initiate the issue of political representation of women. It is argued that political representation of women is important for ensuring their socio-economic and cultural rights. The political presence of women is bound to bring about substantial changes in the working of democracy and bring about gender equality, not just locally but also globally.

Understanding Political Representation

Democracy as a form of government gathers legitimacy from almost all quarters of the world. There is a general acceptance that everything should function democratically. However, how this should be done or what does it require is a matter of debate. In whatever way democracy is understood we find ‘people’ as a defining feature of the concept. There are those who believe that the interests of the people can be protected and fulfilled by an active interventionist state that is committed to bring order in the society and protect individual liberty. There are also those who believe that this can be achieved by having a minimalist state as they believe that an interventionist state would restrict individual liberty and hence hamper their free development. Underlying idea in both these arguments is protecting people’s interest and creating conditions for their free and equal development. However, it is important here to mention that the category of ‘people’ is not that simple. The way we understand ‘people’ is quite controversial and it has acquired different meaning over a period of time. How we understand ‘people’ is important in a democracy because democracy is most commonly understood as rule of the people, by the people and for the people. However, in large democracies it is not practically possible that people govern directly. So in order to keep the essence of participation alive, representatives of the people are chosen who are believed to represent the interests of the people who have chosen them as their political representative. So, political representatives in a democracy establish a certain type of relation between the state and the people. John Stuart Mill believed that the electoral system did not promote fair representation of minority interests. Mill believed that democracy means government of the whole people by the whole people, equally represented. The government that we actually

have is government of the whole people by a majority of the people, like a government of the privileged who are in greater numbers and who have all say in the state. This leads to disenfranchisement of the minorities. In order to overcome this Mill proposed proportional representation which focused mainly on how we can secure a fair representation in legislative assemblies. However, Mill does not take into account the fact that a fair representation requires inclusion of members of minority social groups and that a fair representation means representation according to differences like ethnicity and gender. This implies that a fair representative democracy must ensure, inter alia, actual political representation of women. "Political representation may be defined as voluntary participation in political affairs through membership, voting and taking part in the elections and activities of the political parties, legislative bodies and/or politically motivated movements." Hanna Pitkin talks about four types of representation: "formal representation, referring to the institutional rules and procedures through which representatives are chosen; descriptive representation, referring to the compositional similarity between representatives and the represented; substantive representation or responsiveness, referring to the congruence between representatives' actions and the interests of the represented; and symbolic representation, referring to the people's feelings of being fairly and effectively represented."

These four types of representations should not be understood separately but in close connection with each other. In this categorization accountability and authorization is at the core. It means that the represented can sanction the representatives if they do not fulfill their promises to the represented and that is because people have authorized their representatives by choosing them. Though for Pitkin electoral process is not a necessary mechanism of representation, in modern democracies election process is the basis of representative democracies. Descriptive representation means having representatives from the same group. This means black represents blacks, dalit represents dalits, a woman represents women. It is basically "representation for" and is meant to ensure that the representative process should ensure that the representative body is also representative of the society-it should reflect the social diversity. "Substantive representation" means "acting in the interests of the represented in a manner responsive to them". It signifies that the policies and approach of the government must actually fulfill the needs and demands of the represented. "Symbolic representation" signifies representatives "stand for" the represented "with an emphasis on symbols or symbolization". "Symbolic representation is concerned not with who the representatives are or what they do, but how they are perceived and evaluated by those they represent".

"Women's descriptive representation" depends upon the "formal representative structures and processes, policy responsiveness, and symbolic representation". Past research has shown that descriptive representation does have a positive impact on the responsiveness towards women's concerns and interests and it also increases the legitimacy of the policies. With the growing number of women in the legislature the responsiveness too increases. "While even a few women in a legislature can generate important benefits for women, real gains in policy responsiveness and political legitimacy appear to depend upon the achievement of a critical mass".

Liberal Feminism and Women's Representation

The under-representation of women is an established fact in the history. However, this started to change with the growing women's movement in the twentieth century when women started to raise their voice against all forms of injustices. Women formed various autonomous organizations to put forward their demands and raise awareness about the gender injustices that women all over the world faced. They drew the attention of the world towards the democratic assemblies which they argued were highly unrepresentative of the women both in terms of ideas and also in terms of numbers.

“Women constitute half the world's population, but they account for less than a quarter of the membership of national parliaments globally. In 2015, 12% of India's national legislators were female; in the US Congress this number was 19%; and in the UK's House of Commons, it was 29%. This political under-representation of women goes hand in hand with poor substantive representation of their preferences, as reflected in gender gaps in health, education, and economic opportunities worldwide.”

Feminists have always argued that the 'mainstream' politics has always sidelined women and their experiences. So, political representation of women has always been considered as a trivial matter.

Mary Wollstonecraft long back in the eighteenth century had raised the issue of political equality of women and argued that equality in the public realm is crucial for women's emancipation. For this she believed that women must not only have equal rights as men but they must also have equal access to education and economic opportunities. The focus of liberal feminism has always been on ensuring equality in the public realm, which they believe is crucial for addressing all other forms of inequalities in different realms. They were mainly concerned with equal rights of women. They argued that because of the unequal process of socialization and the discriminatory socio-cultural practices women have not been able to realize their full potential as human beings and hence they get fewer opportunities than men. So they focus on the empirical evidences of the presence of women or women's representation in the public realm and assess its impact. Are women present in the public decision making process? If not, then why not? And if yes then what impact does it have? What barriers do women have in entering the public realm? Liberal feminists highlight the fact that in most of the public institutions, both domestic and international, women are highly underrepresented and wherever they are present it is only in support work or clerical posts. The important positions are still occupied mainly by men. Liberal feminists argue that the barriers to women's representation in the public realm must be identified and removed so that women have equal opportunity as men in the public sphere.

Factors Affecting Women's Political Representation

Scholars argue that there can be different factors that could affect women's access to political spaces like "cultural, socio-economic, and political factors". These factors play an important role in determining women's access to political power and can be seen as a problem of causality. Are cultural aspects at the root and lead to socio-economic and political problems or vice-versa? Is it important, therefore, to first ensure "a culture of gender equality" and then women can have access to other opportunities and become economically independent, which is important for her entry into the political space? One cannot give a fixed answer for this and therefore it is more suitable to understand it in such a way that "cultural, socio-economic, and political factors interact to create a dynamic that acts as a global incubator for the election of women."

The fundamental reason for lack of women's political representation has been social and cultural. The cultural factors pertain to the values and beliefs that a society holds and propagates. Cultural factors do have a major impact on women's access to public spaces. It may function through a number of channels like religion, education, family which are the agents of upholding the patriarchal values. It is rooted in the idea that women do not have their independent identity. Women's identity is always tied to the head of the family. Before marriage her identity is tied to her father and after marriage it is attached to her husband.

"By marriage, the husband and the wife are one person in law: that is, the very being or legal existence of the women is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated and consolidated into that of the husband: under whose wing, protection and cover, she performs everything."

Those who used to oppose women's political representation argued that women cannot have interests separate of their husbands and thus cannot have rights as separate individuals. So in the initial years of women's movement the issue was not whether women have political rights or not but rather the issue was whether women were separate individuals or not "who can own property". As the movement progressed, women started to demand their rights not as separate individuals but as group. They argued that they have the right of political representation not just because they are individuals but because of the very fact that they are women. But the question was whether women's demand based on their membership to this particular group "women" was legitimate or not? It is important to understand that women have some distinct interest because of which they claim that these interests need representation. But the question is why only women should represent women? One answer might be that women know and can understand the problems faced by women in a much better way compared to men because they too have experienced the same. So the presence of women representatives is important in order to give a voice to women's issues and represent their interests. However, not many women say that as representatives they would like to represent the interests of only women. They believe that this kind of descriptive representation, i.e. women will represent women, may harm the women's movement as this would portray them as representing very narrow interest and hence may send the message

that they cannot be the representative of everyone. The socio-economic conditions too are one of the important reasons of women not entering into active politics. Therefore, some experts argue that if socio-economic condition of women is improved it would also improve the number of women parliaments. It is important to understand that the problem of representation of women is not just a political matter rather is also related to biology, economy, sociology, and psychology.

Political factors too play an important role in election of a woman candidate. It can be understood as “political rights of women and political regimes.” Political rights of women signify the citizenship issue. It refers to the historical account of citizenship rights for women-when they got the right to be the full citizen of a country, when did they first went out to vote, when was the first women political representative chosen, when, for the first time, a woman sat on a top political post. Some studies have shown that these factors do have a correlation with the number of women representatives in the parliament. Political regime, on the other hand, refers to the type of political system-federal or unitary, nature of parliament-bi cameral or uni-cameral, nature of party system, party ideologies, number of parties, number of national parties and regional parties, method of selection of candidates, election funding, election campaign, number of seats in legislatures. Studies have shown that a parliament which has candidates from different parties and different regions or in other words a parliament which is a true reflection of the society, women have greater chance of getting elected than in a parliament which has representatives from only two parties. The electoral system too has an impact on women representation. Studies show that in a system having proportional representation women candidates have greater chances of getting elected. Parties too have an important role in deciding whether they want to field a woman candidate or not or how many woman candidates they want in the elections. If there will be more seats in the parliament then parties have more seats to allot and hence women candidates will have greater chances of getting a ticket and parties too would be more willing to give tickets to female candidates. However, the selection of the candidate is not always neutral and it is based on inclusion and exclusion, as many times there is an arbitrary selection and rejection of candidates.

“the system is designed to select a standard model candidate who is articulate, well-educated and typically employed in a professional career, in business as an executive or manager, in education as a school teacher or university lecturer or in the law as a practicing barrister or lawyer [...] By defining the appropriate qualifications for a career in politics in such a way then certain types of candidates will tend to be successful. As a result women, working-class candidates and those from the ethnic minorities will tend to be consistently disadvantaged.”

Political representation of women would not just mean an increase in the number of women representatives but also bring about a change in the nature of masculine political discourse. However, political parties are often reluctant to consider women as a candidate in the election

and rather choose a male candidate who has a better chance of winning. In some cases when women get the ticket they have to face the opposition that is often dominating and sexualized. After all these odds if a woman gets elected it does not ensure her actual participation. So it is important that women work towards bringing about a change in the nature of power-politics. This can be possible when there are representatives who can raise the concerns of women and work towards transforming the political and social culture. The following words well captures this idea:

“The number of women voters has been increasing. There is need for representatives who can raise and articulate their precise demands and create spaces for growth of a new political culture and groups. These representatives, for instance, can raise issues like the declining workforce participation rate of women and the two crore missing women in the electoral rolls, as these issues have a direct impact on women’s representation in politics. They need to broaden the understanding of “women’s issues,” which are as much about the issue of polarization of society as about the issue of gas cylinders.”

Quota System and Women’s Representation

It is important to understand that though the actual presence of women is essential, the effort should also be on changing the attitude at both social and political level. To increase the number of women representatives many countries have introduced quota system by which some seats are reserved for women candidates. It is argued that if women’s representation is ensured through quotas it can effectively bring about “changes in the nature of political competition”. “For example, it may lower the average competence in the pool of eligible candidates, alter voter preferences for political parties, or increase the number of politicians that are new in office.” Various studies have shown that quotas and reservation policies do have an impact on the nature of policy making. Studies show that if the decision makers are women then the policies do reflect the concerns of women and also more women come forward with their demands and concerns.

Though the implementation of the quota system has brought about substantial changes but that is not the sole reason for all the changes that have happened so far. In some countries quota system has been successful while in others they had no substantial effect. Quota for women needs to be adopted in a well systemized manner so that it can bring about the desired result. “We know that quotas are more likely to be effective in closed-list proportional systems with high party magnitudes. But even in those cases, quotas should be written with placement mandates to avoid having women pooled at the bottom, or they should require that male and female names alternate on lists. Most important, quotas must have ‘teeth’.” Quota must avoid any confusion and must be clear and it should be backed by “strict enforcement mechanism” in order to be successful. However, quotas have limitations which is well captured by the following line by “The Kristen Sample of International IDEA (Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance)”, an inter-governmental organization working for

democratic reforms: “quotas cannot guarantee more women presidents, governors or mayors and can’t keep women in politics”. It further states:

“First, women are a large and easily identifiable group whose members possess many and varied political interests but also are widely perceived as sharing some common, identifiable “women's interests”. Second, although women's representation has improved markedly in recent years, women remain underrepresented in most countries according to many definitions and measures. Third, while many minority groups also have identifiable interests and are widely underrepresented, it is much more difficult to compare them systematically because these groups are so varied; a group that is a minority in one country can be a majority in another and absent altogether in a third. Women, however, constitute approximately 50% of the population virtually everywhere.”

Therefore, the opinion is divided on whether quota system can be effective in ensuring the goal of women empowerment through greater political representation of women.

Political Representation of Women and Democracy

Now the question is whether democracy is or should be understood and defined on the basis of political representation of women? Does greater political representation of women mean stronger democracy? If the answer is yes, then why major democracies in the world have very low proportion of women as political representatives? Should democracy be defined in terms of women representation? And finally can we conceive democracy without women? “Among institutional factors, the level of democratization has the broadest effects. In general, the transition and consolidation of democratic societies can be expected to promote widespread political and civil liberties, including the right of women to vote and to stand for elected office. Yet the role of democracy in promoting women’s role in public life remains in dispute.” One of the basic problems of the process of democratization globally is that it tends to overlook gender equality in terms of political representation. It is generally assumed that with the establishment and consolidation of democracy would result into equal distribution of rights and equal political and civil liberties including rights and liberties of women. Usually democracies do stand for equal rights and liberties in formal sense but in substantive sense they fail in promoting this, especially when it comes to promoting the political rights of women as very few measures are taken to politically empower women.

“Changes in women's voting behavior, their increasing role in national legislatures, and their continuing activism in civil society will affect the quality of democratic leadership, the priorities of policy making, the building of democratic political cultures, and the responsiveness, transparency, and sustainability of democratic institutions. Without a clear understanding of the role that women play in these historic changes, the full meaning of the changes themselves cannot be understood. The trajectories of women's movements and

the vitality of women's organizations are important indicators of how well democratic institutions are working on the ground.”

Women’s movement all over the world is the indicator of growing impact of democratization on women’s political participation and mobilization. The UN Decade for Women (1976-85) promoted women's rights and the integration of women into development at a time when many states were governed by military, communist, or authoritarian regimes. In the 1990s, women's nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) were active in a series of UN meetings: on the environment in 1992, on human rights in 1993, and on population in 1994. The Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 revealed that a shift had occurred, with the political integration of women joining economic development and women's rights as a major concern.

It is now widely accepted that “women's participation in national and local politics, in the economy, in academia and the media is fundamental to democracy and essential to the achievement of sustainable development and peace in all contexts—during peace, through conflict and post-conflict, and during political transitions”. Therefore, if a political system will overlook “participation of women” and will not bother about “women’s rights”, it would fail one half of its citizens. “Indeed, true democracy is based on the realization of human rights and gender equality. If one of these falters, so do the others. Weak democracy remains a major barrier to the enjoyment of human rights. Likewise, the failure to respect human rights is an impediment to effective democracy.”

Political Representation in India

In the “political empowerment” criterion of “WEF Global Gender Gap Report 2020”, India ranks 18th. This is much better than its rank in other indexes. What is to be noted here is that “political empowerment” in this index does not reflect the complete picture as it takes into account the gap between men and women in only top positions of the system like ministerial posts, heads of the state. They consider the data for the last fifty years. So the figure of the “head of the state” section is high mainly because of the long tenure of Indira Gandhi as the Prime Minister of India. In other parameters India’s rank is drastically low. It ranks “69th in ministerial candidate category which means only 30% of women are in this position” and “122 in the category of women occupying parliamentary seats which signifies that only 17% women are in this position”. Apart from this the index does not take into account the women representation at local and state level politics. If we look at the state chief ministers we will find that there is only one women chief minister in India i.e. in West Bengal. However, political representation is not just about representation at the highest level. Political representation of women should be conceptualized in terms of “women as leaders and women as active citizen.”

In order to increase political representation of women, a provision for seat reservation for women in local government was added in the Constitutional 73rd Amendment of 1992. However, the Bill demanding the same provision in the Parliament has still not been passed.

The studies conducted to understand women's political participation and representation reveal that women's participation in public spaces is very low which is attributed to mainly women's lack of experience and knowledge about politics and institutional structures and practices. The patriarchal structure too is a major hurdle as women have to always take permission to go outside and cannot function as autonomous beings.

“Women have significantly lower knowledge about political institutions and electoral rules: they are 5-10 percentage points less likely to give the correct answer to a set of questions about political institutions. It is particularly striking that 27% of women give the wrong answer to the question of whether women can become panchayat members (that is, they answer “no”), despite the existence of a one-third quota. In addition, women lag behind men on their self-assessed leadership skills, they do not have much voice in key household decisions (for example, only one-third of women report having a high level of input into household repair decisions), and they face significant mobility restrictions (for example, 46% of women report requiring permission even to go to nearby places such as a friend's house).”

In 2019 Lok Sabha elections there was an increase in number of women representatives. However, only 14% of women are Members of Parliament, which is further as low as 9% in state legislatures. Women's representation at the local level is much better than that of the Parliament at the national level. However, representation of women is affected by a number social and political factors. The requirement of the use of money during the election campaign results in restricting women's representation from only elite or wealthy class who already have a political background.

Men and women are granted equal rights in the Constitution of India. But still it is a fact that the number of women representatives has been consistently low since independence compared to their male counterparts. Data shows that the number of women candidates filing the nomination is extremely low which leads to decreased chances of women being elected. This also reflects the fact that the political parties do not provide tickets to women candidates. Since India's independence India's score in terms of women's political representation has not been very satisfactory. Though women do vote in elections and this number has seen a rise in past years, the number of women reaching to the top posts are still very low, which depicts the indifference of the political discourse towards the participation of women in political processes. The political parties too are reluctant to give election tickets to women candidates when they have the option of a male candidate. Because of the nature of political campaign and other electoral processes it becomes difficult for the women to fulfill the demands of the political processes as they have several restrictions and limitations in a patriarchal society. The institution of patriarchy functions as one of the major hurdles in the path of effective political participation of women, apart from the economic barrier. Women's identity is always seen and defined in terms of her husband or father. In this sense her political identity too gets attached to her husband or father. Therefore her presence in the political sphere is

possible usually with the permission or approval of the male patriarch. Her identity as an autonomous political being is lost within this patriarchal discourse.

Conclusion

Political representation of women is important for the health of democracy. The issues related to “gender equality and women empowerment” are issues within the discourse of “human rights and justice”, which are today important indicators of democracy.

“It is now critical to ensure full participation of men and women and the integration of women's rights in transitional structures and the reforms undertaken. Women's rights must be part of the foundation of these new beginnings, and not something to be dealt with at a later time. Change comes through working collectively to achieve concrete progress. This will only be possible with the solidarity of both women and men. This solidarity must be built through the sharing of everyday tasks and responsibilities within our homes, in our communities, and in public life.”

Women’s political rights are important not just for women but also for the development of the society and economic well-being of the nation. Various international organizations like World Bank have agreed and have been vocal in admitting that women’s greater role in public sphere, their access to education and other resources are crucial in contributing towards “inclusive growth, sustainable development, and long term prosperity”.

References

Leslie A. Schwindt-Baye and William Mishler (2005), “An Integrated Model of Women's Representation”, *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 67, No. 2, pp. 407-428.

Raghabendra Chattopadhyay and Esther Duflo (2004), “Women As Policy Makers: Evidence From A Randomized Policy Experiment In India”, *Econometrica*, Vol. 72, No. 5, 1409–1443.

L. Iyer and A Mani (2013), “The power of women’s political voice”, *Ideas for India*.

Manon Tremblay (2007) “Democracy, Representation, and Women: A Comparative Analysis”, *Democratization*, 14:4, 533-553.

Pippa Norris and Ronald Inglehart (2001), “Cultural Obstacles to Equal Representation”, *Journal of Democracy*, Volume 12, Number 3.

Hanna Fenichel Pitkin (1967), *The Concept of Representation*, Berkeley: University of California.

Nalini Gulati and Ella Spencer, “Leaders and citizens: Women’s political participation in India”, <https://www.theigc.org/blog/leaders-and-citizens-womens-political-participation-in-india/>, accessed on 5/01/2021

Laxmi Puri, “The Role of Women in Democratic Transition”, <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/stories/2011/11/the-role-of-women-in-democratic-transition>, Accessed on 6/01/2021.

(b) Women in Conflict and Peace

Megha

Introduction

There is a growing consensus in the international community that women must be included in the peace and security processes. This is reflected through the different resolutions that have been passed including “United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1325 in 2000”. However, it is also a stark reality that women’s experiences in “peace and conflict” are largely overlooked by both national and international actors as well as by the policy makers. “It is remarkable that more than a decade after the adoption of UNSCR 1325, women have participated as negotiators in peace agreements in only 9 per cent of cases. Less than a third of agreements signed during this period contain any references to gender (UNPO Secretariat 2011: 12)”. This shows the indifferent attitude towards women in international matters, which also restricts women’s involvement in these processes. This further affects the participation of “poor and marginalized women”. It is important to understand that any project of democracy cannot be considered successful unless it incorporates women in all its processes. There are studies that show that women’s role is significant in both conflict and peace and their activities in fact affect the state of security in their area. Excluding women would mean that their voices are unrepresented and their experiences remain excluded. Therefore, for the processes of “conflict and reform” to be successful, it is important that women are included in the mainstream deliberations.

This can be argued with the help of following examples. “Following Sierra Leone’s civil war and the signing of the Lomé Peace Accord in 1999, the gendered application of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration initiatives meant that a significant proportion of women combatants were largely excluded and thus neither demobilized nor de-securitized. In Northern Ireland between 1974 and 2006, women set out to disrupt four peace negotiations that they believed were not conducive to their interests. And in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), the framing of women’s inclusion in the state security apparatus as having a pacifying and ‘humanizing’ effect risked destabilizing the reforms enacted, as violence committed by women soldiers has been ignored.” The “nationalist identities” and “politicized ethnic and religious cleavages” do affect the kinds of choices that are made by “women to participate in war efforts” and therefore “they have an impact on the state of security in their communities and should be identified as stakeholders in the respective conflicts.”

There is a need to understand that gender, conflict and peace are interrelated and do not exist in a vacuum. Peace and conflict do have gendered bases where unequal gendered relations are not only part of daily lives but they do infiltrate men’s and women’s lives, their sufferings and their roles differently. Men

and women differently perform during conflict and peace and also post conflict and peace while making policies. This makes the relationship between gender, conflict and peace more rigid and complex in the sense that it's hard to decide whether these are gendered identities which are shaping repercussions of conflict and peace or is this typology of conflict and peace which is constructing identities of women and men differently.

Gender

Sex is understood to be biological phenomenon explains biological characteristics of men and women who is taken to be natural though postmodernist feminist challenge this naturalness of biology as well. Gender is considered to be socially and culturally constructed which poses certain characteristics on male and female biology and converting them into masculine and feminine. Gender not only puts femininity in opposition to masculinity but in dichotomy of each other. Characteristics like rationality, aggression, protection, strength, public life, domination and leadership are traditionally considered to be associated with masculinity and on the other hand emotionality, passivity, privacy, submission, weaken, vulnerability are believed to be associated with femininity. These characteristics are dichotomous in the sense that characteristics associated with femininity are devalorized and characteristics associated with masculinity is not only valorized but celebrated also. “Feminize something or someone is to directly subordinate that person, political entity, or idea, because values perceived as feminine are lower on social hierarchy than values perceived as masculine are lower on the social hierarchy than values perceived as neutral or masculine.”

This makes us realize that gender is not only empirical but also an analytical category. Gender as an empirical category “refers to the embodied and ostensibly biological binary of male- female sex difference”. In the empirical form gender is investigated as a variable, for example women and men are differently participating in and affected by political and economic practices. On the other hand gender as an analytical category “refers to the signifying system of masculine- feminine differentiations that constitutes a governing code”. It is strongly argued that gender permeates language and culture which systematically shapes not only who we are but what we think and what we perform. Understanding gender analytically helps in generating a critical and transformative stance in feminist thought as it uncovers that it is “the (Symbolic, discursive)cultural privileging of that which is identified with masculinity is key to naturalizing the (Symbolic, discursive, cultural, corporeal, material, economic) power relations that constitute multiple forms of subjection”. This is very much explained by V. Spike Peterson in her idea “feminization as devalorization” which involves privileging of masculinity evident in conflict, war and militarism. This idea uncovers a critical point that feminization as devalorization is not only about devalorizing “the empirical gender category of women but also sexually, racially, culturally, and economically marginalized men” because the idea is that “the denigration of feminized qualities attributed to those who are subordinated lacking reason, agency, control etc.

Understanding gender analytically also critically explores that as an analytical category gender not only subjects women and marginalized men but also “concepts, desires, tastes,

styles, ways of knowing, cultural expressions (art, music), roles, practices, work, nature” and so on can be feminized by reducing their legitimacy, status and value. In this way devalorization works through the ideological and material ways.

Gender Operating in Conflict

As explained earlier Gender works both in empirical and analytical categories. The chapter critically explores that in the realm of idea and practice of conflict gender works in these two ways only. First women differently participate and affected by conflict situations. They have their particular gender roles and they are also perceived with their gendered roles. Secondly conflict creates a gendered situation where men engaged in conflict are feminized by each other but constitute our ways of knowing.

Conflict situation is a major site for achieving masculinity for several reasons. First, in terms of embodiments, symbolism and institutions (may be informal institutions) women and men’s role is defined. Women is not considered to be taking life even in conflict situations so understood not as an active agent and this is justified with the reference of her body. Her body is considered to give birth, to give life thus essentializing her role not as combatant but a passive identity who is always in need of protection. On the other hand men are considered as life takers whose efficiency depends on his ability to protect others. Killing is one of the factor to judge and celebrate his masculinity. Conflict is considered to be the business of men where women doesn’t have place as an active agent but as a victim only. Second, the conflict as a practical situation is constructed to emphasize and resonate with masculine cultural themes. Different terms are used such as cowardice, bravery, duty, honor, protector where it is really difficult to separate conflict and masculinity. Like war and nationalism, patriotism does play a major role in conflict situation like in Israel–Palestine conflict both the sides are fighting to make their own nation. The population from both sides has become patriotic to the extent that it has turned into killing each other. The question sometimes arises why the men are so into conflict? One of the reasons behind this is the socially constructed gender roles constituting men as courageous to the extent that there is fear of accusations of cowardice which attracts men. It is also considered to be part of their masculine adventure and excitement and their feeling of “getting thrilled”.

In contrast to men’s role women are involved in a “distinct, symbolic role in nationalist culture, discourse and collective action, a feminine role that has been prescribed by masculine social and political culture. Yuval-Davis and Anthias have discussed five ways in which women have been prescribed to “participate in ethnic, national, and state processes and practices: (a) as biological producers of members of ethnic collectivities; (b) as reproducers of the [normative] boundaries of ethnic/national groups [by enacting proper feminine behaviour]; (c) as participating centrally in the ideological reproduction of the collectivity and as transmitters of its culture; (d) as signifiers of ethnic/national differences; and (e) as participants in national, economic, political and military struggles Even in conflict situations women are expected to remain in supportive, symbolic, often suppressed and traditional roles”.

This idea of depicting women as a victim and fulfilling supportive and symbolic role has been challenged by different scholars who with their studies have uncovered that women are very much involved in the conflicts in different states and places as active agents and combatants such as in El Salvador, Colombia, Eritrea, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Uganda, and elsewhere. In the Middle East alone, women have fought in groups such as Al-Qaeda, the Iranian Revolutionary Guard, the Islamic State (ISIL), Jabhat al Nusra, and the Kurdish Peshmerga, where it is estimated that one third of the Kurds currently fighting against ISIL are female. It is also argued that the women who are involved in wartime violence are typically framed by the media as sensational and problematic. Despite rapidly developing research agenda elsewhere and also in academia, “the role played by the women in international, transnational, and local conflicts remains underappreciated” and mostly the focus remains on wartime sexual victimization.

These critical scholars also uncover the interaction between gender and other characteristics such as age or education. For example, women were especially important to the Farabundo Martí National Liberation Front (Frente Farabundo Martí para la Liberación Nacional, FMLN) in El Salvador as skilled medics and radio operators because of their greater literacy compared to their male peers, combined with the additional training they received in refugee camps.¹⁴ In the Ukrainian Insurgent Army (Ukrayins'ka Povstans'ka Armiya, UP A), “women participating in the insurgency against the Soviet Union were, on average, better educated than their male peers, yet they were simultaneously perceived as not being independent thinkers.”

There is also vast debate about the increasing incorporation of women into national militaries leading to the question of whether they are capable of performing similar roles as men though it has been seen that women have fought for non-state militaries even when states continue to limit women's roles. This is clear with the discussion of the history the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) done by Miranda Alison, where she discusses that: “Initially, LTTE women were involved in propaganda work, medical care, information collection, fundraising and recruitment, but they were soon given military training. In 1983, the organization founded a special section for women called the Vituthalai Pulikal Munani (Women's Front of the Liberation Tigers)... Its battle was against the Sri Lankan military in 1986...estimates [of female combatants] vary from between around 15-20% to one-third of the organization's core combat strength, with some estimates less realistically claiming 50%.” Likewise within the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (Fuerzas Armadas Revolucionarias de Colombia, FARC) guerrillas, where approximately 30 percent of the army is female, women fight alongside the men and share camps. Female members of the FARC have many of the same responsibilities as male members, ranging from active combat to the laying of landmines to camp duties”. With these examples it is argued that the groups working with egalitarian or ‘liberatory’ ideologies, provides space for women's participation and their roles remain equal to men.

It has been realized with some more research in national militaries that increasing the

number of roles for women doesn't have consistent outcomes. "Even though American women were officially excluded from specific combat roles until Defense Secretary Panetta and Joint Chiefs of Staff Chairman Dempsey announced the repeal of the 1994 Direct Ground Combat Definition and Assignment Rule for women in January 2013, those who were deployed to Afghanistan perceived themselves as operating on the front lines. This perception was highest among the cultural support teams that were embedded with the infantry as part of an attempt to improve relations with, and gather intelligence from, women in Afghanistan. In other cases, specific military roles maintain women's distance from the front lines. Although women have served in the Israel Defense Forces (IDF) since its inception as part of a mandatory military service requirement for all Israeli citizens, attempts to implement the recommendations of a 2007 military committee report calling for women's full equality within the IDF have been slow moving. Women have recently been admitted to some of the IDF's unmanned aerial vehicle operating teams but are limited to operating the drones with the country's mechanized units rather than with the infantry".

Feminists though uncovers how women do play active role in conflict, military and national struggle which supposed to provide them agency and independence but in practice the women find themselves under the thumb of institutionalized patriarchy once national independence is achieved. This can be understood with the example of Algeria. "In 1962 Algeria freed itself from French colonial rule. The struggle had been a long and bitter one, and the fight for Algerian independence had been notable for the involvement of Algerian women where around 11,000 women were active participants in the national resistance movement, and that 2,000 women were in the armed wing of the movement). Despite this extensive involvement of women in a Muslim country's military movement, once independence was won, Algerian women found themselves 'back in the kitchen', forced to trade their combat fatigues for Islamic dress and the veil." This shows that nationalism leads to conservatism, where it signifies patriarchy. Fighters and nationalists are 'retraditionalisers' and hold tradition as a legitimating basis for nation-building and cultural renewal.

One of the basic components playing crucial role in conflict is the military which is highly sexual. Joane Nagel while discussing about the relation between masculinity and nationalism uncovers several (masculine hetero) sexualized aspects of military institutions and activities. First, warfare and conflict is a sexualized affair. Hartsock (1983, 1984) argues that all forms of political power, including military power, have an erotic component; she points particularly to a masculine eroticism embedded in notions of military strength and valor. Classical history is replete with references linking strength and valor on the battlefield with masculine sexual virility, hence Julius Caesar's admonition to men to avoid sexual intercourse before a battle (or in more modern times before that social equivalent of war, sport) so as not to sap their strength. Mosse discusses debates in Germany about masturbation and homosexuality as sexual practices that endangered national military strength, and describes war as an 'invitation to manliness'. A second way to depict that military institutions and actions are sexualized is how the enemy is perceived in conflicts? In wars and nationalist

conflicts enemy men are either perceived “as sexual demons, bent on raping nationalist women, or as sexual eunuchs, incapable of manly virility”. Enemy women are also depicted in sexualized manner. “Enemy women are characterized as sexually promiscuous and available: sluts, whores, or legitimate targets of rape. The accounts of virtually all wars and conflicts contain references to and discussions of the rape, sexual enslavement, or sexual exploitation of women by not only individual or small groups of men, but by army high commands and as part of state-run national policies”. A third sexualized aspect of militarized conflict is the way military weaponry and offensives were depicted with “masculine imagery of rape, penetration and sexual conquest”. This is very much evident with the phrase written on US missiles targeted on Iraq during the 1991 Gulf War that was, ‘Bend over, Saddam’. Similarly Cohn discusses that one ‘well- known academic security adviser once made an argument that “under Jimmy Carter the United States is spreading its legs for the Soviet Union”. In this way the actions of states and armies are characterized in sexual terms in national defense discourse as well.

Women in Peace

“Security and insecurity” both are in some way or other related to conflict. This can be understood by the fact that even after a conflict ‘ends’ or ceases, the violence or the other harsh effects of that conflict persists for very long and can lead to a sustained environment of insecurity for a very long time. Often it is the case that these conflicts erupt because of the conditions at the local or community level, “understanding and addressing discrimination, marginalization and insecurity experienced by women at that level is crucial for the development of sustainable peace.” Therefore it is important that post-conflict rehabilitation and state-building activities do consider these local communities and their views and opinions. There are also some studies that highlight the “productive qualities of conflict”. These studies argue that conflicts sometimes also provide women the opportunity to challenge and change the traditional or patriarchal system of oppression and assume leadership roles.

The peace keeping process has evolved over time. Initially the UN peacekeeping processes included only military men but gradually it expanded and incorporated the “civilian component” as well. Today the nature of such peacekeeping operations has become “multidimensional” which includes “restoring peace, organizing elections, disarming and reintegrating former combatant, monitoring human rights, consolidating rule of law, working on good governance and so on”. The irony of these peace processes has been that though conflicts have often been gendered the post-conflict peace processes often ignore the gender dimension. The processes of peacebuilding and peacekeeping in a post-conflict situation are often gendered that reinforce the patriarchal structures and focus mainly on the male elites. This results in reinforcing the “gendered inequalities” and further marginalization of women in the post-conflict societies. In such societies the violence and exploitation faced by women are often not taken into account and are overlooked. Some studies have shown that the violence against women after any conflict by the armed forces or “state troops” remain for at

least another four to five years post conflict.

Different case studies that have been done in various conflict zones suggest how women and their experiences have been largely overlooked in both conflict and peace times. A case study in Afghanistan suggested that the “role of women in conflict and peace” were either ignored or considered unimportant which was mainly because of the prevalent belief that Afghan women are generally passive and have no or minimal role in matters related to public sphere, especially war and peace that are considered as matters of masculine state which requires masculine traits to function. Afghan women were considered as “victims without any political agency”. However, despite this kind of representation of the Afghan women, their role evolved during different phases of conflict from a passive victim to an active agent in the struggle. The case of Afghanistan also shows that women have also been used to legitimize “humanitarian interventions”. It was seen that US justified its intervention in 2001 in the state by arguing that they want to “liberate” the Afghan women from their conditions of unfreedom and injustice. “The category of ‘woman’ has typically been applied as a one-dimensional concept, used to justify both international and local interventions, which illustrates how gender is at the heart of the conflict in Afghanistan, as it is in the other country case studies in this publication. The US invasion of Afghanistan in 2001, for instance, was partly justified as a necessary step in the ‘liberation’ of Afghan women.” However, this categorization considers women as a homogenous identity whereas the reality suggests that there is great diversity in the Afghan women in terms of their age, ethnicity, class, place of residence (rural or urban) which in many ways affect the agency that women have. “These identities inform women’s ability to exercise agency in both the family and the community. For example, older women are typically afforded greater space in which to act, and women from minority Hazara communities exercise relatively high levels of agency in comparison with women from other ethnic groups.” This suggests that if such humanitarian interventions have to be successful it is important that they do not overlook this “intersectionality of identities” that is fundamental to any community. Therefore, “national and international efforts to encourage peace and democracy would have a greater chance of success if they involved local communities and were responsive to the diversity inherent in these communities.”

The case of Myanmar suggests that the inclusion of peace deliberations in post-conflict societies is important for “sustainable peace” and deepening of democracy. During the conflict in the state of Kachin women were involved in both peace and conflict (struggle). They participated actively in the struggle mainly because of their experiences of “gender based violence”, injustices and exploitation. So the struggle of women in this region was politically and ideologically motivated as it was mainly influenced by their “marginalized position” in the society. “This means that the women have expectations for what peace and security mean to them, and as political agents, are able to act on their motivations when the opportunity arises”. The stereotypical understanding of women greatly affected their access to leadership roles. Despite active participation of women in the struggle, the general belief that women “retire after marriage and child-birth” helped in sustaining the “gendered

dichotomy” in terms of the defined roles of men and women. This also led to the denial of crucial positions to women, despite the fact that they had experience in the struggle. Their experiences were often ignored. The peace process of Myanmar too ignored women. This was reflected by the fact that the peace process did not take into account women’s experiences of violence and hence did not include the security concerns raised by women. This case study highlights that “gender-based violence not only informs women’s participation in the conflict as violent actors, but also influences women’s groups’ tacit support for armed ethnic minority organizations”. This explains how ignoring “gendered concerns” can undermine the “opportunities for sustainable peace”.

However, we can see a gradual change in such a gendered attitude towards peacekeeping processes with the “UN Security Council resolution on ‘Women, peace and security’” adopted in 2000. This resolution “acknowledges the contribution of women in peace and security” and their role in conflict resolutions and peacebuilding processes. Despite this progressive step there are still structural obstacles in this path. It is important to draw our attention to the fact that the language of these resolutions is still patriarchal which portrays women as victims who are always in need of protection. This approach prevents women from actively participating in peacebuilding and peacekeeping processes. This has led to defining the concepts of peace and security within the “hyper masculine” discourse which results in “remilitarization of the post-conflict society” which in turn hampers the path towards “sustainable peace”. The UN documents use the stereotypical language of explaining and defining the gendered role specifying “what women and men are expected to do, what space they should occupy, who should have control over resources and who should hold power”. All the documents of UN relating to peace and conflict depict women as victims who are helpless and hence they are often included with the vulnerable groups like children and older people. This creates the impression that women do not have agency and they do not have control over their own life. “A lack of gender perspective in peace keeping operations will reinforce the visibility and legitimacy of men as the main stake holders in the peace building processes and, at the same time, will contribute to the invisibility of women who will remain confined to the traditional roles as care takers and care givers.” Gender perspective can be including by having more women in the decision making and policy making processes because if the “peace makers” and “peace envoys” remain to be only men then it would be very difficult to incorporate the “needs, perspectives and expectations of women.”

Conclusion

To conclude it may be argued that first it is important to cross the language barrier in at all levels of peace keeping and peace building processes if gender has to be considered seriously in all the peace and security discussions so that women no longer are considered as victims and are seen as autonomous being with agency and rights. It was rightly pointed out by a leading scholar that genuine peace is possible not just by “eliminating war” but also by creating a just social order free from all kinds of subordinations and dominations and the “unequal gender relations”.

These critical scholars have also problematized the contrasting categorization between civilians and combatants where women and children are considered primarily and sometimes exclusively in civilian deaths. By assuming that women are civilians essentially in contrast to combatants much of the security studies literature portray women as perpetrators of violence. “In defining each individual's status in terms of identifiable groups, we fail to assess a particular individual's relationship to the conflict. In doing so, we neglect the degree to which the participation of individuals in conflict is formal or informal, voluntary or forced, when such information should in fact drive our designation of these individuals as civilians or combatants. Viewing non-participants in conflict as members of groups such as “women and children” can over-determine our understanding of how the individuals that belong to these groups participate in war and can obscure the variation in their roles between or within conflicts.”

There were several points that came out of the discussions and deliberations on these lines. It was agreed that proper “gender training” is important for people who are involved in such peace and security dialogues and process. It was important to address traditional male roles and norms in the gender training. It was also agreed that men should be engaged in such training processes, which was believed to improve the impact of gender training on men.

References

V. Spike Peterson, “Gendered Identities, Ideologies, and Practices in the Context of War and Militarism”, in Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via (ed.), *Gender, War, and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives*, Praeger: England, 2010.

Megan Gerecke, “Explaining Sexual Violence in Conflict Situations”, in Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via (ed.), *Gender, War, and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives*, Praeger: England, 2010.

Catia Cecilia Confortini, “Links between Women, Peace, and Disarmament: Snapshots from the WILPF”, in Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via (ed.), *Gender, War, and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives*, Praeger: England, 2010.

Laura Sjoberg and Sandra Via (ed.), *Gender, War, and Militarism: Feminist Perspectives*, Praeger: England, 2010.

Nadine Puechguirbal, “Peacekeeping, Peacebuilding and Post-conflict Reconstruction”

Jenny Hedström and Thiyumi Senarathna (ed.), *Women in Conflict and Peace*, International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, 2015.