POLITICS & SOCIETY
in the DEVELOPING WORLD

MEHRAN KAMRAVA

Politics and Society in the Developing World

This book is a welcome new edition – which completely updates and revises the very popular first edition, *Politics and Society in the Third World*. Mehran Kamrava has brought the book in line with the major changes in global politics, and the politics and social issues of the developing world.

The book includes key issues such as:

- industrial development; dependency theory and globalisation; the increasingly important roles of the IMF and the World Bank, the GATT and other multinational institutions
- urbanisation: the increase of street children, prostitution, illegal constructions and the emergence of populist individuals and political parties in government-neglected secondary cities
- social change and the political consequences of social change; the increasing influence of Western values, capital and institutions
- political culture: its role and impact in newly democratic developing countries
- revolution
- democratisation: including analyses of civil society organisations and NGOs, civil society, 'political society', state collapse, democratic bargains and transition, consolidation and problems of legitimacy, elections, and multi-party politics
- more examples from Africa, East Asia and rural societies.

Mehran Kamrava teaches political science at the California State University, Northridge. He is the author of *Democracy in the Balance, Revolutionary Politics* and *The Political History of Modern Iran.* His *Revolution in Iran: The Roots of Turmoil* and *Understanding Comparative Politics* are also published by Routledge.

Politics and Society in the Developing World

Second edition

Mehran Kamrava

London and New York

To my family

Contents

Tables

Preface to the first edition

Some years ago, I found myself troubled by my inability to find a satisfactory answer to the question: 'Why is democracy absent from the Third World?' The harder I searched for an answer, the more puzzling the enigma grew. One after another, what on the surface appeared as satisfactory answers – greedy leaders, warped heritages, authoritarian cultures, etc. – became exposed as the tautologies which they were. I searched in the political, but found the social as compellingly important; I analysed the social, and found the cultural inseparable; I examined the cultural, but found it void without the other two.

Admittedly, it was this intellectual confusion which gave birth to the present work. In my search for dynamics which have chased democracy out of the Third World, I found the Third World itself a victim of much academic and scholarly neglect. While British scholars retain a seminal interest in the study of the region, the Third World as a whole has in recent years aroused the curiosity of few American observers. Once the preserve of such giants of the field as Samuel Huntington and Lucian Pye, the Third World has since the end of the 1960s been progressively pushed onto the academic backburner, no longer the fashionable subject that it once was, having become marginalised into something of a doctrinal toy for a few ideological diehards who find its peculiar characteristics supportive of their agendas. There is indeed a paucity of recent serious scholarship on the region, although, again, a few impressive works have come out of England.

It was within this vacuous atmosphere that I felt compelled to write this book, not necessarily to right the academic wrongs of recent years but at least to try once again to bring the subject to the fore of analysis and debate. For now, this seemingly elementary task appears much more pressing than the question of why democracy and the Third World have for so long been diametrically opposed.

I have examined the subject within a multidisciplinary framework, analysing the Third World not only politically but socially and culturally as well. The book analyses the processes of political and industrial development, their numerous consequences on social forms and societal actors, their implications for political

culture, and, finally, their endemic contribution to political instability and revolutions. Chapters 1 and 6 examine the political phenomena of state-building and revolutions respectively. These political developments, the following pages argue, occur and are invariably conditioned within the social and cultural milieux in which they evolve. To this end, Chapters 2 and 3 examine industrial development and urbanisation. Both chapters entail considerably more analysis on the *social* consequences of modernisation and demographic shifts than on their micro- and macro-economic aspects, examining economic factors only in so far as they affect social and political life. Chapters 4 and 5 are devoted specifically to these two spheres. Chapter 4 examines the varied and far-reaching effects of social change, while Chapter 5 discusses characteristics inherent in Third World political cultures which in turn shape the contours of political conduct and social interaction. Throughout, I have attempted to emphasise the interconnected nature of these seemingly diverse developments. The political and social lives of the Third World cannot be understood in isolation from one another, and any attempt to separate the two is bound to result in what can at best be only an incomplete and partial understanding of the subject.

Preface to the second edition

Much has changed in the world since the first edition of this book came out, most of it for the better. When I first wrote much of this book in the late 1980s and the early 1990s, communism had only just fallen in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union still existed, and the death of bureaucratic authoritarianism in South America dated back only a few years. It was these dramatic shifts and their attendant consequences that prompted me to reformulate and substantially revise many of the arguments made in the original edition.

Given the magnitude of these global changes and their impact on developing countries, I have substantially revised the arguments of Chapters 1 and 2 in order to account for, respectively, the consolidation of a number of new democracies as well as new economic and industrial realities. Chapters 3, 4 and 5, on urbanisation, social change and political culture, have all been revised and updated as well, as have some of the main arguments in Chapter 6, on revolutions. A slightly different version of Chapter 7, which discusses the appearance and role of civil society in the processes of democratic transition and consolidation, has previously appeared in *Cultural Politics in the Third World,* which was published in 1999.

As with all other projects of this magnitude, I could not have completed the work on this new edition without the help and support of a number of colleagues, friends and family members. The comments and suggestions of reviewers for Routledge as well as those who reviewed the first edition on their own, some more kind than others, have been a tremendous asset in pointing out some of the weaknesses of the first edition and ways to remedy them. I have especially benefited from the insightful comments and suggestions of my good friend Professor Frank Mora, whose knowledge and expertise of Latin America and political development I especially value. Just as helpful have been members of my family, especially my brother Kamran, whose smiling face always cheered me up whenever the work or the topic got to me. Finally, my wife, Melisa Çanli, whose encouragement and support for this and whatever else I do have never wavered, taught me yet again what it means to love and be loved. She encouraged me to write when I didn't feel

like it, stopped me from writing when I was too tired, and listened to me rant and rave about the madness of the topic when I needed to vent. For these and for everything else, I will always be grateful to her.

<div style="text-align: right">

M. K.
Northridge, California

</div>

List of terms

barriadas, barrios	squatter settlements (Latin America)
barung-barongs	squatter settlements (Philippines)
bidonville	squatter settlement (North Africa, especially in Algeria)
bus tees	squatter settlements (India)
callampas, colonias	squatter settlements (Latin America)
dependistas	supporters of dependency theory
descamisados	the shirtless ones (in Peron's regime, the underprivileged)
favelas	squatter settlements (Latin America)
gecekondu	squatter settlements (Turkey)
gourbiville	squatter settlement (North Africa, especially in Algeria)
halab-abads	squatter settlements (Iran)
kampongs	squatter settlements (Malaysia)
lumpen proletariat	rural migrants and unskilled workers
mostazafan	the disinherited (in post-revolutionary Iran)
personalismo	a personality cult
proletarias	squatter settlements (Latin America)
ranchos	squatter settlements (Latin America)

1 Political systems and processes

The 1980s and 1990s have witnessed a remarkable transformation in the very fabrics of politics and society in the developing world. Politically, numerous tyrants and autocrats have been overthrown in popular, democratic revolutions, while the few remaining ones, still found primarily in the Middle East and in parts of Africa, have had to devise new strategies for survival and for placating demands for political reform. Socially, constant advances in information technology – from satellite television to facsimile machines, computers and the internet – have made it all but impossible to keep societies politically isolated and unaware of the larger currents under way globally. Late into the 1990s, the Third World political formulas of the 1960s and the 1970s seem simplistic and rudimentary in comparison, relics of an era in which dictatorships reigned supreme, 'underdevelopment' was a universal Third World attribute, and democracy was only a distant ideal for many and a farcical gimmick for others. Today, however, the rules of the political game have changed in many developing countries, complicated by the onslaught of democracies and all they entail: free elections, parliamentary politics, independent judicial systems, social autonomy and the rule of law.

Authoritarian holdouts do continue to exist, however, especially in the Middle East and much of Africa, and a strong argument can be made that the 'democracies' found in a number of developing countries – Peru, Venezuela and Kenya among them – do not really deserve the label. This chapter focuses primarily on such restrictive political systems, leaving the analysis of democratic transition and consolidation to be discussed separately in Chapter 7. It argues that the political processes that occur in the developing world can in large measure be summed up as efforts to attain institutionalisation and legitimacy. For reasons enumerated below, these two developments assume crucial importance in developing countries, whether authoritarian or newly democratic, where the combined effects of rapid industrial and urban growth, intense social change and disjointed political cultures have made political instability and sudden changes frequent features of the body politic. In essence, the politics of the developing world is driven by continuous struggles on the part of governments to attain legitimacy and in the process to consolidate

their rule in relation to their societies. Different types of government develop out of these efforts, of course not without the influence of indigenous factors, ranging from personalist states to bureaucratic-authoritarian, populist or, lately, democratic ones.

INSTITUTIONALISATION

Political institutionalisation is one of the central dilemmas that Third World governments have long faced. Institutionalisation refers to the effective establishment of state authority over society through specially created political structures and organs. In its most elementary form, political institutionalisation is a state-building process. As an unavoidable phase in the process of political development, institutionalisation involves the 'extent to which the entire polity is organised as a system of interacting relationships, first among the offices and agencies of the government, and then among the various groups and interests seeking to make demands upon the system, and finally in the relationships between officials and articulating citizens'.[1] Some scholars view institutionalisation as a linear, evolutionary phenomenon whereby 'a political structure is made operational in accordance with stipulated rules and procedures, enabling more regularised, hence predictable, patterns of political behavior, minimal trauma in power transfer, and a foundation for the effective development of policies as well as the application of justice'. 'Ideally', they argue,

> political institutionalisation enables a movement from the erratic practices and arbitrary decisions stemming from a high dependence on personalized rule. In its success, it also reduces the likelihood of abrupt, drastic change in basic structure, including revolution, since change is made possible in legal, evolutionary manner by established procedures.[2]

Yet such a directional definition of political institutionalisation – with democracy as an implicit reference point – is applicable only to selective and recent cases, where political actors have deliberately set out to create state institutions and political procedures that are democratic. Apart from such efforts under way in Africa immediately after independence and in Eastern Europe and South America in the 1980s, following the collapse of authoritarian states, institutionalisation often takes place over time and gradually. The longer a state is in existence, the more elaborate tend to be the means through which it interacts with or controls society. Institutionalisation is the penetration, both objectively and subjectively, of society by existing state institutions. The degree to which a particular system is institutionalised depends not on the extent of its correspondence to democratic rules and practices, as the above quotation implies, but on its success in penetrating the various levels of society, hence resulting in popular compliance with the body

politic, whether voluntarily or through an actual or perceived threat of coercion. Thus institutionalisation involves more than the mere mechanical penetration of society by various state agencies and institutions. It carries with it an implied emotional and ideological acceptance, whether forced or voluntary, of the credibility of institutions which emanate political power.

In essence, institutionalisation determines the extent of the strength of the nexus between state and society. It is this function, that of a linkage between state and society, that makes institutionalisation so quintessentially pivotal to the political process in the developing world. It is, indeed, as will be shown, the extent of institutionalisation that to a large extent determines the viability of particular states and the measure of their popularity among those they govern. The greater and more in-depth the institutional bonds between state and society, the less likely it is for political alternatives to gain hold among the popular classes. Conversely, the more fluid such nexuses, the higher is the probability of political change and the less permanent are state structures likely to be. The inherently fragile political systems of most developing countries, and the even more tenuous bonds that bridge political and social actors together, are both products of what is at best skewed and incomplete institutionalisation.

It is important to note that institutionalisation is possible only in societies where there is a clear and dominant centre of power that is capable of overcoming other competing power centres. Institutionalisation cannot take place when political institutions are either insufficiently strong or do not have a single and identifiable social mass to penetrate (Lebanon in the 1970s and 1980s, the former Yugoslavia in the 1980s, and Afghanistan, Burundi, Rwanda and Somalia in the 1990s).[3] In such societies, deep communal divisions and conflicting allegiances prevent the effective domination of one group over another and result in the emergence of community-exclusive authority structures. Thus in these countries – as well as in Mandatory Palestine, Northern Ireland and Cyprus – 'political authority is divided between the sovereign political center on the one hand, and the institutionalised or semi-institutionalised political centers of the constituent communities on the other'.[4] In the absence of any overwhelming centres of authority, the rule of the state becomes precarious and highly susceptible to shifts and fluctuations in the economy, demography and communal balances of power. For institutionalisation to take place, there needs to be a dominant centre of power that is capable of enforcing its authority over other social forces. Without such domination by any one group, political institutionalisation cannot occur and a 'stateless society' emerges.

Political institutionalisation in the developing world takes place through several mechanisms and at various levels. Specifically, institutionalisation occurs first in the narrow confines of the political establishment itself. In this sense, it refers to the development of norms and explicit as well as implicit codes of conduct, 'the rules of the game', among principal political actors and institutions. It signifies the routinisation of certain political procedures and the prevalence, whether due to

precedent or to legal prescriptions, of certain principles over others. This sort of political institutionalisation is most frequently attempted through the provision of national constitutions, most of which lay down in detail the mechanics of the political system and the relationships of its various components. In a broader level, implicit codes of political conduct and procedural behaviour emerge and dominate the political life of society, frequently sanctioned by the highest levels of political office.

A second mechanism through which political institutionalisation is achieved is through various institutions that link the political system to the various strata of society. These institutions include, most notably, the bureaucracy and other administrative arms of the state such as parastatals and quasi-governmental agencies (e.g. government-owned banks, cooperative shops and insurance companies), its coercive organs such as the military and the police, and other organisations through which the state solicits popular support and participation.

The most prevalent of these measures, and traditionally perhaps the least effective, has been the provision of constitutions that lay down the overall nature and the characteristics of political institutions in elaborate detail. It is often thought, both by political figures and by intellectuals, that the provision of a constitution is the first and the most fundamental step towards the creation of an ideal state. Constitutions are often intended to serve two diametrically opposed goals. For revolutionaries and national liberation fighters, of the kind that pervaded Africa in the 1960s, constitutions hold promises of institutionally guaranteed civil liberties and political democracy. They are official documents intended to outline the contours of the political establishment and to keep in check the powers of politicians and other public figures. Often, such constitutions are hurriedly put before the public in a national referendum, in order to enhance their popular legitimacy and supposed sacrosanctity. In the Republic of Congo (Congo Brazzaville), for example, President Denis Sassou Nguesso – who had ruled from 1979 until multi-party elections in 1992 and returned to power after a five-month civil war in 1997 – has promised to devise a new constitution to present to the people in a popular referendum. It was with these same aspirations that European-style constitutions proliferated in post-independence Africa a few decades earlier, with the hope that the democracies of the former colonial powers could be transplanted on to the entire continent.[5] In the aftermath of the collapse of authoritarianism in Eastern Europe and South America constitutional engineering has once again re-emerged as a viable tool for establishing democratic polities. In 1998, for example, the Mozambican government distributed 50,000 copies of the country's constitution for debate among politicians, lawyers, religious leaders and various social groups over proposed amendments designed to reduce the power of the presidency.

But not all constitutions set out to delineate democratic systems. In numerous developing countries, especially those ruled by authoritarian regimes, constitutions are tailor-made to fulfil specific political purposes and to present a mere cloak of

legitimacy to norms and practices otherwise considered as unpopular and illegitimate. In the 1970s, Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines, Kim Il Sung in North Korea and General Park Chung-hee in South Korea, to name only a few, devised constitutions convenient for their own personal ends,[6] as do to this day successive military governments in Thailand[7] and the new regimes of Africa.[8] Even the democratic provisions of the first constitution of post-revolutionary Iran have been changed beyond recognition, retaining little if any of their original democratic flavour.[9]

Nevertheless, whether democratic or authoritarian, by themselves constitutions are largely incapable of guaranteeing the longevity of the systems they were intended to create and to safeguard. This unworkability of (democratic) constitutions in the developing countries can be generally attributed to their failure to take into account indigenous social and political conditions.[10] To begin with, a lack of existing political infrastructures, organisational cohesion and a shared political heritage in most developing countries precludes the evolution of political institutions there based on constitutional models imported from the West. Efforts at wholesale constitutional engineering have met with little success because they blindly attempt to implement an overnight transformation of political attitudes and practices. Political institutionalisation involves piecemeal social engineering and time instead of mere importation of ideas and institutions.[11] In post-independence Africa, of which Nigeria is a prime example, the constitutional pattern of the colonial countries was emulated in an effort to superimpose European institutions on African settings.[12] But the predominance of communalism and tribal loyalties invariably resulted in the breakdown of imported institutions such as parliaments and of concepts such as democracy. Imported European institutions were no more capable of overcoming the centrifugal forces of African societies than were any other institutions.[13]

In Latin America efforts to import North American and Western European political ideals and constitutional measures yielded equally dismal results. Before the wave of democratisation that appeared in the 1980s, despite the devotion that Latin Americans have traditionally had for constitutionalism, little respect for constitutional mandates could be found in the region, with the majority of political leaders observing constitutional procedures only when it suited their purposes.[14] The element of *personalismo* in Latin American political culture has also encouraged the predominance of leaders with strong personalities over political institutions and principles, thus further reducing the practical viability of constitutions.[15] Similar reasons have led to the failure of constitutionalism in the Middle East, whose political culture is marked by a predominance of personalities and strong elements of patrimonialism. In most Middle Eastern countries dictatorial leaders are often the embodiment of the very political systems over which they rule.[16] The forceful personalities of leaders like Gamal Abdel Nasser, Hafiz al-Assad, Saddam Hussein and Ayatollah Khomeini, coupled with their distaste for limitations imposed by democracy, have left little or no room for the growth and maturation of constitutional restraints and principles. Moreover, most Middle Eastern countries share Africa's

problems of communalism and ethnic heterogeneity, as starkly demonstrated by the cases of Iraq and Yemen, giving state leaders added purchase in curtailing democratic rights in the name of political stability and national unity.[17]

As a result of the overall failure of constitutionalism in most developing countries, state structures and institutions there have evolved largely independent of constitutional restraints and are instead at the mercy of strong, existing centres of power. Throughout the developing world, the political symmetry and the balance of power provided in most constitutions has been tilted in favour of one of the existing centres of political and/or social power. Political institutionalisation has taken place, though not in accordance with constitutional means and procedures, but according to the capabilities and the wishes of those who happen to hold the reins of power. The nature and characteristics of this society-wide powerful group, and the reasons behind its emergence as a power-broker and an institutionalising agent, depend on indigenous factors and conditions, thus varying from one region and country to another. None the less, whereas constitutional measures have mostly failed to act as viable institutionalising agents, political institutionalisation in the developing countries has gone full speed ahead at another level: the gap between state and society has often been bridged through the bureaucratic and coercive arms of the state. Untamed and unrestrained by constitutional limitations, or at best selectively interpreting legal restrictions to suit their purposes, most Third World governments have, with varying degrees, come to rely on the military to sustain themselves in power and on the bureaucracy to penetrate the inner echelons of their society.

The role of the bureaucratic apparatus as an agent of political institutionalisation in the developing world is particularly important, in fact so much so that the bureaucracy has come to be one of the most central of state institutions itself. Often the main agents of social change and of political socialisation, Third World bureaucracies are frequently highly involved in the political process and play a major role in implementing political goals.[18] Bureaucracies are, in fact, by far the most omnipresent symbols and extensions of the political establishment. They frequently serve as the sole source of contact between the average citizen and the government and are thus the only forum for political input and participation. Nevertheless, the role of bureaucracy in most developing countries is often purely administrative rather than one of innovation and policy-making, the latter frequently being the exclusive domain of state leaders.[19] In order to carry out the numerous tasks that it has often taken on, the bureaucratic establishment in most developing countries is enormous in size and its duties are cumbrous. Not only is the bureaucracy seen as the principal agent through which the masses and the state come into contact, it is further viewed as the primary force through which developmental goals are enacted. An overwhelmingly large bureaucracy is thus maintained in most developing countries, the size of which is perpetuated by a variety of factors. Most frequently, civil service jobs are attractive owing to their inherent social prestige,

as, for example, is the case in South Korea.[20] More often, they offer secure employment to thousands of otherwise redundant high school and university graduates, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of the Middle East, where the private sector remains underdeveloped and incapable of absorbing new graduates. Even when economic shortcomings result in increased unemployment and redundancies, jobs in the civil service, whose members provide one of the main sources of a regime's powers, are relatively secure compared with those in the private sector.[21]

LEGITIMACY

By itself, excessive bureaucratisation is no guarantee of the institutional strength of a political system. Nor is institutionalisation *per se* a sufficient precondition for political stability. The developing world is inundated with examples of states that are overly bureaucratised yet have little or no popular legitimacy and are, therefore, inherently unstable.[22] A viable, functioning political system needs not only to embody institutions that are capable of enforcing its mandates throughout society, but also to have an ability to give some sort of credibility to those mandates among significant social strata. Somehow, the political system needs to justify its rule, at least among those social actors whose interaction with and support for the body politic make the latter's survival possible. Without a 'moral authority' to enforce their rule, state institutions remain socially unintegrated and their ability to govern is greatly reduced.[23] Whereas institutionalisation provides the mechanical and structural nexus between state and society, legitimation links the two emotionally and psychologically. The extent of a state's institutionalisation determines the degree of its functional viability. But to be socially viable as well, the state's political mandate needs to be underwritten by norms and practices that legitimise its existence. Thus the search by developing countries to find and to maintain popular legitimacy is an integral part of the process of political development.[24]

In the face of a general absence of solid institutions and apparatuses, ingrained traditions, shared experiences and a common political heritage, and the meteoric rise and fall of maverick politicians and their customised regimes, legitimacy, no matter how narrowly based or derived from false premises, becomes crucial to basic political survival. For those even slightly concerned about political longevity, achieving some measure of popular legitimacy becomes just as important as the efficiency of political institutions and the effectiveness of the coercive arms of the state. This is achieved through several different means, each of which depends on the particular nature of forces that prevail in society, as well as on the characteristics of the political establishment itself. Specifically, in non-democracies five broad and interrelated mechanisms can be identified through which political legitimacy is acquired and perpetuated. They include charismatic authority, patrimonialism,

clientalist relations, the appeal to ideology or to emotionally significant historical events, and politically inclusionary policies aimed at expanding a regime's popular support base. To varying degrees, the remaining non-democracies of the Third World employ one or a combination of these political forms in order to emphasise and to augment their moral authority to rule.

In its purest form legitimacy signifies a shared conviction among the people of the ruler's unshaken right to govern. This type of legitimacy can be found in instances of charismatic leadership. The charismatic leader is popularly believed to be infallible and endowed with supernatural qualities, qualities that are not inherent to the individual leader but arise out of the relationships which develop between him and his followers. As such, charismatic authority is marked by an absolute and unwavering devotion of the masses to their leader, a relationship reminiscent of the 'peculiar kind of deference . . . paid to prophets', one of 'masters' and 'followers and disciples'.[25] Thus, so long as conditions conducive to his image as a charismatic leader prevail, the legitimacy of the ruler is unquestionable. Whether based on magical qualities or on a cunning ability to gratify collective emotional or economic yearnings, the continued perception of the leader as charismatic sustains his legitimacy. This, to a great extent, explains the unending efforts of Third World leaders at self-edification and to present larger-than-life pictures of themselves to their peoples (see below).

Yet, by nature, charismatic leadership is unstable and impermanent. Instances of genuinely charismatic authority are indeed rare and occur only in extraordinary circumstances, when all three elements of charismatic rule – a devoted mass of followers, a leader able to fulfil a charismatic role, and conditions that are conducive to the emergence of a leader–devotee relationship – are present. Charismatic leadership is at best a transitory form of political rule that inevitably gives way to routinised and procedurally more sound types of leadership.[26] In the popular eye, according to Max Weber, the charismatic leader loses his legitimacy when 'his mission is extinguished'. 'The charismatic holder is deserted by his following . . . because pure charisma does not know any "legitimacy" other than that flowing from personal strength, that is, one which is constantly being proved.'[27] In essence, the charismatic leader needs constantly to live up to his perpetuated image, maintaining a ceaseless drive to fulfil one prophetic mission after another. The vitriolic rhetoric of ancient and contemporary charismatic leaders, from historic warriers to modern-day Hitlers, Castros and Khomeinis, only attests to their unending struggle to fan the flames of their legitimacy to keep them from subsiding. In order to maximise their legitimacy, charismatic figures make deliberate efforts to portray themselves as average citizens, concerned with the needs and pains of the downtrodden. They become reflections of the man in the street, generating and in turn symbolising a sense of national identity.[28] In the process, they establish a particularly intense one-to-one relationship with at least one segment of the

population, among whom their appeal and power reach unparalleled heights. Practically every charismatic leader has his equivalent of the Hitler Youth, fanatic followers for whom real or concocted causes form the essence of the charismatic leader's self-proclaimed mission. Juan Peron proudly espoused the causes of the 'shirtless ones' (*descamisados*), Khomeini those of the 'disinherited' (*mostazafan*) and Nkrumah became immortal in the eyes of a group of devout followers called the Youth Pioneers. It is among these groups and classes that the leader's charisma becomes a powerful motivating factor, prompting an almost blind devotion to his directives and orders. For the likes of the 'shirtless ones', only the charismatic leader understands and identifies with their pain, and only he can liberate them from their hopelessness and misery.

Whereas charismatic systems rely exclusively on the bonding force of the political leader's personality, patrimonial polities are based on a resonance of personal loyalties not only between the people and the leader but between political incumbents and their successive echelons of lieutenants. Charismatic leadership is inherently a political aberration, void of specialised institutions and procedures that transmit the directives of the ruler to the ruled. It is intrinsically informal. The political system can be summed up in the person of the leader and in the force of his aura, which in turn penetrate the society and mobilise diverse social classes. As such, the legitimacy of the political system rests entirely on the personality of the leader and on his actions. In patrimonial systems, however, while a strong personality continues to dominate the political system, it is not as central to its legitimacy as is the case in instances of charismatic rule. Instead, the political establishment relies on a series of informal networks made up of personal ties, kinship and loyalty. Even the development of formal institutions such as bureaucracies does not significantly reduce the informality that pervades the decision-making processes of patrimonial systems.[29] The patrimonial relationships that dominate the household and the family are fabricated throughout society and link the person of the ruler to those whose support is of vital political importance. It is through these linkages, between political leaders and their powerful proxies, and in turn between the proxies and their subordinates, and so on and so forth, that the political system acquires its legitimacy. The state and society, informal as the former is, are tied together through an intricate and proliferating web of networks that emanate from the highest political offices and stretch down to the narrow reaches of society.

To this day, patrimonial systems inundate the political landscape of what Weber called 'traditional' societies, particularly those found in the Middle East.[30] Nevertheless, the steady transformation of traditional societies into transitional ones due to industrial development and economic change, and the gradual emergence of enclaves of economic and in some instances even political elites within these countries, have forced political establishments to rely increasingly on clientalist relations in order to maintain their legitimacy. The relationship of

governments and elites becomes one of patrons and clients: political stability and order depend on the consensus of support for the ruling regime, exhibited by powerful and influential elites. In order to attain the greatest degree of elite consensus, a regime must implement and formulate policies that cater directly to the demands of those elites, to their constituencies, and to those whom they represent.[31] The elite in turn grows increasingly more dependent on the state for the preservation of its social status through special privileges and access to goods. Through its overwhelming control of resources, the state is able to provide various benefits and services to individuals and groups in exchange for their support or at least political complaisance.[32] The construction of schools or paved roads in a particular neighbourhood, the awarding of contracts to private firms and offers of employment or promotion within the civil service are some of the most common forms of patronage found in the Third World. The state's legitimacy thus rests on its continued ability to keep socially and politically significant elite groups as its clients.

Advanced and institutionally evolved patrimonial arrangements often find expression in the form of clientalist or even corporatist systems. Due to the early and accelerated industrial development of the region as a whole, and also because of the manner in which this development has largely come about, patron–client relations are most readily discernible in Latin America.[33] Successive civilian and military regimes, brutally authoritarian as they were, staked their legitimacy on the success of their developmentalist agendas and on the economic fruits of their policies. Gradually, these clientalist relations matured into corporatist ones, in which the state was answerable not to individuals but instead to organised, corporate groups such as trade unions, industrial conglomerates, military establishments (or factions within them), civil servants, and the like.[34] Corporatist states are usually highly centralised (corporatism originated with the fascist regimes of Italy and Spain), and actively promote political and/or economic programmes, an activism that is as much ideologically motivated as it is necessitated by the need constantly to cater to corporatist groups.[35] Such groups mediate between the individual and the central government, and each generates independent allegiances which will be pooled and reconciled in the common submission to a single government.[36] Similar to clientalist relations, these allegiances maintain the legitimacy of the political system based on its ability to protect and promote the interests of the corporate groups.

Some non-democracies seek to acquire popular legitimacy through the promotion of populist, politically inclusionary policies aimed at reducing the gap between the masses and the governing elite. Most often, such states develop when post-revolutionary regimes successfully perpetuate the popular enthusiasm of the revolutionary experience and channel it towards legitimising new political forms and institutions. Similar to states headed by charismatic leaders, inclusionary states derive their legitimacy through a direct and intense fusion with society, ostensibly promoting direct mass participation in the political process. However, unlike purely

charismatic leadership, the political institutions of inclusionary states are well developed and are specifically designed to direct mass participation towards politically sustaining goals. Political legitimacy lies not in the personal appeal of a central figure, or in the viability of patrimonial networks or clientalist or corporatist relations. Instead, the legitimacy of populist, inclusionary states rests on their unimpeded capacity to generate mass-based political participation and in directing it towards furthering their own sustenance. Political mobilisation, and the accrual of certain tangible or emotional benefits for the masses in the process, significantly reduces the possibility of mass uprisings against states with inclusionary policies.[37]

Lastly, political establishments seek legitimacy in the shelter of ideologies, claiming before their citizens to follow theoretical frameworks which for one reason or another are held in high esteem by significant strata of society. In one shape and extent or another, all states claim to be the followers and protectors of certain ideologies. Yet some states, those whose very genesis can be traced to ideological movements, are decidedly more doctrinaire than others. In post-revolutionary cases, for example, any slight deviation from narrowly interpreted, prevailing doctrines is tantamount to heresy and often seen as high crimes and treason. The emphasis on Marxism–Leninism in socialist states or on, say, Islam in post-revolutionary Iran is more than a matter of the forced imposition of doctrinal values over society by its new leaders. It is part of an intense legitimation process which the new leaders embark on, staking their claims not only on immediate and tangible results but also on promises of future betterment and glory. So long as they can deliver the goods that were promised, or at least convince enough people that their ideology is indeed the right one, then competing ideologies find little purchase among the masses and the ideological legitimacy of incumbents remains intact.

But for states to stake their legitimacy on the righteousness of their ideology, an experience as traumatic as that of revolution is not always a necessary precondition. Post-revolutionary states do indeed tend to be more bombastic in their adherence to and propagation of specific ideologies and doctrines. That is primarily because such states are *revolutionary* by nature. Ideological fanaticism is a result of both the still ongoing indoctrination of the masses and the need to substitute for institutional exigencies by emotional and extralegal appeals. Yet not all ideological states can be viewed as fanatical. Once in force and accepted by large segments of the population, over time ideologies lose their strictly doctrinal character and become part of a growing, internalised value system.[38] Ideological orientations, on the part of the elites and the masses alike, become part of a comprehensive world view, free of their once engrossing missionary zeal and instead controlling subtle nuances in thought and behaviour. Rigid ideological interpretations become loosened, the state-sponsored ideology becoming less and less ideological. Even those state symbols with ideological significance – constitutions, monuments, national holidays, etc. – eventually lose their fervently emotional significance and become part of the rituals of everyday life.

The declining importance of ideology as a means of political legitimation is dependent on both the extent to which it already has popular roots and on the degree to which the political establishment is institutionalised. The greater the strength of prevailing political institutions, and the more routinised the downward flow of power from the upper echelons of the state, the lesser is the need to justify existing political forms by ideological justifications. Throughout South America and East Asia, for example, comparatively high levels of political institutionalisation, and since the 1980s the consolidation of democracies, have significantly reduced the power that ideologies such as socialism and Marxism once had in both regions. Even in Peru, where the Shining Path guerrillas at one point inspired romanticised images of warrior-peasants, the old character of ideological debates has significantly changed. The shy appearance of democracy in much of Latin America and in such Asian countries as the Philippines and South Korea has pushed most other competing ideologies into the background.[39] Even in those Asian countries where larger political questions are at times violently debated in the streets and through mass demonstrations – as in Indonesia and Malaysia, and somewhat less frequently in Taiwan – ideological clashes are seldom over which 'ism' to adopt and are, instead, more often over when and how to have a democratic polity. But in much of the Middle East and in parts of Africa ideology continues to be a compelling force. Over-bureaucratisation and inflated government structures, so long hallmarks of Middle Eastern and African governments, have, for the most part, failed to result in routine and institutionally sound processes of decision-making and state–society nexus. Thus the rhetoric of ideology, unbending and unwilling to compromise, reigns supreme in these regions and continues to give birth to demagogues and prophets.

Structurally, the institutional characteristics of the various state types have direct bearing on their search for legitimation: personal appeal legitimises charismatic leadership; informal ties and loyalties help sustain patrimonial states, as do in other instances clientalist and corporatist taints; and, to varying degrees, ideologies either are the very justifications for which a state exists or form a larger world-view of which a state is an integral part. The centrality of institutionalisation and legitimation is ignored by few, not least of all by Third World political actors themselves. Yet despite often frantic and concerted efforts, both political institutionalisation and legitimacy in much of the developing world remain at best elusive goals. Gigantic bureaucratic apparatuses thrive and grow uncontrollably, but often in size and inefficiency and waste rather than in their ability to bridge the gap between the state and the narrow reaches of society. At best, only a majority of the urban society becomes subject to the rule of bureaucratic norms and governance, and even then it does so grudgingly and with reluctance. For the most part, civil society remains resistant to the advent of bureaucratised procedures and to the

regulative impulses of the bureaucracy, only to be accentuated by the emotional and ideological distance between state leaders and the bureaucratic 'second stratums'.[40] What results are political systems that are run overwhelmingly according to only perfunctory constitutional frameworks, operating largely in a social vacuum, and at best only partially successful in carrying through their economic and political agendas. Popular legitimacy remains a distant dream for most non-democracies, unless attained through appealing to personal emotions and manipulating collective sentiments. Within such a context, the political systems that evolve embody highly authoritarian traits, traits that find breathing space and reinforcement in prevailing social, cultural and economic circumstances. Until fully consolidated, meanwhile, emerging democratic systems remain highly fragile and tenuous, susceptible to the persisting dictatorial tendencies of a wretched history not long past.[41]

TYPOLOGY OF STATES

Within the context of skewed institutionalisation and ongoing struggles to attain popular legitimacy, four broad types of political establishment can be found in the developing world. 'Sultanistic' and neopatrimonial states, solely dependent on the force of their leader's personality, dominated the developing world's political landscape not too long ago but are now dwindling in number and are rarely found in their pure form. Frequently, personalist states develop increasingly specialised agencies and come to rely on more institutionalised procedures and coercive means, such as the bureaucracy and the armed forces, in order to stay in power. The result often closely approximates bureaucratic-authoritarian states, in which the foundations of political power rest on a domestically oriented military and an ever-growing network of government bureaux and institutions. Populist, inclusionary states, meanwhile, rely not only on personal appeal and on institutional means to hold on to power but include the additional element of mass collective behaviour. Lastly, a growing number of experiments in democracy have dotted the developing world since the 1980s, especially in Latin America and parts of Africa, in which parliamentary and party politics are played out in still-evolving democratic settings.

Personalist states thrive in societies where the development of organisations and institutions has been particularly mute.[42] An absence of solid political institutions and of procedural methods facilitates the ascension of ambitious personalities to positions of political power by enabling them to employ non-institutional means in order to attain that power. As a result, factors that are otherwise politically insignificant, such as personal willpower and wiliness, connections and loyalties, social prestige, and charisma and oratorical skills assume paramount political importance. The root causes of the paucity of strong political institutions are social as well as political. Institutions and organisations have failed to acquire strength and resonance in large measure owing to their alien nature. This is

particularly the case in Africa and in the Middle East, where there have been frequent efforts to superimpose European institutions on incompatible, indigenous social and political settings.[43] Political systems have sprung up based on notions and principles with which the public is only familiar in the abstract, on political practices with little or no precedent in culture or political heritage, and on offices and institutions which have hitherto been non-exsitent. Thus politically salient forces like patrimonialism and autocracy frequently manifest themselves in such modern guises as presidency and multi-party systems. Age-old practices and traditions overwhelm and dominate the conduct of modern institutions and offices. Hence 'presidential monarchies' or, whether or not officially so entitled, presidents for life appear with unabated regularity. Moreover, the political dynamics which evolve in personalist systems are by nature self-perpetuating. Politicians are likely to engage in personal rule if the rules and regulations of the state are not well understood or appreciated and are poorly enforced, and if they know that others are aware of this and are unlikely to conform to the rules in their own conduct.[44] The prevalence of patrimonial politics is equally important. Because networks of loyalty and kinship are so central to their maintenance, patrimonial systems breed the dominance of personal ties over institutional means, often to the extent that political institutions become vehicles at the mercy of powerful individuals.[45]

A few recent examples will better illustrate the point. Omar Bongo – who, among other things, considers himself a writer and a philosopher – has been the president of Gabon since November 1967. Before his ouster in May 1998, President Suharto had ruled over Indonesia with an iron fist for thirty-two years. Ex-president Moussa Traore had similarly ruled over Mali for more than twenty-three years until being overthrown in March 1991. Kenya's President Daniel Arap Moi has been in office since 1978, and the Ugandan president, Yoweri Museveni, in office since 1986, wants to sponsor a referendum in the year 2000 for Ugandans to choose between a multi-party democracy and his 'democracy without parties'.

Among personalist states, a few are headed by charismatic figures. Such leaders differ from others in both the nature of their regimes and in the underlying justifications with which they legitimise their rule. The masses share their hero's conviction that his reign is part of a historic mission. The charismatic leader is not only a political leader, but also the bearer of a 'message' of some sort for his people.[46] He is not only a destroyer of the old order, but the builder of a new one in its place.[47] His aim is not merely to usurp power, but rather to steward the body politic in a specific direction. He charts a new, often traumatic, course for the political drama, one based on his ideals and promises and zealously supported by countless followers. The messianic tendencies inherent in charismatic rule combine to endow the charismatic leader with increasingly mythical qualities. Especially in countries where the ramifications of intense social change are rampant, those who come close to fitting patterns of traditional myths themselves become popularly endowed with mythical qualities.[48] For groups excluded from the mainstream of society before the

charismatic leader's appearance, the leader acquires the image of socially popular mythical legends. This ascription of legendary qualities to the charismatic figure, even if only subconscious and implicit, is reinforced by the leader's abilities to master obstacles that not long ago appeared to be insurmountable. This allusion may not necessarily be cultivated by the government or by the charismatic leader himself. The deep-seated nature of most myths, coupled with the immense popularity of the charismatic figure, result in his association in the public's mind with legendary and mythical figures. Just as 'Imam' Khomeini's crusade ran tellingly parallel to Shi'ite mythology, Mao's deification as a prophet, Mustafa Kemal's as 'the Father of Turks', Kwame Nkrumah's as 'the Saviour, Redeemer, and Messiah', and Nelson Mandela's personification of South Africa's struggles and hopes have all had deep and resonant roots in the traditions of their respective countries.[49]

It is no surprise that even autocratic leaders who do not have the slightest degree of charisma try hard to portray themselves as charismatic. In most developing countries massive pictures of the leader adorn billboards, city walls, government offices and postage stamps, showing him in smiling poses and acknowledging his people's adoration. Charitable foundations, schools, hospitals and sports stadiums are named after him, and routine efforts are made to forge emotional bonds between the masses and the person of the leader. Drivers visiting Baghdad have to pass through giant exact replicas of Saddam Hussein's wrists holding two intersecting swords. But such artificial attempts seldom bear any fruit, often invoking negative reactions by those who see through the manipulations and are angered by them. Since they do not have the genuine, hero-like devotion of the masses, autocratic leaders instead often resort to ascribing grandiose characteristics of historic importance to their reign. Not unlike charismatic leaders, they embroil themselves in a 'mission complex', convincing themselves that they indeed have a historic mandate to fulfil. At every opportunity, in speeches, writings and in press conferences autocratic leaders elaborate on their grand visions. 'March towards Great Civilisation' was the Iranian Shah's encapsulated political catchphrase;[50] an 'epic struggle . . . that will give life and sustenance to our national vision of a New Society', Marcos never tired of propagating his rule.[51] Unlike charismatic leaders, however, their followers are far less convinced of the historic importance of the concocted mission, remaining sceptical and hesitant rather than deeply involved.

Whether or not embroiling themselves in a mission complex, the primary goal of non-charismatic, autocratic leaders is mere political survival. Their agenda is not economic development or political democratisation but rather simple survival and longevity in the uncertain and hostile political arena. Governing takes place on the basis of mercenary incentives, with the autocratic leader personally controlling the civil service and the armed forces. The fall of Mabutu Sese Seko in the former Zaire in May 1997 after some thirty-two years of rule put an end to one of the world's most corrupt and brutal predatory political systems.[52] Nevertheless, slightly more benign versions of such states can still be found in Cameroon, under President Paul

Biya (in office since 1982), and in President Omar Bongo's Gabon. In these and other cases of predatory states personal loyalty and fear are the mainstays of the government, wrapped in a patina of familiar political symbols and traditionally respected practices.[53] A series of patron–client relations is developed, through which autocratic leaders recruit local and regional clients and perpetuate their rule by giving them privileged access to resources.[54] It is also through such clientalist relations that personal control over the armed forces and the bureaucracy is ensured. Loyalty to the person of the leader, or at least to his clan or tribe, becomes the main criterion for the promotion of military officers and civil servants.[55] At the same time, considerable efforts are made to ensure that no one person or group of individuals gathers enough power and clout to be able to challenge the personalist leader. Intra-elite discord and factionalism are deliberately sown in order to minimise the possibility of an orchestrated assault on power by those not entirely endowed with it. Offices and institutions are created primarily to counterbalance the weight of other ones, and personal animosity between subordinates is perpetuated so that lieutenants can keep each other's powers in check.

In order to consolidate their rule further, personalist leaders often devise an extensive network of auxiliary institutions through which they hope to augment their personal reach into the depths of their society. Personalised military and police forces, government ministries and bureaux and official political parties are some of the more common organisational tools which autocratic leaders employ to strengthen their personalised reigns.[56] Similar to purely charismatic forms of government, entirely personalised polities are rare and often include strong amalgams of bureaucratic and military organisation. In such systems the personality of the ruler permeates the various aspects of the body politic, serving as the primary binding force which holds the polity together and on which the political system's survival depends. But to enforce his rule effectively and to keep his regime intact, the autocratic leader relies on a host of institutions and organisations specifically designed to maximise his political longevity. Tailor-made constitutions, self-serving ideologies and artificial cults of personality have already been alluded to. Equally, considerable energy is put into turning the military and the bureaucracy into pillars of personal support and, in turn, vehicles through which the leader's personality cult is socially and politically sustained. Hence the personalist nature of political rule is increasingly transformed into militarily and bureaucratically institutionalised polities. Purely personalist regimes have thus become rare and infrequent, while states closely resembling the bureaucratic-authoritarian ones found in South America in the 1960s and the 1970s continue to be found in the Middle East and North Africa.

Frequently, bureaucratic-authoritarian (BA) and BA-like states disguise themselves as democracies driven by party and electoral politics, presidential systems and de-politicised bureaucracies and security forces. In practice, however,

such states are kept intact by a powerful combination of often direct military interference into politics, highly politicised bureaucracies, overwhelmingly powerful if not the only official political parties and doctored elections in which the winners and losers are predetermined. The state relies on a series of elements that are highly conducive to authoritarian politics. Its survival is dependent on the longevity of an autocratic leader with a penchant for political manipulation, a personally loyal military keeping the state's opponents at bay, and an official political party designed to generate mobilised support for the state but itself an inseparable part of the bureaucracy. Patrimonial and clientalist practices bind the state's highest echelons to its rank and file and to the larger society. The situation is little different in overtly military regimes which grow out of successful *coups d'état,* with a powerful officer or a junta replacing the civilian autocrat.

State-sponsored political parties often play pivotal roles in the functioning of authoritarian systems. One-party states either emerge as a result of structural transformations within personalised systems, through which autocrats hope to augment the institutional reach of their rule, or are products of successful liberation struggles in which a single party dominated the movement.[57] Equally frequently, acute social or ethnic cleavages often accentuate the perceived need for the politically unifying effects of official political parties.[58] In single-party states actual political power often lies with a single party under whose auspices all political activities are supposed to take place. All political appointments are made from within the ranks of the party, the party's platform is a reflection of the government's policies, and, at least nominally, all of the various branches of the state, such as the legislature and the bureaucracy, adhere to the party's ideology. It is this ability effectively to monopolise various forms of political activity, and to turn dissenters into supporters, on which the political viability of one-party systems depends.[59]

State-sponsored parties serve four specific yet entwined functions, namely political institutionalisation, legitimation, recruitment of officials and the mobilisation of popular support. Frequently borne out of personalised autocracies, state-sponsored parties institutionalise the powers of the ruling elite and facilitate their access to power. In countries where existing political and social institutions lack autonomy and strength, state-sponsored parties fill the vacuum by providing organisational cohesion and order to otherwise fragmented social and political settings. Except for the military, such parties are often the most organised and structured institutions, fusing the state to societies torn by parochial tendencies and disjointed political loyalties.[60] As a result, the party affords the ruling elite the opportunity to expand its institutional base by penetrating further into society and strengthening its hold on power. This is particularly the case in African countries, such as the former Zaire (now called the Democratic Republic of Congo) and Kenya, where the single party is designed to curtail and eventually to replace tribal, clan and other parochial sources of identity.[61] At the same time, the party aims to maintain

the ruling incumbents' monopoly on power by creating an exclusive domain within which the political drama can be played out.[62] Thus participation in the party and adherence to its goals and doctrines become integral parts of the political process.

Related to the institutionalising functions of state-sponsored parties is their role as legitimising agents. This role is played at both a functional and an ideological level. Functionally, the party acts as a legitimising agent by providing institutional links between the state and society. At the same time it gives cohesion and legitimacy to ideas espoused by political leaders. State parties offer a forum through which government officials and policy-makers doctrinally justify their continued hold on power as well as their policies and actions. Through devising a popular ideology, the party attempts to convince the public that it in fact has a mandate to rule. Invariably, this ideology is heavily embedded with nationalist symbols and ideas, even in the remaining communist states of China, Cuba and North Korea, where the state's official doctrine is a variation of the Marxist theme. Through its organisation and ideology, the party also mobilises popular support for the regime and its policies. Moreover, the local branches of the party provide means for political socialisation at the local level, a function of immense significance given the absence of other similar, organised bodies. The state party forms a crucial and often unique nexus between the government organs on the one hand and the populace on the other. Through the party, doctrines and ideologies are propagated and popularised, policies and initiatives are formulated and laid out, and mass rallies are often arranged in support of the state or individual leaders.

In addition to mass mobilisation, the official party is often the only channel through which the average citizen can become actively involved in the political process. Being an agent of institutionalisation and indoctrination, the state party becomes one of the most significant vehicles for entry to and advancement in the government machinery. In fact, the ability to recruit future political leaders from among the general population over time enhances the popular legitimacy of the official party.[63] At a more popular level participation in the activities of the official party is often the first and only form of political activity that most people living under such systems engage in. Thus, at least in so far as the population is concerned, the importance of the party as an eye-opener to the world of politics is unparalleled. More significantly, the party's rank-and-file activists form a sizeable pool from which dedicated loyalists can be recruited into positions of leadership.

The structure of state-sponsored parties is often based on a rigid hierarchical arrangement that stretches in rank from the autocratic leader down to mid- and low-ranking civil servants. Theoretically, the state party's structure is frequently based on a form of 'democratic centralism'. According to this interpretation, the party is endowed with a highly centralised and isolated leadership cadre, while its aim is to appeal to wide segments of society. Since the party's primary function is to give popular legitimacy to the policies that have already been devised by the government, there is little room in it for the free debate of ideas and options. Thus the democratic

aspect of 'democratic centralism' has little more than cosmetic value. Instead, what is emphasised is the centralised character of the party's structure. In countries governed by civilian dictators or by soldiers in mufti, usually the governing dictator is the real if not the nominal head of the state party. At the same time, membership in the party by cabinet ministers, legislators, bureaucrats and other political figures is often obligatory or at least an implicit rule. Apart from those in policy-making positions, however, few have a say in determining the party's platform and its policies.

Exclusionary states, whether purely personalist or based on some form of bureaucratic authoritarianism, are inherently brittle and are susceptible to violent and sudden collapse. The maintenance of the political status quo depends primarily on the preservation of an exclusive elite enclave held together by a combination of coercion and patrimonial ties. Because of their very exclusion from the political process, politically excluded groups are disenchanted with the system and, given an opportunity, attempt to grab at political power. Moreover, the coercive and patrimonial bonds that hold the state together are themselves susceptible to unravelling under strenuous conditions. Wars and economic setbacks can significantly reduce a state's coercive abilities and its staying power – as starkly demonstrated in Argentina following its defeat in the Falklands/Malvinas conflict in 1982 – as can the inability to deliver promised goods cause internal dissension and elite squabbling. Thus, despite their outward appearance, which often portrays them as deadly and invincible, most bureaucratic-authoritarian and BA-like states are highly vulnerable to crises and otherwise insignificant shifts in the political arena.

Inclusionary populist regimes, in contrast, enjoy far greater strength both in so far as their institutional viability is concerned and in relation to their popular legitimacy throughout society. Whereas bureaucratic-authoritarian and autocratic states rely on the exclusion of the masses from politics, populist ones specifically aim to establish a mass-based political system. They rely on collective behaviour and other forms of mass mobilisation as one of their primary supporting pillars. Emphasis is put on the symbolic dimensions of public affairs, manifested in the form of street marches, demonstrations and collective outbursts of political jubilation and support. Although such ritualistic ceremonies are often 'little more than a cheap means to achieve political acquiescence', they are intrinsically valuable as they often bestow on people a sense of self-identity and self-concept.[64] For the masses who were once excluded from the political process, participation in events heavily impregnated with political symbolism results in a sense of enhanced popular involvement in national political life.[65] Although such states may be as dictatorial as traditional bureaucratic authoritarianisms, their incorporation of the masses into the political process makes them appear as popular democracies. In this sense populist states enjoy a degree of popular legitimacy unsurpassed by others. It is

this heightened sense of legitimacy, brought on by the ostensibly democratising effects of mass mobilisation, which enables such states to motivate their populations to make supreme sacrifices for the nation.[66]

Significantly, populist inclusionary states are almost invariably post-revolutionary polities that were brought on as a result of the collapse of authoritarian systems. Mass mobilisation is achieved even before the establishment of new political institutions, and at a time when emotional and ideological bonds linking revolutionary leaders with the masses are strongest. Such links are greatly strengthened with the acquisition of power by the revolutionaries, reinforced by an increasing, mutual reliance by either side on the other. The new leaders need their supporters more than ever before in order to augment their tenuous hold on power, while the masses rely on their leaders to deliver the promised goods for which they endured the traumas of revolution. What thus emerges out of revolutions is ideologically reconstructed national identities involving the sudden incorporation of formerly excluded popular groups into state-directed projects.[67] Such projects frequently include economic self-help programmes, intensive efforts aimed at inculcating a new culture and national identity, and, when congenial, international wars. Many post-revolutionary states excel at channelling popular participation into international wars. Because of the way that revolutionary leaders mobilise popular groups during their struggle for state power, the new state can tackle mobilisation for war better than any other task, including the promotion of economic development. The realisation of this potential depends on threatening but not overwhelming geopolitical and international circumstances.[68]

Wars are, however, costly ventures in human and material terms and are, as a result, impermanent. Even the longest of the protracted wars in which post-revolutionary states engage, such as Iran's war with Iraq in the 1980s, eventually simmer down and turn into bombastic rhetoric. Outlasting wars as politically strengthening agents are ceaseless efforts aimed at redefining popular national identity and the citizens' perceptions of themselves and of their nation. In its ambitious quest to create 'a new man', the state micro-manages politics. It initiates various programmes and projects – through the media, the sponsorship of various acts of collective behaviour and 'educational' efforts of varying subtlety – in order to enhance its own legitimacy by minimising the state–society gap and in the process creating a new political culture suited to its own purposes. As an observer of Cuba's post-revolutionary politics has noted, even the apparently spontaneous demonstrations of support for the Cuban regime are staged and carefully coordinated:

> What may appear to the untrained eye as an immense sea of anonymous faces of persons temporarily detached from their customary social relations to participate in the *jornadas* [journeys] of the revolutionary calendar is instead a publicly acknowledged, carefully rehearsed, and studied choreographic exercise

of groups who are firmly attached to existing institutions and occupy clearly specified and lasting niches.[69]

The conventionalisation of collective behaviour is a particularly rewarding practice for keeping the elite's ideology alive and maintaining elite–mass linkage. By encouraging mass participation, it separates the devout from nominal followers. Furthermore, it perpetuates the legitimacy of the state by keeping the revolutionary spirit alive.[70]

Popular legitimacy, or more aptly mass devotion, greatly strengthens the central government. An additional element that significantly enhances the powers of post-revolutionary states is their greater willingness to rely on coercion and brute force in order to maintain power. Reliance on coercion as a politically sustaining means is especially apparent in post-revolutionary states, where the new elites have won power only after a long and protracted struggle. Success in the violent pursuit and defence of power habituates leaders to the political use of violence. 'Elites who have secured state power and have maintained their position by violent means are disposed to respond violently to future challenges.'[71] Revolutions do indeed eat their own children, with the more powerful victors brutally suppressing former colleagues for the sake of consolidating their new powers. The bloody and savage purges that invariably follow every violent revolution, from the infamous purges of the Stalin era to those that followed the Chinese, Cuban and Iranian revolutions, are more than mere historical coincidences. They demonstrate a pre-occupation on the part of new elites to secure their powers first against counter-revolutionaries and then against would-be separatists. Having relied on violence to acquire their new powers, and in the process having risked a great deal, revolutionary elites seldom have any inhibitions about continuing to rely on violence in order to protect their new privileges.[72] As a result, emerging post-revolutionary states are often far more brutally coercive than the ones they replace, suppressing actual or perceived sources of opposition with considerably less restraint than their predecessors did. Such states are thus much stronger not only because of the popular support that they cultivate but owing to the ease with which they employ coercion in order to stay in power.

Populist, bureaucratic-authoritarian and personalist regimes have often been called 'praetorian'[73] or 'avant garde'.[74] These and similar labels are meant to denote systems with generally low levels of political development and institutionalisation. The muted political evolution of such states is largely due to oligarchical, colonial and neocolonial experiences, where popular political participation at the institutional level was non-existent or at best severely curtailed.[75] Excluded from the political process, popular groups yearning for political participation confront each other against a backdrop of unevolved political institutions and an uncommon heritage of political principles and expectations. As a result, states that evolve within such contexts are characterised by an absence of 'effective political institutions capable of mediating, refining, and moderating groups' political action'.

> In a praetorian system social forces confront each other nakedly; no political institutions, no corps of professional political leaders are recognized or accepted as the legitimate intermediaries to moderate group conflict. Equally important, no agreement exists among the groups as to the legitimate and the authoritative methods for resolving conflicts. In an institutionalized polity most actors agree on the procedures to be used for the resolution of political disputes, that is, for the allocation of office and the determination of policy . . . In a praetorian society, however, not only are the actors varied, but so are also the methods used to decide upon office and policy. Each group employs means which reflect its peculiar nature and capabilities. The wealthy bribe; students riot; workers strike; mobs demonstrate; and the military coup. In the absence of accepted procedures, all these forms of direct action are found on the political scene.[76]

Political power is not derived from constitutional sources or electoral legitimacy, but rather from extralegal and non-institutionalised means such as social prestige, patrimonial and clientelist loyalties, charisma or brute force.

Since the decade of the 1980s, a tide of democratisation has swept across parts of the developing world.[77] Particularly astounding has been the experience of Latin America, where military juntas and governing generals, once inseparable from the political arena, have been handing over the reins of power to democratically elected civilians in one country after another. Peru, Brazil, Argentina and Chile, to name a few of the more notable examples, have all undergone dramatic transformations in their respective political systems, their colonels and generals having left presidential palaces and returned to their barracks. South Korea has also taken significant steps towards inaugurating a more democratic political system, although democratisation as a whole has been haltingly slow there. A few African countries, such as Kenya and Nigeria, continue to toy with various political experiments ranging from multi-party systems to *de facto* life presidencies.

The break-up of military-authoritarian states, especially of the type which inundated Latin America in the 1960s and the 1970s, is in large measure a result of the failure of the economic policies which they pursued. In the early days of their rule, such regimes saw themselves as more than just caretaker governments, wanting to bring about rapid industrialisation and espousing numerous development projects.[78] They staked much of their legitimacy on promises of an impending 'economic miracle', in the process heavily borrowing from international agencies and brutally suppressing domestic opposition. Their efforts were greatly facilitated within the international climate of the time, especially by the approval of successive administrations in Washington. From the Kennedy administration's 'Alliance for Progress' programme to the Nixon–Kissinger doctrine of 'multi-polarity', Washington believed that only development-oriented, conservative regimes were capable of countering the threat of communist growth in the developing world.[79] Much American economic and diplomatic support was thus given to military-

dominated, pro-Western regimes throughout the developing world. Singapore and South Korea in East Asia, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey and Egypt in the Middle East, Somalia, Zaire and Nigeria in Africa, and practically the whole of Latin America except Cuba received unprecedented amounts of American military and economic aid.[80] But in the late 1970s and the 1980s America's priorities gradually began to change as its foreign policy readjusted itself to the realities of the post-Vietnam era. The United States' changed diplomatic outlook that followed the end of its costly war with Vietnam, most tellingly represented by President Carter's concern with human rights, was reinforced by massive budget deficits and the end of the Cold War in the 1980s.[81] Military-dominated states in the developing world were left largely on their own. Lacking what was once unconditional military and economic support from abroad, and domestically ridden with debt and unfulfilled economic miracles, such states began collapsing one after another. Most gave up power peacefully, sponsoring elections and handing governments over to civilian victors. Only a few, like Somoza in Nicaragua, the Shah of Iran and Marcos in the Philippines, were overthrown in mass-based revolutions.

From among those countries in which non-democratic states broke up in the 1980s, only the ones in Latin America have been able to establish genuinely democratic polities. Iran's post-revolutionary experience can hardly be described as democratic, while those that have appeared in the Philippines, South Korea, Pakistan and Turkey have led highly precarious existences. Especially in Pakistan and Turkey, the military establishments continue to play pervasive political roles from behind the scenes. In Turkey in 1997, the military launched what amounted to a silent coup against the prime minister, Necmettin Erbakan, and his ruling Refah Party.[82] Even the fledgling democracies of Latin America continue to be threatened by occasional signs of unease within the military establishment and by lingering economic dilemmas. In Venezuela's December 1998 presidential elections, the population overwhelmingly voted for Hugo Chavez, a former army paratrooper who in 1992 had led a failed coup attempt against the elected government in office at the time. In 1992, Peru's civilian president suspended his country's democratic constitution on economic and political grounds. Nevertheless, within the developing world, Latin America's experience with democratic systems since the 1980s has proved by far the most enduring. Several factors have underlain this relative strength. Latin America's long tradition of multi-party politics, dating back to the nineteenth century, is a definite factor,[83] as is the unabatedly high esteem in which democratic principles are held throughout the continent.[84] Moreover, with the important exception of Peronist Argentina, Latin American political culture does not embody a continuous strand of personality cults. The cultural salience of *personalismo* has in recent years been generally muted at the hands of highly rationalised bureaucracies and nongovernmental organisations.[85] Even the military states of the 1960s and the 1970s, except those of Fulgencio Batista and Anastasio Somoza, were headed by collective juntas rather than personalist leaders.[86] Pressures for

fundamental political changes by international lending agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund were also instrumental in prompting most Latin American states to undertake sincere efforts towards establishing democratic systems. All of these factors have combined to strengthen the viability of Latin America's democratic systems, fledgling as they still are.

CONCLUSION

Developing political systems and processes are marked by symptoms of skewed political development. Except for the recent democracies, political institutionalisation remains but a mirage and the nexus between state and society is tenuous at best. Non-democratic governments function largely void of meaningful popular legitimacy, supported instead by coercive police forces and mushrooming bureaucracies. Extralegal and non-institutional means, from patrimonial and clientalist ties to personal charisma and ideology, underwrite the legitimacy of inherently brittle political systems rather than democratic, constitutional practices and principles. Populist states which thrive on mass mobilisation are equally authoritarian, yet their inclusion of previous outcasts into the body politic gives them a democratising sense and enhances their strength relative to other state types. In the last decade a trend towards representative democracy has appeared in selected parts of the developing world. While the transition to democratic rule involves dynamics that are unique to each individual case,[87] several similar economic and international developments have led to a flourishing of democratic states in South America and parts of Asia and Africa. Whether other countries in the developing world will follow suit remains to be seen.

Central to an understanding of the essence of development politics is an appreciation of the fluid nature of state organisations and institutions. The institutionalisation that has taken place in much of the developing world has been a product of the efforts of those already in power. Since political institutions by themselves have little or no autonomy and strength, incumbents and other holders of office have moulded and shaped them in accordance with their interests. Additionally, there are no established or popularly accepted 'rules of the game', political principles and doctrines often holding as much sway as the people who propagate them. Institutions are at the mercy of those in power, and the forcefulness of personalities overwhelms the strength and appeal of principles.

As a result of this lack of political common ground, the path to power in much of the developing world lies outside the methods prescribed by constitutional or civic laws. Access to power in non-democracies lies not in institutionalised procedures but depends on the utilisation of personal attributes such as charisma and chivalry or, in frequent instances, the stewardship of the armed forces into rebellion. Only recently have there been cases of free and untampered elections in a few developing countries, as the notable examples of Argentina, Brazil, South Africa and Venezuela demonstrate. Yet even in such recent democracies, especially those in Latin America,

the continuing likelihood of military coups threatens civilian administrations. In these and in other countries only a combination of personal dedication and political willpower, a general shift in social attitudes concerning the viability of democratic institutions, and compelling domestic and international circumstances will guarantee the survival of non-authoritarian regimes. For the rest of the developing world, numerous variations of authoritarian regimes are entrenched and supported by deep-rooted political dynamics.

NOTES

1. Lucian Pye. 'The Concept of Political Development', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973), p. 51. Pye gives the label of 'integration crisis' to this development.
2. Robert Scalapino. 'Legitimacy and Institutionalization in Asian Socialist Societies', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* (Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986), p. 59.
3. Other examples in which lack of sufficient powers by the central authority has resulted in political fragmentation and civil war in the 1980s and 1990s include Angola, the Sudan, Liberia, Guinea-Bissau, Sierra Leone and Zaire, both before and after Mabutu's fall, when the country's name was changed to the Democratic Republic of Congo once former rebel leader Laurant Kabila took over.
4. Dan Horowitz. 'Dual Authority Polities'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 14, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 329. Horowitz calls these systems 'dual authority polities'.
5. Jean-Yves Calvez. *Politics and Society in the Third World.* M. J. O'Connell, trans. (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973), p. 79.
6. Gloria Hernandez. 'Political Institution Building in the Philippines', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* p. 268; in the same book see also, Han Sung-joo. 'Political Institutionalization in South Korea'. p. 120; and Chung Chin-wee. 'The Evolution of Political Institutions in North Korea'. pp. 22–3.
7. Chai-Anan Samundamanija. 'Political Institutionalization in Thailand: Continuity and Change', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato, and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* p. 248.
8. B. O. Nwabueze. *The Presidential Constitution of Nigeria.* (London: C. Hurst & Co., 1982), pp. 4–5.
9. See Shaul Bakhash. *The Reign of the Ayatollahs.* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1985), chapter 4.
10. B. O. Nwabueze. *The Presidential Constitution of Nigeria.* p. 5.
11. Robert Jackson and Carl Rosberg. 'Personal Rule: Theory and Practice in Africa'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 16, no. 4 (July 1984), p. 438.
12. Jean-Yves Calvez. *Politics and Society in the Third World.* p. 79.
13. Robert Jackson and Carl Rosberg. 'Personal Rule: Theory and Practice in Africa'. p. 438.
14. J. Lloyd Mecham. 'Latin American Constitutions: Nominal or Real', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* p. 224.
15. Ibid. p. 225.
16. Charles Butterworth. 'State and Authority in Arabic Political Thought', in Ghassan Salame (ed.), *The Foundation of the Arab State.* (London: Croom Helm, 1987), p. 91.

17. Paul Cammack, David Pool and William Tardoff. *Third World Politics: A Comparative Introduction.* (London: Macmillan, 1988), p. 70.
18. S. N. Eisenstadt. 'Problems of Emerging Bureaucracies in Developing Areas and New States', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* pp. 290–1.
19. Fredrick Bent. 'A Comparative Analysis of Public Administration in Modern, Traditional, and Modernizing Societies', in Chandler Morse (ed.), *Modernisation by Design: Social Change in the Twentieth Century.* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969), p. 191.
20. Chung Eun Sung. 'Transition to Democracy in South Korea'. *Asia Profile.* vol. 17, no. 1 (February 1989), p. 31.
21. For more on the role of the bureaucracy in developing countries see below, Chapter 2.
22. This was the case in pre-revolutionary Iran, as well as in contemporary South Korea, where, despite massive bureaucratisation, political instability and crises occur(ed) with frequency.
23. Robert Scalapino. 'Legitimacy and Institutionalization in Asian Socialist Societies'. p. 59.
24. Lucian Pye. 'The Concept of Political Development'. p. 50.
25. Max Weber. *On Charisma and Institution Building.* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 48.
26. Ibid. p. 54.
27. Ibid. p. 22.
28. For discussions of images of oneness with people, see Lisa Anderson. *The State and Social Transformation in Tunisia and Libya, 1831–1980.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986), pp. 260–1 for Libya's Mummar Qaddafi; Moshe Ma'oz. *Syria under Hafiz Al-Asad: New Domestic and Foreign Policies.* (Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1975), pp. 6–10 for Asad; and Dankwart Rustow. 'Ataturk's Political Leadership', in R. Winder (ed.), *Near Eastern Round Table 1967–8.* (New York: NYU Press, 1969), pp. 145–9 for Turkey's Ataturk.
29. James Bill and Robert Springborg. *Politics in the Middle East.* (Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown, 1990), p. 161.
30. For a careful analysis of patrimonialism in the Middle East, see ibid. chapter 4.
31. Percy Hintzen. 'Bases of Elite Support for a Regime: Race, Ideology, and Clientalism as Bases for Leaders in Guyana and Trinidad'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 16, no. 3 (October 1983), p. 364.
32. Ibid. p. 365.
33. See below, Chapter 2.
34. For more on corporatism, see Rod Hague and Martin Harrop. *Comparative Politics and Government: An Introduction.* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1987), pp. 134–7.
35. Rose Spalding. 'State Power and its Limits: State Power in Mexico'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 14, no. 2 (July 1981), p. 155.
36. Roger Scruton. *A Dictionary of Political Thought.* (London: Pan Books, 1983), p. 98.
37. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. *Politics and Society.* vol. 17, no. 4 (December 1989), pp. 494–5.
38. Percy Hintzen. 'Bases of Elite Support for a Regime: Race, Ideology, and Clientalism as Bases for Leaders in Guyana and Trinidad'. p. 365.
39. Aldo Vacs. 'Authoritarian Breakdown and Redemocratization in Argentina', in J. Malloy and M. Seligson (eds), *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America.* (Pittsburg: Pittsburg University Press, 1987), p. 17.

40. For a discussion of the 'second stratum', see Leonard Binder. *In a Moment of Enthusiasm: Political Power and the Second Stratum in Egypt.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978).

41. A case in point is the recurrence of coup attempts by the military in Argentina after its political retreat in the mid-1980s.

42. E. B. Portis. 'Charismatic Leadership and Cultural Democracy'. *Review of Politics.* vol. 41, no. 2 (Spring 1987), p. 242.

43. Richard Sandbrook. 'The State and Economic Stagnation in Tropical Africa'. *World Development.* vol. 14, no. 3 (1986), p. 321.

44. Robert Jackson and Carl Rosberg. 'Personal Rule: Theory and Practice in Africa'. p. 437.

45. Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner. *Interpreting the Third World: Politics, Economics, and Social Issues.* (New York: Praeger, 1986), p. 37.

46. E. B. Portis. 'Charismatic Leadership and Cultural Democracy'. p. 241.

47. Ann Ruth Willner and Dorothy Willner. 'The Rise and Role of Charismatic Leaders', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* p. 233.

48. Ibid. p. 231.

49. Bankole Timothy. *Kwame Nkrumah from Cradle to Grave.* (Dorchester: Gavin Press, 1981), p. 156.

50. Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. *Answer to History.* (New York: Stein & Day, 1980), pp. 175–7.

51. Ferdinand Marcos. *Five Years of the New Society.* (Manila: Marcos Foundation, 1978), p. 3. In North Korea, admittedly an unusually extreme example, Kim Il Sung created somewhat of a political religion revolving around 'self reliance' (*chuch'e*). See Chung Chin-wee. 'The Evolution of Political Institutions in North Korea'. pp. 35–8.

52. Prior to that, in 1986 the equally repressive reign of the Duvalier family came to an end in Haiti, where from 1957 to 1971, Dr François Duvalier (Papa Doc), and then his son, Jean-Claude (Baby Doc), plundered the country and terrorised Haitians through armed gangs known as the *Tonton Makout.*

53. Richard Sandbrook. 'The State and Economic Stagnation in Tropical Africa'. p. 323.

54. Ibid. p. 324.

55. Tribal reference points are particularly instrumental in appointments and promotions in Africa (e.g. the Ishantis having more leverage under Flt-Lt Rawlings in Ghana), while in the Middle East it is religious affiliations that are more important. Most high-ranking military officers in Iraq share Saddam Hussein's Sunni sect of Islam, while in Syria most are of the same Alawi background as Asad.

56. Samuel Huntington. 'Social and Institutional Dynamics of One-party Systems', in S. Huntington and C. Moore (eds), *Authoritarian Politics and Modern Society.* (London: Basic Books, 1970), p. 7.

57. Jacqueline Braveboy-Wagner. *Interpreting the Third World.* p. 31.

58. Samuel Huntington. 'Social and Institutional Dynamics of One-party Systems'. p. 14.

59. Ibid. p. 44.

60. Ibid. p. 12.

61. Jean-Yves Calvez. *Politics and Society in the Third World.* p. 105.

62. Samuel Huntington. 'Social and Institutional Dynamics of One-party Systems'. p. 12.

63. Clement Moore. 'The Single Party as a Source of Legitimacy', in S. Huntington and C. Moore (eds), *Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society.* p. 51.

64. E. B. Portis. 'Charismatic Leadership and Cultural Democracy'. pp. 237–8.

65. Theda Skocpol. 'Social Revolutions and Mass Military Mobilization'. *World Politics*. vol. 40, no. 2 (January 1988), p. 149.
66. Ibid. p. 150.
67. Ibid. p. 164.
68. Ibid. pp. 167–8.
69. B. E. Aguirre. 'The Conventionalization of Collective Behavior in Cuba'. *American Journal of Sociology*. vol. 90, no. 3 (1984), p. 549.
70. Ibid. p. 563.
71. Ted Robert Gurr. 'War, Revolution, and the Growth of the Coercive State'. *Comparative Political Studies*. vol. 21, no. 1 (April 1988), p. 49.
72. Ibid. p. 53.
73. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. (New Haven, CO: Yale University Press, 1968), p. 196.
74. Yeheakel Dror. 'Public Policy-making in Avant-garde States', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies*. p. 278. As characteristics of avant-garde states, Dror also includes a colonial heritage terminated after an intense manifestation of nationalism, the absence of the middle classes and a small elite aspiring to achieve rapid social and economic transformations.
75. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. pp. 199–200.
76. Ibid. p. 196.
77. Democratic transitions and consolidation will be explored more fully below, in Chapter 7.
78. Mitchell Seligson. 'Democratization in Latin America: The Current Cycle', in J. Malloy and M. Seligson (eds), *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Changes in Latin America*. (Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press, 1987), pp. 4–5.
79. Thomas Paterson, J. G. Clifford and Kenneth Hagan. *American Foreign Policy: A History*. (Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath & Co., 1991), p. 529. President Kennedy's speech in 1960, quoted in ibid. is instructive of America's foreign policy direction at the time: 'I think there is a danger that history will make a judgement that these were the days when the tide began to run out for the United States. These were the times when the communist tide began to pour in.'
80. See, especially, Robert Litwak. *Detente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
81. Thomas Paterson, J. G. Clifford and Kenneth Hagan. *American Foreign Policy: A History*. p. 689.
82. Racked by sectarian strife between the dominant Sunnis and the Shi'ite minority, in November 1998 the Pakistani government gave wide-ranging powers to the military in the port city of Karachi, including the right to establish military courts and to investigate offences.
83. Jean-Yves Calvez. *Politics and Society in the Third World*. pp. 76–7.
84. Aldo Vacs. 'Authoritarian Breakdown and Redemocratization in Argentina'. p. 17.
85. For an examination of the role and structure of NGOs, see Leilah Landim. 'Non-governmental Organizations in Latin America'. *World Development*. vol. 15, supplement (1987), pp. 29–38.
86. Mitchell Seligson. 'Redemocratization in Latin America: The Current Cycle'. p. 5.
87. Chung Eun Sung. 'Transition to Democracy in South Korea'. p. 26.

2   Industrial development

The dilemmas of political institutionalisation and longevity are by no means the only difficulties that Third World leaders must grapple with. The challenges posed by industrial development, or lack thereof, are equally daunting. The quest for industrial development and economic growth has been a consistent feature of developing countries in recent decades, especially in the light of growing disparities between levels of development in the West and those in the developing world. The race towards industrialisation has been particularly intense since the 1960s, when, having come of age, Third World leaders became uncomfortably conscious of their industrial and technological backwardness vis-à-vis the West. A 'Decade of Development', as declared by the United Nations, was ushered in during the 1960s. The hope was to accompany the tide of political independence and self-rule sweeping over Africa and other parts of the developing world with the termination of Western economic domination and the initiation of rapid, indigenous industrial development. These hopes and expectations were somewhat fulfilled in the 1970s, although often only after considerable economic readjustment, when increased global demands for raw materials and liberal lending practices by multinational credit agencies fuelled growth and expansion in numerous Third World countries. But the rapid pace of economic growth turned out to be short-lived. The boom of the 1970s was unceremoniously followed by the bust of the 1980s, a decade burdened with famine, destitution, political instability and domestic and international wars. The economic downturn of the 1980s was in large measure a result of unreasonable hopes and expectations, misguided policies, unimaginative planning and rampant corruption and mismanagement, all of which in one way or another plagued the Third World in the 1970s. As economic realities set in, Third World politicians began desperately searching for ways to restructure or completely relinquish the enormous debts that they had accrued from Western creditors in previous years. By the 1990s the debt problem had been mostly solved, although the gap between the rich and the poor continued to grow, compounded by the prevalence of old plagues – famine, drought, civil wars – and the spread of a new, even more deadly one, AIDS.

And still, after thirty years of debates, trials and promises, the fundamental question that confronted Third World leaders at the dawn of independence remains unanswered. The dilemma of reaching economic development and industrial growth is as big an enigma now as it has ever been; indeed, it is more of a mystery now than ever before. This chapter does not offer any simple answers, nor does it seek to demonstrate supposed superiorities inherent in one approach to industrial development as opposed to another. The task here is to examine the process of industrial development through charting the different courses which various Third World governments have taken. To do so, it is first necessary to examine the theoretical frameworks within which development policies are devised.

It is conventionally assumed that there are two dominant schools of thought prevailing in the study of Third World development: the modernisation and the dependency approaches.[1] Despite the connotations attached to it, branding the modernisation approach as a framework for the analysis of *industrial development* in the developing world is not entirely accurate. The study of industrial development has indeed taken place within these two broad and very different theoretical frameworks. It is, however, important to realise that the group of scholars which has come to be known as modernisationists focuses primarily on *political modernisation* rather than on industrial and technological development. As reflected in their publications, such authors have been concerned mainly with the ramifications of *political development* on levels of industrial growth.[2] Consequently, modernisation theory remains largely a framework for the analysis of political development rather than industrial growth. Nevertheless, as a school of thought, modernisation theory has contributed to the understanding of Third World industrialisation, albeit in an indirect manner. Emphasis on the political process has not precluded discussions of industrial and technological development. In one form and to one extent or another, political stability is seen as highly important in achieving desired levels of industrial advancement. Within this vein, theories of modernisation assume the evolution of capitalist development along a linear path towards modernisation.[3] Modernisation is seen to occur within stages not very different from those that took place in the West centuries ago: feudal relations were changed into capitalist forms of production, leading to the subsequent growth and spread of industrial technology.[4]

Despite such digressions into the study of Third World industry, the primary emphasis of modernisation theory remains in the domain of politics. Most modernisationists identify lack of adequate political superstructure and capable leadership as the underlying causes of the developing world's industrial backwardness vis-à-vis the West. Notable modernisation theorists such as Rothstein, Weiner, Pool and Huntington all argue, in one form or another, that elite maintenance is a necessary precondition for the achievement of industrial, social and political progress. For his part, Huntington claims that it is the *degree* of government and not necessarily its form that is important in determining its ability

to bring about progress.[5] It is necessary, Huntington and others argue, to devise policies not threatening to the elite and to others who are in decision-making positions, so that they could plan and oversee the country's modernisation with safety and confidence. Otherwise, insecurity at best impedes their ability and willpower and at worst compels them to emigrate from their country.[6]

Several criticisms can be raised against the modernisationists. For one thing, most completely ignore the role of culture. Are cultural peculiarities in the Third World so insignificant as to prompt it to follow a similar tradition– modernity trajectory that Europe did? Simply to assume that such resonant phenomena as religion, tribalism, ethnicity, caste and other culture-driven forces will wither away under the weight of modernity or careful political crafting is, at best, foolhardy. Who would have guessed that after decades of secular development in Latin America the first cries for democratic justice would come from Liberation Theology? Or that years of secular nationalism and industrial development could do precious little to divorce religion from the Middle Eastern mind? Even the East Asians, who seem the furthest along the modernisationists' imaginary path towards development, have not abandoned much of what defines their tradition in order to get there. Politics is important, but emphasising its determining historical role must be tempered with attention to other forces that may at least be just as significant, if not more. Modernisationists focus on the political ramifications of 'development', by which they at times mean economic and at other times political development. However it is defined – and countless and at times varying definitions of political development abound[7] – the utility of the concept must not be stretched to the point of ignoring those social and/or cultural dynamics that could be equally compelling political forces.

To the charges of Eurocentrism and political reductionism the cynic may add that of political conservatism, particularly if one's own analytical prism is situated somewhere left of the centre. Not all modernisationists go so far as to prescribe remedies for the 'King's dilemma' in the same way as Huntington does. But the overall underpinnings of the paradigm do tend to concentrate on the most effective ways of attaining political stability rather than spreading social justice.[8] This in itself is a moot point; no-one said political scientists must be moral philosophers as well. What is troublesome is the modernisationists' lack of attention to the realities of global politics and their blind eye to the economics of power. How did the Third World get there to begin with? Simply to argue that there is a path to thread from tradition to modernity and that there are crises to overcome in the process is to miss a bigger picture involving the forces responsible for the continuous underdevelopment of the Third World. How can the Third World develop if it is being chronically underdeveloped, both now and in the past, by forces far greater than those it can muster on its own? Development is not, therefore, as clear-cut as modernisationists argue, and it involves, among other things, international, economic machinations far more subtle and permeating than any linear theory of historical

and political evolution can explain. Enter dependency theory, critiquing the modernisation approach's strictly political explanations and pointing instead to the workings of international political economy.

A general re-evaluation of the merits and viability of the modernisation approach was prompted largely by the abuse and excesses that were committed by Third World dictatorships in the name of industrial development and growth. An alternative theoretical framework was thus devised, focusing on the dependency of Third World governments on more powerful patrons. Instead of lack of political stability and capable leadership, proponents of dependency theory see global imperialism and neocolonialism as the main forces inimical to genuine industrial development in the developing world. Pioneered primarily by scholars of Latin American politics, dependency theory has over the years come to represent the radical approach to the study of industrial development.[9] It focuses on the dependent relationship that has evolved between Third World countries on the one hand and Western governments and multinational firms on the other. Emphasis on the compartmentalisation of history into different periods, especially since the dawn of the colonial era, forms one of the main cornerstones of the dependency theory's approach.[10] Referring extensively to the colonial history of Latin America and Africa, and the omnipresence of West European and North American influence on the economy, culture and the politics of these regions, the 'dependistas' maintain that the West has reached its present high levels of development largely through underdeveloping the Third World. The great divide, it is argued, began around 1800, when the development of industry in the West led to the exploitation and de-industrialisation of what is now known as the Third World.[11] This exploitation was made feasible through colonialism, resulting in an international division of labour whereby colonies and semi-colonies offered the cheap labour and raw materials that were needed for the development of industries in the West. Colonial Africa's relationship with Europe was a prime example of this type of exploitative relationship. The industrial sector in Africa was primarily designed to supply cheap raw materials for Europe's industries and to furnish colonial settlers with luxury goods and consumer items.[12] The colonies were meant to be profitable enterprises, at least for shareholders and companies back in the colonial power, and to pay their way for military and administrative rule as much as possible. With the international market as the dominant force, what was produced in the colonies was determined not by the colonies' needs and capabilities but by economic competition in the world market.[13]

According to the dependency approach, the economic legacy of colonialism did not end with its political demise, which in most cases was merely a symbolic abdication of colonial privileges. The colonies were economically too profitable and their economies were structurally too dependent on colonial powers for dependent relationships between the two to be easily relinquished. Western governments and multinational firms devised various means and methods to maintain the economic dependence of former colonies despite their newly achieved status as independent states. Since nationalist sentiments and political restrictions

often made direct investments impossible, new methods, such as international loans and assistance programmes, were utilised to achieve the same old goals of capital exportation and exploitation.[14] In fact, various forms of international assistance programmes became the cornerstone of the evolving and expanding world economy beginning in the 1950s. International agencies and banks provided underdeveloped countries with loans for food, agriculture, experts and technical equipment, almost all of which were imported from the developed countries. However, the intent of these loans was not only to facilitate the establishment of the necessary industrial infrastructures in the developing world (e.g. dams, roads, railways, communication systems, etc.), but, more importantly, to enable the developing world to increase its imports from the West.[15] The very nature of capitalism, dependency theorists argue, requires continued economic penetration of the developing world. With the rise of monopoly capital in the industrially advanced countries, it is necessary to expand markets in the developing world in order to mitigate problems arising from overproduction at home.[16] One of the ways by which developing countries are enabled to increase their imports from the West is through lucrative loans and grants. Some have even gone so far as to argue that

> agriculture and livestock credit to the poor is a scheme hatched out by the business and financial leaders of the industrial countries in their offices in New York, Washington, and Frankfurt for the sole purpose of giving themselves a good image and making it appear as if they were concerned about resolving the problems of the Third World. None of this can be taken seriously, and still much less in the beef cattle and meat industry where there is no room left for the peasant and much less for poor-credit-schemes.[17]

Even if the allocation of generous aid packages to developing countries by the industrial West takes place with the genuine goals of development in mind, real economic growth cannot take place as long as the goods exported remain mostly raw materials. In fact, the degree to which countries specialise in the export of raw materials has a significantly negative impact on their economic growth.[18] Continued reliance on the export of raw materials by developing countries, which is the bedrock of the prevailing international trade system, leaves exporters vulnerable to fluctuations in the international market arising out of global supplies and demands.[19]

Proponents of the dependency approach further maintain that the unequal and dependent relationship between the centre (i.e. the West) and the periphery (the Third World) has in turn resulted in the formation of acute differences in the class structure of the peripheral societies themselves. Dependency is said to be not just a condition but a series of relationships among unequal classes of power, whether between nations or within nations.[20] The linkage between centre and periphery only benefits a small class of people in the underdeveloped countries, whose profits continue to mount despite declining terms of trade. Instead of promoting an

international equalisation of income or technology, trade accentuates existing inequalities within the Third World.[21] 'Superexploited' is the condition which most observers ascribe to those who comprise the less privileged stratum of the Third World's bifurcated, dependent societies.[22] In specific relationship to Latin America, where dependency theory finds its most widespread applicability, 'the centre of wealth and power' is seen as 'a grouping of big corporate-financial interests' who exist side-by-side with a mass of immiserated people at the bottom of the social ladder, called a 'surplus population' or 'marginalised classes'.[23]

As earlier mentioned, the dependency approach owes much of its origin to works by observers of Latin American politics and economy. Admittedly, certain aspects of dependency theory are remarkably accurate in describing the pattern of economic growth and development in Latin America over the past few decades. North American influence on Latin America's industry, infrastructure, economic projects and even political life and cultural orientation is pervasive and at times overwhelming. The unprecedented economic growth of the 1960s, the 'development decade', and that of the 1970s, which witnessed an incredible rise in the level of industrialisation throughout the continent, were aided and financed primarily by loans and grants from public and private institutions in the United States.[24] Beginning in the 1960s the Kennedy administration launched a concerted effort to expedite American-sponsored social and economic development in Latin America under the auspices of the Alliance for Progress programme. Through such a programme, President Kennedy hoped to alleviate or at least minimise in other Latin American countries causes for political upheavals of the kind that had taken place in Cuba.[25] Latin America's continued geopolitical significance for American policy-makers, its enormous investment opportunities and vast consumer markets, abundant raw materials, and cheap labour have all combined to result in a concentration of American investments and economic activities in virtually all Latin American countries. As a result, capitalist economies have flourished in Latin America largely with the aid of American investments, capital, imports and credits and loans. In major Latin American cities, as well as in smaller towns and villages, American influence on such economic activities as the purchase of consumer items, industrial production, mining, transportation and even city planning and architecture is paramount. Within this context of overwhelming concentration of North American-based economic activity in Latin American countries, the appearance of a dependent relationship between the 'centre' (the United States) and the 'periphery' (Latin America), to borrow dependency theory's jargon, is irrefutable. Over the past few decades, almost every single Latin American country, from Mexico in the north to Argentina in the south, has become highly dependent on investments, imports, loans and grants from the United States. As the decade of the 1980s demonstrated, this dependence has reached gigantic proportions. When the United States sneezed, Latin American countries were stricken with pneumonia: the economic downturn

that occurred in the USA in the 1980s was concurrent with catastrophic economic setbacks across Latin America. From 1980 to 1988, Argentina's rate of inflation averaged 88.6 per cent, Brazil's stood at 188.7 per cent, Peru's at 119.1 per cent and Mexico's at 73.8 per cent, to cite a few examples. Meanwhile, average annual rate of growth for gross national product per capita from 1965 to 1988 was 0.0 per cent for Argentina, 2.3 per cent for Mexico, -0.5 per cent for El Salvador, 0.1 per cent for Peru and -0.9 per cent for Venezuela.[26] Overall, the average rate of inflation for Latin America and the Caribbean stood at 117.4 per cent, with their per capita GNP growth at only 1.9 per cent.[27]

The dependency approach has brought great insight into the study of Latin American development, particularly in highlighting the role played by multinational firms and agencies, hitherto largely ignored. In its sharply pointed analysis of developing economies, the dependency approach has made it clear that the attainment of political independence alone is not a sufficient panacea for solving problems of economic development; the economic dependence of peripheral states on stronger centres does not necessarily end there.[28] However, dependency theory's applicability to Latin America does not bestow it with universal validity, particularly in relation to countries and regions whose histories radically differ from the Latin American experience. The emphasis that proponents of dependency theory place on historical, economic and political circumstances that are specific to Latin America, such as the exploitation of 'agromineral' societies, circumscribes dependency theory's applicability to other regions and geographic settings.[29] Extensive reliance on the dynamics of colonial exploitation, the reasons underlying colonial expansion, and the manner in which it was brought about make dependency theory almost uniquely applicable to those countries with a colonial past. Dependency theory's specificity vis-à-vis Latin America is its Achilles heel.[30] Those developing countries whose history was spared the colonial experience, which are, admittedly, few, or whose colonial penetration did not fit the Latin American pattern and extent are left largely outside the purview of the dependency approach. Dependistas, for their part, counter with the argument that those countries not subject to outright colonialism were later victims of neocolonialism, which was politically less risky but still equally lucrative. Thus a similar set of analytical principles apply to them in examining their struggle towards industrial development.

Besides its narrow specificity, another shortcoming of the dependency approach lies in its emphasis on greater international and economic dynamics at the expense of other relevant factors such as indigenous political cultures, policy initiatives and available resources. Dependency theory concentrates almost entirely on the exploitative nature of the relationship between the centre and the periphery, between large banks and multinational firms and the developing countries, while brushing aside fundamental factors *within* the developing country that also affect its course of development and its industrial projects. Attributing a sense of omnipresence to

a largely elusive 'global imperialism', proponents of dependency theory place the blame for the current economic shortcomings of Latin American countries squarely on the shoulders of American banks and the US government, ignoring domestic policy initiatives and circumstances indigenous to each Latin American country. The latent conspiratorial assumptions that underlie the dependency approach – attributing present economic circumstances to master-plans contrived by multinational corporations (MNCs), while overlooking factors such as human greed, corruption and short-sighted policies – frequently cast a doctrinal gloss over factors with otherwise deep social, political and historic roots. The tendency within the dependency school to place the blame for the miseries of the Third World on foreign sources, be they governments or private firms, explains in part the widespread popularity of the dependency approach among Third World intellectuals and even commoners. It is easier to blame someone distant for one's agonies than be willing to accept responsibility. Given the colonial history of much of the developing world, and the avaricious tactics frequently used by multinationals in winning developing markets, it is not difficult to see why many in the developing countries readily agree with many of the dependency approach's premises.

Another difficulty with dependency theory is its assumption that all economic interactions, whether between countries or between classes, are necessarily exploitative and thus conducive to the emergence of a dependent relationship. But this is an assumption that is valid neither universally at the national level nor, especially given the post-Cold War world, at the international level. While economic dependence does exist within countries and classes, it is often outweighed by *interdependence.* The dangers of Third World dependence lie in the partial and incomplete adoption of import-substitution industrialisation (ISI) strategies of economic development, whereby foreign industry and technology are imported, ostensibly indigenised, and turned into local know-how and expertise. There are often tremendous differences between the theoretical premises of ISI and its practical application and consequences. Theoretically, ISI is designed to enhance and augment the industrial infrastructure of the recipient developing country and expedite the flow of technology transfer to the developing world from MNCs. But the practical ramifications of the strategy are often quite different. Because of its feasibility and almost immediate, tangible results – assembled cars in the streets; hotels, skyscrapers and other impressive-looking buildings raising the city's skyline; flashing neon lights giving the city an air of bustling modernity; well-paying jobs and modern-looking consumer goods for the middle classes, etc. – few countries in the developing world in the 1960s and the 1970s did not adopt the import-substitution strategy. But, at least initially, most of the ISI-based economies found it easier to emphasise the importing of industry rather than its indigenisation, which involved raising the technical skills of labour through sponsoring training programmes, dampening middle-class expectations and initiating unpopular anti-inflationary measures, and

expanding beyond local markets and into hitherto unexplored markets. In short, many politicians found it far less troubling and much more rewarding to keep the imports high and hope that the population's level of industrial aptitude would catch up by itself. The net result was economies that depended on continuous imports for a satisfactory performance, and aggressively pursued politicians whose legitimacy rested on the economy's performance. As one observer has written, 'far from "transferring capital" to the Third World . . . the corporations are abstracting a great part of the potential investment surplus from them, and, moreover, directing the part that they do re-invest towards their own ends – the extraction of more profit – not towards the needs of development for the countries concerned'.[31]

But the latter phase of ISI eventually did arrive for a number of countries, with local levels of skill and infrastructural development steadily rising to unprecedented heights. In fact, the ensuing industrial *development* – as opposed to mere superficial *growth* – gradually changed the relationship between some Third World economies and the multinational corporations from one of outright dependence to interdependence. Especially in the bigger markets, not just in East and Southeast Asia but also in Latin America, the multinational corporations had themselves become somewhat dependent on a continuation of their operations within individual countries. Slowly but steadily, a situation of mutual dependence evolved between a number of Third World countries and the MNCs that were once one of the only mainstays of their economies. Unequal though the benefits of the new global market economy may be, it is undeniable that a situation of interdependence between a number of MNCs and Third World markets has either already developed or is in the process of developing. The American giant AT&T, therefore, is now as dependent on the Mexican telephone market as Mexico is on its services; and the same goes for Ford Motor Company in Brazil; McDonnell Douglas in China; Fiat in Egypt; European and Japanese automobile manufacturers everywhere in the Middle East, and so on. American politicians and corporations need Mexico's partnership in NAFTA as much as Mexico needs them. While there was indeed once a dependent relationship between an overwhelming majority of Third World countries and multinational corporations – who can forget the United Fruit Company's political adventures in Paraguay? – and remnants of it exist to this day, the developing world as a whole has become too savvy to have remained an exploited pushover. It may still be the lesser member of the partnership, but it is not a dependent, nonentity either.

PATTERNS OF DEVELOPMENT

The applicability of a particular theoretical framework to industrial development largely depends on specific strategies adopted by individual governments. Undoubtedly, policies designed to expedite economic progress and industrial

development vary greatly from country to country. Nevertheless, development strategies can broadly be divided into the import-substitution strategy and that relying on exports. Before examining these two varying courses of attaining industrial development, it is necessary to analyse the broader political and economic contexts within which development strategies are adopted and formulas for economic and industrial growth are devised.

Third World governments use a variety of vehicles in order to achieve development objectives and carry out industrial policies. Such means include, among others, state agencies and public parastatals, multinational corporations and, to a lesser extent, smaller workshops and privately owned enterprises. One of the most prevalent tactics used in seeking to expedite industrial development is nationalising key industries and bringing them under direct government control, a frequently used tactic in newly independent states in the 1960s and the 1970s. Leaders viewed nationalisation as the only effective means to control their country's economy and expedite its industrial development.[32] To many in the developing world, nationalisation also symbolised control over their own destiny and economic future, an opportunity lost during decades of foreign economic domination. But the trend towards nationalisation was gradually halted, and in some cases reversed, when government-run industries proved wasteful, inefficient and unable to compete effectively in international markets. Growing demands for readjustments and enhanced productivity by international creditors were also instrumental in bringing about a general re-evaluation of the merits of large-scale nationalisation. Beginning in the 1980s, strict government control over industries began giving way to joint ventures involving both government agencies and domestic as well as international investors. Although nationalised industries still dominate many Third World economies, a number of governments have initiated measures to attract foreign capital and have nationalised only those industries which they view as having special significance.[33]

National strategies for industrial development are often encapsulated in comprehensive development plans. In pursuing the path to development, developing countries are confronted with a number of dilemmas concerning social practices, demographic factors, economic needs versus capabilities and the political feasibility of specific projects. The very purpose of achieving industrial development brings about a number of basic issues which force Third World policy-makers to devise and implement significant policy decisions. These include choices of reliance on indigenous as opposed to exogenous sources of development, self-reliance versus interdependence, growth versus distribution and centralised planning versus operations of the market.[34] These decisions determine the structure of the economy and are thus of paramount importance to political leaders and policy-makers. It has become common practice among most Third World governments to present their development objectives as comprehensive packages in the form of seven- or, more commonly, five-year development plans. Still others devise catchy names with

which they denote their development objectives, such as the late Shah of Iran's pursuit of the 'Great Civilisation',[35] or, somewhat less ostentatiously, South Korea's 'New Community Movement',[36] and Tanzania's Ujamaa.[37] These doctrinally impregnated programmes are intended to provide a national ideology under the auspices of which development plans can be conceived and launched.[38] The provision of such development plans is seen as necessary in achieving the complex tasks of development and overcoming seemingly insurmountable obstacles. Every aspect of development, from the doctrinal framework within which it is to occur to provisions considered for its implementation, is supposed to be formulated in development plans. Most significantly, development plans set clear objectives to be reached and identify the obstacles that need to be overcome.[39]

Political considerations weigh heavily in formulating development plans. To begin with, devising development plans gives Third World leaders and policy-makers control over crucial economic resources and, ultimately, over their national destiny. This partly explains the prevalence of development plans in most African states soon after independence in the 1960s. Some 60 per cent of Africa's newly independent states devised 'transitional schemes' or '*plans intérimaires*' in order not only to readjust their economies to post-colonial conditions but, more important, to assert their unquestioned authority over the economic sphere.[40]

Other international and domestic political factors also figure prominently in the provision of development plans. Clearly, leaders and policy-makers formulate development plans in accordance with their own agendas and ideological persuasions, most of which are often highly pronounced and rarely flexible. Political realities do, nevertheless, often influence the content and even the intended direction of development plans. Some of these factors include the volume of aid received from various development agencies, such as the US Agency for International Development (US AID), or conditions under which international lending institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) agree to grant loans. Frequently, the World Bank and the IMF attach strict conditions to the loans they grant, often requiring an end to state subsidies and the institution of anti-inflationary measures.[41] Internal political considerations similarly limit the scope and content of development plans. Resource allocation is invariably influenced by such political dynamics as clientalist relations between the central government and various social classes, anticipated reactions by those most directly affected by the various projects and practical limitations on the capabilities of the government.

The dilemmas of pursuing industrial growth through development plans or by other means do not stop at political considerations. Ingrained patterns of social relations, demographic and geographic factors, unrealistic hopes and expectations, difficulties associated with execution and implementation, and economic limitations and infrastructural inadequacies all in one way or another circumvent the scope and viability of development plans. Political leaders and bureaucrats themselves

often do not have a full and complete understanding of the complexities and consequences of modernisation. They thus often embark on modernisation programmes with blurred images of the future or with conflicting goals, hoping either to emulate foreign success stories or to regain an elusive and long-lost historic glory.[42] In most developing countries, especially in places where political instability prompts leaders to make lofty promises of rapid economic gains, unrealistic objectives render many development plans inoperable early on, leading to their alteration through a series of unannounced amendments and modifications. As a result, the value of such plans as reliable guides to economic and industrial growth diminishes greatly before the end of their term.[43]

Similarly, development plans need to take into account historically accepted and practised patterns of social relations and organisations. A striking example of the effects of social organisation on development planning is the existence of caste relations in India, which greatly influences the feasibility, applicability and implementation of development projects.[44] The prevalence of tribal loyalties and bonds exerts a similar influence on the development objectives of most African countries. Although tribalism as a viable social force in Africa has been steadily on the decline, it is still powerful enough to influence the planning and execution of various development projects. Geographic characteristics are also important, particularly in so far as access to navigable waters and major ports is concerned. Being landlocked is a major political and economic handicap for a number of developing countries, not only forcing them to cultivate good-neighbourly relations with countries that have access to water but diverting much of their effort to the development of costly aerial or land-based transportation networks.[45] There are thirteen landlocked countries in Africa (Botswana, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Lesotho, Malawi, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe), twelve in Asia (Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bhutan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Mongolia, Nepal, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan) and two in Latin America (Bolivia and Paraguay).

Lastly, demography plays an overwhelmingly important role in devising development plans and pursuing industrial objectives. Especially in smaller countries, there are extremely high costs attached to social overheads and public services as well as to those manufacturing industries which involve economies of scale.[46] These countries also suffer from a general lack of competition from within, a limited pool of natural resources and low productivity and standards resulting from relative intellectual isolation.[47] The curtailed development potential of countries with limited human and geographic resources is most evident in many Third World island nations and other countries with relatively small populations. Island countries such as Malta, Jamaica, Cuba, Haiti and the Dominican Republic, as well as several smaller African states like Burkina Faso and Uganda, share similar predicaments of limited population and natural resources, thus being drastically limited in scope of the

development objectives they can pursue. Only Hong Kong and Taiwan, whose industrial development was at least initially launched with massive infusions of Western capital, radically differ from other small developing countries.

It is within these limitations and constraints that strategies for industrial growth are adopted and development plans formulated. As mentioned earlier, such development strategies fall into the two broad categories of industrialisation through heavy reliance on foreign imports, the so-called 'import-substitution' strategy, and export-oriented development. Import-substitution strategies for development gained increasing prevalence in the 1950s and the 1960s throughout Latin America, much of East Asia, and parts of the Middle East and Africa.[48] The primary assumption underlying this strategy envisions relying on technology developed in the more advanced countries in order to build up a domestic industrial infrastructure. Imported technology is thus used as a substitute for domestic technology, which is presumed to be backward and inferior by comparison. It is hoped that this imported technology will stimulate growth and development in other local industries and, ultimately, itself become locally adapted and absorbed. The most telling evidence of import-substitution strategies in developing countries is their ever-increasing number of foreign-owned and -controlled assembly plants, assembling a wide range of products from household consumer goods to automobiles and industrial products.[49]

Despite its widespread popularity in the 1950s and the 1960s, the import-substitution strategy for development has largely failed to produce its intended results. By and large, import-substitution policies have accentuated unequal and dependent relationships between Third World governments and Western suppliers. Part of the problem is the failure thoroughly to follow through with import-substitution policies in a comprehensive manner and instead merely to emphasise reliance on the policy's 'import' aspect. On the surface, import-substitution policies have met with great success, especially for those Third World leaders and policy-makers whose preoccupation with their countries' international image supersedes their concern for substantive growth and development. The increasing number of assembled consumer and industrial goods such as refrigerators, colour television sets, automobiles and even factories is seen as testimony to economic wealth and technological advancement. However, assembly plants are of little value if their underlying technology remains alien and unintegrated into the local economy. Throughout the developing world, the actual design, production and engineering of locally assembled products often remain the exclusive domain of foreign companies. Growing economic nationalism and unease with the powers of multinational corporations have in recent years prompted Third World policy-makers to insist on increases in the local content of import-substitution industries. Nevertheless, owing to inherent assumptions of dependence on foreign technology for industrial development, import-substitution strategies have led to considerable increases in both imports from abroad and in economic influence by multinational corporations.[50]

Whether out of political timidity in dealing with multinationals or lack of political will fully to implement intended policies, many Third World governments which follow import-substitution strategies have become subject to increasing influence by foreign companies. This influence is often concentrated in areas most vital to the host country's economy: in Mexico in the 1970s multinational corporations owned and controlled 84 per cent of the rubber industry, 80 per cent of the tobacco industry, 79 per cent of the electrical machinery industry, 62 per cent of the non-electrical machinery industry and 67 per cent of the chemical industry. Brazil was in a similar situation, with foreign companies owning 100 per cent of the automobile, 85 per cent of pharmaceutical and 55 per cent of the machinery and equipment industries. In Argentina, meanwhile, multinational firms owned some 85 per cent of the car industry, 96 per cent of petroleum refining, 82 per cent of the non-electrical machinery industry, and 75 per cent of the rubber industry.[51] As these examples demonstrate, import-substitution strategies have the potential to deepen the dependence of the host country on multinational firms substantially and to perpetuate their continued local operations. Moreover, the monopoly which these companies often establish over the host country's market insulates industrial development from foreign competition, thus reducing the incentive for acquiring improved technology and keeping the level of domestic integration in manufacturing relatively low. As a result, technological capabilities in most countries using import-substitution policies have frozen at the level of initial imports and acquisition.[52] The frequency of late-model cars in streets does not necessarily attest to technological advancement but is, more likely, the product of liberal import policies or foreign-owned assembly plants. The basic pattern of importing manufactured goods and exporting raw materials continues to persist in much of the developing world.[53]

Despite its seeming futility, there are examples, albeit only very few, of developing countries that have used import-substitution policies with great success. South Korea is one of the most notable examples of a developing country that has successfully transformed an import-substitution strategy into export-oriented development, as are, to a lesser extent, India and even Mexico and Brazil. For a growing number of developing countries, export-oriented development has become the major avenue through which industrial development is reached. Export-oriented strategies of development enable countries to develop internationally competitive industries and to overcome limitations imposed by small domestic markets. Since cheaper labour costs enable Third World exporters to sell their products at lower prices, often the markets targeted for penetration are those of other developing countries, as exemplified by the export to other Third World states of armaments and light aircraft by Brazil and railway carriages and heavy industry by India. South Korea and former Yugoslavia even attempted to compete in the United States' automobile market, perhaps the world's largest. While South Korea's Hyundai Motors has met with relative success in the United States, former Yugoslavia's attempt at marketing cars there proved largely unsuccessful and was short-lived.

A successful transition from import-substitution to an export-oriented strategy for development does not necessarily entail complete independence from multinational corporations or from foreign technology. In most instances dependence on multinationals continues to be a lingering reality. Only in relatively rare instances has the ability to export manufactured goods been developed entirely from within and free of reliance on foreign firms. Domestic companies have often not had the opportunity to develop adequate technology to produce a large variety of manufactured goods for export, a disadvantage accentuated by their limited knowledge of foreign marketing and distribution techniques.[54] Much of the technology and know-how needed for producing and manufacturing exportable industrial goods has, as a result, come from multinational corporations. This has in turn led to an increase in the influence of multinational corporations on the economies of countries in which they operate, to the point of making some of them highly dependent on their operations.

In order to expedite the process of development, a number of developing countries have designated specific areas and regions where export-oriented industrial plants and factories are concentrated. Often called export processing zones (EPZs), these areas are in essence industrial parks designed to accelerate industrialisation, generate employment and further develop export capabilities. Through providing infrastructure and other production facilities, EPZs are intended to attract prospective investors, most of whom are multinational corporations whose products are largely earmarked for exports.[55]

EPZs and other industrially designated areas have gained increasing prevalence in the developing world in recent years, with an estimated fifty-five countries having some form of export processing zones in 1980.[56] Despite this widespread popularity, however, the effects of such zones on industrial development remain minimal and largely elusive. To begin with, these segregated areas function mostly as isolated enclaves in the economy that are only marginally linked with domestic suppliers and users, thus prohibiting significant technological spill-overs to local industry.[57] Moreover, the skills that are employed in such zones are mostly the same as the rudimentary ones needed for the assembly of pre-manufactured parts, such as tightening screws or welding rods together. As a result, very little meaningful technological transfer takes place. According to one estimate, over 70 per cent of the labourers in export processing zones are low-skilled, female labourers whose jobs can be learned in about a week.[58]

The conceptual provision of development plans is one thing; their implementation is quite another. Throughout all different stages, from their initial doctrinal conception to their actual implementation, development plans are subject to a variety of forces and influences which in one way or another often mute their effectiveness. Such obstacles tend to be as subtle as they are varied. Most fundamentally, development plans are for the most part experimental projects through which policy-makers and

politicians try out their beliefs and political ideologies, not all of which are always necessarily compatible with the needs of their country. Geopolitical and strategic considerations, often taking the form of regional rivalries or internal conflicts, are equally prominent in influencing development plans in ways that may not be conducive to industrial growth and may even prove detrimental. Heavy emphasis on military industries or on weapons procurement – especially in the Middle East and Africa – frequently warp development plans by diverting funds earmarked for industrial projects.[59] Grand promises and expectations of miracles similarly render most development plans unrealistic and inoperable. Overambitious plans, often intended more for public consumption than for practical application, are frequently altered before even being started and their goals are dramatically downgraded. Even when the watered-down versions of development plans eventually reach the implementation stage, they face massive obstacles arising from practical restraints and limitations.[60] Politicians and policy-makers, whether products of the domestic educational system or holders of foreign degrees, are often out of touch with the realities of everyday life in their own society, thus overlooking many of the finer details of implementing their plans at the local level. Policies devised in and directed from national capitals are not always thoroughly understood or welcomed by those whose lives they directly influence. In most other instances, the mechanisms needed for the local implementation of development plans – skilled manpower, local bureaucracy and tools and machinery – are simply absent or are inoperable.

The success or failure of development plans to a large extent determines the degree to which a country has progressed towards industrialisation. More importantly, development plans provide blueprints according to which industrial objectives are determined and paths towards reaching them are charted. It is here that the relationship between industrial planning and the structure of economy is most clearly consequential. The specific pattern of development directly influences the structure of economy. Conversely, development projects are formulated within existing doctrinal frameworks and available economic resources. The extent and nature of industrial development projects in turn determine the structure of the domestic economy in terms of the types of economic activity in which various social strata engage.

STRUCTURE OF ECONOMY

Throughout the developing world, the economic structures of the urban and rural areas differ radically. In the countryside most economic activities occur within the field of agriculture, varying in form from artisanship and trading handicrafts to farm labour and various gradations of land and livestock ownership. In cities and other large metropolitan areas the range of economic activities is far wider. Broadly, four

primary sources of urban employment can be identified. They include the state, particularly its massive bureaucratic network, local subsidiaries of multinational corporations or domestic enterprises and industries, mid- to small-scale plants and workshops, stores, and the streets, in which most rural migrants attempt to earn their livelihood. It is these various sources of employment, and their prevalence and overall strength in economic life, that determine the shape and functioning of a country's economy. In a broader sense, factors influencing the structure of a country's economy are largely political, influenced by the ideological agendas which leaders seek to implement. In countries whose leaders adhere to socialist ideologies, for example, there are far greater numbers of bureaucrats and other state employees than there are in countries where the prevalence of market forces results in a flourishing of entrepreneurial classes. Similarly, some states impose severe restrictions on certain types of economic activity, be they street peddling or establishing large enterprises (in China, for example). None the less, there are certain economic ramifications of industrial development over which even the most restrictive governments cannot impose effective controls. As a result, the structures of economies are, in essence, products (in fact, directly symptomatic) of development policies and projects.

The different sources of employment found in Third World cities belong to either the formal or the informal sectors of the economy. The informal sector, also called the 'bazaar economy',[61] comprises that category of the economically active population whose employment and economic activities are not linked to any types of formal organisation, public or private. Small traders and shop-owners, street vendors, construction workers and any other segments of the population whose economic activities fall outside the purview of formal organisations are part of the economy's informal sector. Because of its amorphous and fluid nature, the activities encompassed in the informal sector are mostly labour intensive and require little or no prior skills. As Table 2.1 demonstrates, the informal sector often provides employment for a significant percentage of the urban labour force in the developing world. On the other hand, the formal sector often requires formal schooling and technical or administrative know-how.[62] It revolves around organised forms of economic activity that involve set procedures, hierarchical authority structures and rationalised methods for production and capital accumulation. Whether owned and controlled by the state or by private firms, components of the formal sector embody decidedly *corporate* structures and methods that are completely antithetical to the informal and unorganised nature of activities permeating the informal sector.[63] Notable participants in the formal economic sector include the state bureaucracy, which in the developing world is one of the main sources of income for the burgeoning middle classes, government-owned enterprises and parastatals, large-scale and capital intensive industries, and medium to small-scale private enterprises which employ more than five or six people.

Table 2.1 *Estimated share of the urban labour force in the informal sector in selected developing countries*

Area	Share (per cent)
Africa	
Abidjan, Ivory Coast	31
Lagos, Nigeria	50
Kumasi, Ghana	60–70
Nairobi, Kenya	44
Urban areas, Senegal	50
Urban areas, Tunisia	34
Asia	
Calcutta, India	40–50
Ahmedabad, India	47
Jakarta, Indonesia	45
Colombo, Sri Lanka	19
Urban areas, western Malaysia	35
Singapore	23
Urban areas, Thailand	26
Urban areas, Pakistan	69
Latin America	
Córdoba, Argentina	38
São Paulo, Brazil	43
Urban areas, Brazil	30
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil	24
Belo Horizonte, Brazil	31
Urban areas, Chile	39
Bogotá, Colombia	43
Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic	50
Guayaquil, Ecuador	48
Quito, Ecuador	48
San Salvador, El Salvador	41
Federal District and State of Mexico	27
Mexico, D.F., Guadalajara and Monterey	42
Asunción, Paraguay	57
Urban areas, Peru	60
Urban areas, Venezuela	44
Caracas, Venezuela	40
Kingston, Jamaica	33

Source: Michael Todaro. *Economic Development*. 6th edn. (New York: Addison Wesley, 1997), p. 270.

The dichotomy of the urban economy into the formal and the informal sectors can be further broken down to include the various types of economic activity found in Third World cities. These include activities that are in one way or another linked to the state, to privately owned, large-scale enterprises and industrial concerns, or

to the indigenous urban economy. Throughout the developing world, the state tends to be by far the largest single employer, often employing as much as 60 to 70 per cent of the urban labour force. The state is, in fact, the primary vehicle within which development policies are formulated and carried out. The assumption of numerous tasks, from the initial conception of development objectives to their supervision and actual implementation, has resulted in a proliferation of various ministries and departments, often with identical duties whose jurisdictions at times overlap.[64] What have thus emerged in most developing countries are 'development bureaucracies', pragmatic and dedicated to promoting the goals of development, but at the same time unwilling to relinquish their immense political power or at least to share it with others.[65]

With very few exceptions, the developing world's 'development bureaucracies' have turned into gigantic institutions slugging around aimlessly and riddled with inefficiency and corruption. The civil service in the Third World is by far one of the most beneficial avenues for upward social mobility, job security, political and administrative power, and wealth and affluence.[66] To the average citizen, a position in the state bureaucracy means a steady and secure salary, which, although probably lower than that paid by the private sector, is almost never in jeopardy of termination. The growing importance of the civil service in the overall process of development, coupled with its sheer numerical size and social prestige, has largely made it immune to government policies that may have negative consequences for the bureaucracy. Rarely are there ever massive lay-offs of bureaucrats by governments, and in most Third World bureaucracies an implicit (and at times even official) system of job tenure prevails. Because of their control over important state resources and projects, governments are often cautious not to arouse the ire of civil servants by encroaching on their privileges.[67] In some countries, particularly those that have undergone extensive and early bureaucratisation, the powers of the state bureaucracy have grown to such an extent that large numbers of civil servants quietly pursue their own political agendas as opposed to those of the government. Bureaucratic enclaves emerge, unpenetrated by the executive and pursuing more or less independent agendas.[68] Thus Third World bureaucracies have given birth to what some have called a 'second stratum', public officials who work for the government but at the same time sympathise with those opposing its policies. Through their sensitive positions, members of the second stratum are able to slow down the government's response to the opposition or to lessen the intended effects of its policies.[69] The civil service is, at any rate, a powerful and significant political ally whose sympathy and support governments try hard to harness and maintain.

Since most of the political systems found in the developing world embody patrimonial features, however, they are seldom capable of having bureaucracies that are very efficient.[70] Despite the organisational rigidities that are supposed to mark government agencies, most Third World bureaucracies are characterised by

fluidity and lack of established procedures. In these bureaucracies a situation predominates in which interests are articulated only infrequently and policy inputs are often impossible to identify clearly.[71] Instead, there is considerable weight attached to personal connections and loyalties. Symptomatic of the broader patrimonial arrangements which govern political conduct, the cultivation of personal ties and loyalties is an important aspect of one's position in the civil service. As the established avenues of access to power are limited and are largely the monopoly of an oligarchy, extralegal means such as personal contacts, and even bribery and corruption, are often employed in order to achieve desired objectives. When due procedures are seen as obtrusive impediments, logrolling and bribery become commonplace. When an industrialist needs official permission to establish a particular factory or to import certain products, when a conscript soldier seeks to dodge military service, when a civil servant wishes to move up within the bureaucratic hierarchy, or in any other instances where tedious administrative procedures are involved, resort to bribery and corruption is common and indeed often fruitful.[72]

But corruption is by no means the only plague besetting Third World bureaucracies. In many developing countries the state itself has become an instrument of accumulation. Through its ability to regulate economic and financial transactions, attract foreign and domestic capital, award contracts and grant permits, the state in most developing countries controls the economy's most significant resources. Thus for most individuals access to the economy is contingent upon access to the state.[73] At the same time, lack of conviction in the state's ideology or loyalty to the government, low salaries and control over the allocation of lucrative contracts and grants make many civil servants amenable to bribes and gifts. It is not uncommon, therefore, to find Third World civil servants with lifestyles far more affluent than their government salaries would allow.

Whereas the middle classes are concentrated in the state bureaucracy, the working classes predominate in the industrial sector. It is difficult and at times misleading to label the working classes as a single 'class' because of their heterogeneity and vast internal differences. There are several categories of working-class professions, ranging in nature from street vending to working in large industrial complexes. Broadly, three different economic strata within the working class can be distinguished. They include rural immigrants and unskilled workers, known as the lumpen proletariat, semi-skilled labourers and skilled industrial workers. As a subclass, the lumpen proletariat is composed of unskilled immigrants from the countryside who work at whatever menial jobs they can find, as construction workers, coolies, domestic servants, trash collectors, and the like. Sometimes referred to as the 'protoproletariat', these economically marginalised labourers are 'engaged in individual or family enterprises and . . . are not regular salary or wage earners – a group neither proletariat nor peasant'.[74] Their economic activities fall into four general categories: distribution (such as the manual transportation or sale of goods as middlemen), the provision of services (car-minders, professional queuers,

prostitutes, house-guards, shoe-shines, etc.), handicrafts (broom-makers, hatweavers, food-makers, and the like), and, for the ones who are slightly better off, financial manipulation, such as moneylenders and rentiers.[75] Most lumpen proletarians work in the streets, often engaging in the sale of odds and ends like lottery and chance tickets, cassette tapes, candy and gum, knives and mechanical tools, or stolen goods and jewellery. Many sell ready-made products on behalf of merchants who allow them to keep a portion of the profits. There is a proliferation of these street traders in the poorer areas, although they are also found in most major intersections and busy inner-city streets.[76] Their jobs require little or no formal education but instead dexterity, quick-wittedness, bargaining skills, an honest face and an engaging personality, and on-the-job experience.[77] Male adults predominate in street occupations, although women and children are also numerically significant. Only prostitution is almost exclusively a female preserve, although more women engage in retail activities (e.g. sale of fruits) than men, who tend to perform manual labour. For their part, child workers are usually active in small trades, such as shining shoes or washing cars, activities which are the least remunerative, have lowest status, and require minimal access to capital.[78] On the whole, however, male adults who work in the streets generally do not consider themselves to be better off than their younger or female competitors. Still, the fierce competition and labour-intensive nature of small-scale enterprises and street occupations keep both productivity and profitability at very low levels for both males and females, young or old.[79] For this economic underclass, upward mobility is all but impossible. The intensely competitive nature of their work, which for many is not just a job but essentially a struggle for survival, their individualistic mentality, and their seemingly perpetual poverty and economic dependence prevent most street workers from achieving levels of social and economic organisation that could enhance their economic status and well-being.[80]

Semi-skilled working-class labourers are mostly employed in large industrial complexes and factories. Despite their occupation in technologically sophisticated factories, however, these labourers possess few technical skills and their jobs are mostly limited to rudimentary tasks. The industrial activities of most are limited to non-technical responsibilities such as tightening screws, pulling levers or welding. These semi-skilled labourers are former members of the lumpen proletariat who have been able to secure jobs in the industrial sector. Semi-skilled labourers are less numerous than the lumpen proletariat but outnumber skilled labourers. Their upward mobility into the ranks of the skilled is circumscribed by a general lack of education and know-how, although there are those who gain sufficient skills to improve their social and economic standings.

For their part, skilled workers are in a distinct minority, possessing by far greater depth of skills and knowledge than any other segments of the working class. They are concentrated in industries that require higher levels of technical specialisation, such as oil refineries, modern factories and automobile assembly plants. Their small

numbers and comparative technical specialisation turn skilled workers into a 'labour aristocracy', becoming a self-conscious and conservative stratum cognisant of their comparatively privileged position.[81] Although they are still sharply differentiated (and socially segregated) from engineers and technicians, who are considered to belong to the middle and upper classes, skilled workers know a great deal about the machinery with which they work. Lack of spare parts and regular maintenance services force these workers to become intimately familiar with the machines they and their crew work on, some even performing major repairs on sophisticated equipment with makeshift tools. However, precisely because it is part of a labour aristocracy, the skilled stratum of the working class tends to be less productive due to being aware of its privileged position vis-à-vis other workers. The very fact that these skilled labourers are part of an elite is itself a form of job security, alleviating their fear of being readily replaced by others. This lack of productivity is further reinforced by an absence of efficient and advanced management techniques in large Third World industrial complexes, where skilled workers tend to be concentrated.[82]

The working classes are not employed by any one particular sector of the economy, public or private. While most work for small-scale plants and factories which employ ten people or less, others work for major parastatals. Parastatals are public corporations set up by the state in order to run major industries, most notably oil, steel, mining, insurance and even banking. Prevalent in almost all developing countries, parastatals are essentially instruments through which governments intervene in various economic sectors, especially in key industries deemed to be of vital importance to national development.[83] More specifically, parastatals are mostly set up to control foreign trade on behalf of the state in the hope of strengthening its bargaining position in the international arena.[84] Along with local subsidiaries of multinational corporations, parastatals employ the majority of skilled and semi-skilled labourers who are not employed in the private sector. Working for larger industrial complexes usually entails greater job security and fringe benefits, most notably health insurance and paid vacations. None the less, scarcity of skilled labour also forces many smaller employers to provide attractive work conditions and competitive salaries.[85]

Frequently in developing countries the drive towards industrialisation forms the main thrust of national development policies. Politicians and policy-makers alike view lack of industrial development and its slow spread as the main impediments to economic and political parity between themselves and the West. Added to international concerns are domestic political pressures, with local populations constantly comparing themselves with the peoples of the West and feeling troubled by their glaring disadvantages. Development and modernisation plans are thus hurriedly implemented, often with little regard for local needs and conditions and with even less attention to their ensuing social and economic ramifications. Socially and culturally, rapid industrialisation dramatically accelerates social change by

introducing change agents hitherto alien to indigenous conditions.[86] Economically, among other developments, industrialisation fragments the process of proletarianisation, leading to several gradations of distinctive and segregated strata of the working class. Even more importantly, industrialisation severely retards the growth of agriculture as a viable economic sector by diverting scarce resources into industrial projects and away from agricultural concerns. It is within the context of rapid industrial development, and largely as its auxiliary, that agricultural policies in the developing world are formulated and put into effect.

AGRICULTURE

While the drive towards technological modernisation and industrial development has steadily been gaining momentum and intensity in the developing world, decreasing attention is being paid to agriculture. This trend has reached such proportions that many of the developing countries which were once net exporters of agricultural products are now importing much of their agricultural need. In the short span of only a few decades, the vast agricultural resources of most developing countries have been severely depleted owing to neglect and abuse. Once a primary source of revenues and a thriving force in the national economy, the provision of agricultural goods and products has become one of the main causes of international indebtedness and internal strife in many developing countries. The sharpest reversals have taken place in Africa and the Middle East, where chronic drought and deforestation have compounded the negative effects of institutional neglect and public policy. In Africa, the fields of human immiseration inundated with famine and hunger in the 1980s and the 1990s were productive farmlands only as far back as the 1960s.[87] In the Middle East reversals in agriculture have also been sharp, although not comparable to Africa's devastating magnitude. The nations of the Fertile Crescent, from the southern shores of the Mediterranean to the valleys of the Tigris and the Euphrates, have become agriculturally all but barren, importing increasing quantities of food and agricultural products year after year.[88] Once net exporters of agricultural products, the Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iran of the 1990s spend much of their revenues on buying foodstuffs from abroad.[89] A similar downward trend has also been taking place in the agro-mineral industries of most Latin American countries, albeit to a less accentuated degree. Only in East Asia, particularly in South Korea and to a lesser extent in the Philippines, Malaysia and Indonesia, has agriculture retained a seminal role in the national economies. Still, in the region's many war-ravaged nations, notably Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, agriculture (along with most other sectors of the economy) continues to decline in strength and vitality.

Several causes underlie this steady decline in the importance of agriculture in Third World national economies. They include factors that are indigenous to rural

areas as well as those which arise out of national policies. Most notably, the restrictive social structure of most villages and rural communities, inadequate distribution mechanisms and transportation networks and low wages, among others, obstruct the development of conditions conducive to a flourishing of agriculture and agriculture-based industries in the countryside. At the same time, strict and often uninformed government policies, heavy emphasis on industrial growth and 'urban bias' also combine to hamper agricultural productivity and thus its contribution to the economy.

The social structure of farming communities and villages plays an equally important role in impeding the progress of agriculture and in reducing its importance in the overall national economy. This impediment is manifested in several ways, beginning with the farmers' own mentality and views. Most farmers have more confidence in traditional technology than in modern methods, preferring old methods over new ones. Farmers are not necessarily averse to new ideas, most readily accepting hygiene, wage work, radios, television sets and other products of modernisation. They are not, however, equally enthusiastic about ideas on new farming methods and practices since their old ways are low risk, low cost and are validated by generations of experience.[90] This reservation is turned into resentment especially when the new ideas are introduced through government initiatives or by urban-based bureaucrats. Government programmes and policies are often forcibly implemented and leave farmers with little option but to obey official rules. Farmers tend to be self-reliant and resentful of outside intervention, especially if the interferer happens to be the central government, whose intentions are almost always viewed with distrust and scepticism. Confiscation and nationalisation of land under nationalist banners or various ideological guises have made most farmers suspicious of their government's intentions and initiatives, even in instances where such initiatives are launched with sincere objectives in mind. Moreover, traditional methods of farming enjoy general social validity within the village community. As one observer maintains, 'when it is traditional to choose particular seeds, plant varieties, cultivation practices, and cropping systems, the choice means that a local social apparatus exists to support individual decisions'.[91] Ploughing a field by tractor may be faster and more expedient, but in most villages provisions for renting cows and traditional ploughing equipment are far more easily accessible than tractors for rent.

Differentiations in social strata and wealth within farming communities also reduce productivity and further impede the development of agriculture as a viable economic sector. Broadly, farmers can be divided into the two categories of landowners and labourers, most of the latter working for the former. Within themselves, landowners are further subdivided according to the amount of land they own, with the majority possessing small- to medium-size parcels and a small minority with relatively large landholdings. There are, additionally, other landed proprietors who are often absentee and live in nearby cities. Nevertheless, the social composition of Third World

villages is for the most part landless farm labourers, small-scale landholders, and a few comparatively wealthy farmers with more land than others. A vast majority of villagers consider life outside of the village to be much better, certainly more glamorous. Farmers tend to have a low opinion of their own social standing, thinking (often not without justification) that they occupy the bottom of the social ladder and that all non-farmers are better off regardless of their occupation and source of livelihood.[92] Migrants to cities are seen as deserters, and government agents sent to rural areas to improve local conditions are viewed as unwelcome strangers seeking to give unnecessary and intrusive advice. Most literacy programmes designed by central governments for village inhabitants are, meanwhile, elitist and arrogant, equating illiteracy with ignorance and thus reinforcing the farmers' feelings of self-pity and inferiority.[93] Most farmers also view government initiatives designed to increase agricultural productivity as futile and pointless, and, more importantly, as further ploys to wrest control of their meagre resources. As long as they can produce enough to feed themselves and their families, most farmers prefer to be left alone.

Farm labourers and most small-scale farmers earn very little and are often forced to augment their income by means other than farming. Thus the resources and the manpower that could be devoted to agricultural production are instead diverted to alternative economic activities such as wage migration, small-scale trade and artisanship.[94] Migration, both cyclical and permanent, has become a lasting feature of the village economy, draining villages of one of their most important resources, the young.[95] Large landed proprietors, meanwhile, do little to improve local village conditions or the economic well-being of the less fortunate. Apart from providing work for landless peasants as farm labourers or at the most as sharecroppers (tenant farmers), wealthier farmers are generally reluctant to reinvest their income in the village economy. They are, however, more receptive to government-initiated plans and projects as they often stand to gain most from such improvements. Yet, because of this very reason, they are often reluctant to take part in development efforts that would benefit the entire village, preferring instead to participate in projects whose benefits they alone can reap.[96] But even widespread local participation in rural development projects does not guarantee success in improving agricultural output, largely because most projects of this kind are in reality crude means for establishing peasant loyalty to those in power.[97] Only in countries with detailed official policies for the development of rural areas, where extensive local participation has been permitted and self-help programmes launched, as in South Korea, have government-sponsored plans met with any meaningful success.[98]

Other impediments to the growth and development of the agricultural sector arise out of the very manner in which industrialisation in the developing world has evolved over the past few decades. One of the major dilemmas facing Third World agriculture is that of distribution.[99] Emphasis on key industries has led to a frequent neglect of regional and rural roads, as well as other components, needed for the

development of a viable transportation system that would link the country's more remote areas to its main economic centres. The result has been the isolation of most rural communities and agriculture-producing areas from major cities and commercial zones, thus preventing or significantly reducing the efficiency of transporting and marketing agricultural products in the national market. Consequently, most Third World governments find it less expensive and troublesome to import their agricultural needs from abroad than to establish the infrastructures needed for the production, transportation and marketing of domestic agricultural products. Underlying this reluctance to invest in rural areas or at least to improve their links with urban centres is a general tendency to favour urban over rural development. Urban bias, prevalent throughout the developing world, continues to be a major reason for rural underdevelopment and the resultant neglect and decline of agriculture.[100]

A growing number of developing countries have in recent years attempted to initiate measures aimed at reversing their dependence on the import of agricultural products from major international exporters such as Australia, New Zealand, Argentina, Brazil and the United States. This has particularly been the case in countries where popular political and economic nationalism has made leaders uneasily aware of their growing dependence on other countries for foodstuffs. Concurrent with and complementing this emphasis on the development of the domestic agricultural sector has been a general reorientation of most development projects away from official propaganda tools and into more realistic formulas for rural growth. Relying more on military–bureaucratic apparatuses rather than on specific interest groups for their political survival, most Third World governments are also becoming increasingly willing to remove the obstacles that landed proprietors often create in order to block rural projects which they see as threatening to their interests. Despite these improvements, agriculture remains the dark horse of Third World development, continuing to be accorded low priority within the overall schemes of national development.

CONCLUSION

The tangible consequences of industrial development rage on with unimpeded force and dramatic results. Among the many changes that developing countries undergo by virtue of being *developing,* those resulting from technological modernisation and development are by far most noticeable, if not necessarily politically and socially the most consequential. But the theoretical debate over the nature and manner of industrial development continues. Few subjects have perplexed scholars and political leaders of the developing world as much as the ways and means of achieving industrial development. Controversy and debate over the nature of development, its requisites and ramifications, and its actual application and practical possibilities continue to rage in college textbooks and lecture halls as well

as in cabinet meetings and policy-making sessions. Scholarly treatments of the subject remain ambivalent and inconclusive, often revealing more about their authors' doctrinal orientations than about the merits of one approach over another. Even after the collapse of the communist experiment, proponents of the dependency and modernisation approaches remain as far apart now as they have ever been.

Within this context of theoretical ambivalence, a few observations are in order. To begin with, as proclaimed by the dependistas, industrial development is indeed an inherently exploitative process, one in which the natural resources, labour and interests of developing countries are exploited by the parties concerned, especially multinational corporations. But the mere identification of multinational firms as uncaring giants bent on the exploitation of the developing world is a gross oversimplification of much larger and deeper dynamics. This is a position adopted more by people with inflexible ideological perspectives than with keen analytical insight. Most members of the middle classes are also more eager to place the blame for the difficulties they face squarely on the shoulders of foreign enemies and their local proxies than on other factors. Nevertheless, absolving multinational giants from exploiting the developing world is an equally inaccurate oversimplification. The placement of billboards glorifying the taste and the elevated social status arising from drinking Pepsi or Coca-Cola in the remote villages of Uganda, Peru, Mali and countless other developing countries, where most basic necessities of life are considered as luxuries, is tantamount to nothing less than the exploitation of people's fantasies and dreams. It is true that these billboards would not have found their way into such remote corners had it not been for the permission of local and national officeholders. But not all developing countries can stand up to giants like the Coca-Cola Corporation in the same manner as India did.[101] Most Third World politicians, having ascended to their exalted positions through systemic corruption and the patronage of others, possess few bargaining chips when it comes to dealing with multinationals. Even then, there is much room for criticising the practices adopted by multinationals in expanding their global markets. Making money through exploiting the poor may not be illegal, but it certainly clouds the distinction between what is and what is not ethical.

Another observation that merits further elaboration is the relationship between industrial development and political conservatism. The question of whether industrial development encourages political conservatism, or vice versa, has long been a central issue in the study of Third World politics. Many modernisationists have in fact argued that in order to carry out industrialisation programmes effectively a centrally organised and powerful authority structure is needed, one whose centralised powers would enable it to overcome the many obstacles faced in implementing modernisation projects.[102] This line of argumentation was pioneered by Samuel Huntington and a group of like-minded colleagues in the 1960s and the 1970s and found much purchase among leaders throughout the developing world.[103] It was little accident that those two decades witnessed a proliferation of dictatorships

bent on the rapid modernisation of their countries. Brazil, Argentina, Iran and South Korea, and to a lesser extent the Philippines, Pakistan, Iraq, Syria, Egypt, Libya, plus the many one-party states that sprang up in the Middle East, were all governed by modernising dictators who, in various ways, wished to modernise all aspects of their societies except their politics. For the most part, the longevity of these regimes was tied to the success of their economic programmes and industrial policies, especially in South America, where palace coups were common occurrences. Economic success still continues to be the main *raison d'être* for many Third World governments which justify the curtailment of civil liberties on grounds of expediting industrial development and modernisation.

Despite the significant contributions of scholars such as Huntington and Pye to the understanding of modernisation, a consistent connection between strong and even authoritarian regimes and industrial development is yet to be established. For the many examples of modernising dictatorships that achieved industrial growth in a short period there are as many dictatorships which merely terrorised their populations and whose industrialisation policies were limited to blindly inviting foreign investments. Specifically, Latin America and Africa were replete with examples of these despotic regimes, content merely to survive rather than to evolve.[104] Haiti's Duvalier, Paraguay's Strossner, Zaire's Mobutu, Ethiopia's Mengistu and the countless other general-cum-presidents, whose avarice for power was limited only by length of their tenure in office, did little for the industrial development of their respective countries. In the long run economic development is key to political stability. But it does not follow that in the short run political stability and conservatism are keys to industrial development. This is particularly true if what is stabilised is 'the political power of a narrow elite which puts its own interests above those of the country's poor majority'.[105] A similar conclusion can be reached regarding the role and significance of the military in economic growth and industrial development. Military expenditure and size neither necessarily help nor hurt economic growth in the developing world to any significant degree.[106] A positive or negative overall relationship between the two can be detected only by focusing on a specific time period, adopting certain specifications or limiting the sample of countries studied.[107]

The late 1980s and the 1990s have ushered in an era in which dictatorships are collapsing in rapid succession and being replaced by more democratic regimes, as exemplified by the events in Peru, Argentina, Brazil, Chile, South Korea and, more dramatically, in Eastern Europe. There are also indications, albeit faint ones, of 'winds of change' blowing across the African continent. There is little evidence to suggest that the democratisation of such regimes will impede their economic and industrial progress or lead to a reversal of their previous achievements. In fact, the economic fortunes of Eastern European nations may improve following the abandonment of large-scale, centralised planning. India has indeed managed to carry out massive modernisation plans while maintaining a multi-party form of government. Greater input from the public and changes in decision-making

mechanisms and processes will, nevertheless, affect the nature of development plans and the manner in which they are implemented. For instance, growing environmental concerns on the part of an electorate eager to exercise its new voting privileges may curtail the scope of the development policies that Third World leaders once devised without much concern for ecology. Whether such concerns will put a stop to large-scale modernisation remains to be seen and largely depends on a willingness to adopt alternative industrialisation strategies and techniques. What is clear is that one-party or military rule can no longer be justified solely on grounds of expediting industrial development.

The direction of Third World industrial development has changed over the past decades, with emphasis on heavy industries gradually giving way to lighter and technologically more advanced ones. In the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s, hydroelectrical power plants, steel mills, enormous mining operations and assembly plants were built with unprecedented frequency and formed the very industrial infrastructure of many developing countries. In the 1980s and 1990s, instead, there are more factories and plants whose products are geared towards expanding markets for household consumer goods such as television sets, refrigerators, stereos, water heaters and the like.[108] Foreign-owned and -controlled assembly plants still predominate in the industrial infrastructure of most developing countries, but a growing number of these countries have made significant strides towards adopting and absorbing imported technology. There has also been a concurrent reorientation of emphasis towards more advanced industries, particularly in fields such as computer science, aerospace, military technology and nuclear energy. There are few developing countries today that do not have active programmes for the development of alternative energy sources, most, for political reasons, preferring nuclear energy over solar power.

Changes in the orientation of industrial projects and development plans reflect inevitable progress in industry and the subsequent needs of people. Yet industrialisation is by no means the only arena in which fundamental changes in the developing world are occurring. There are equally far-reaching changes taking place in the developing world's urban landscape and in the social and political attitudes of its population, developments which themselves are in one way or another directly related to the process of industrialisation. Apart from its economic and technological ramifications, industrialisation's two most significant contributions include unprecedented urbanisation and demographic changes on the one hand and alterations in the social composition of urban inhabitants and in their attitudes and cultural orientations on the other. Particularly in the developing world, there are strong and interconnected consequences arising from industrialisation, urbanisation, social change and popular cultural orientations. Only through a comprehensive study of all of these developments can a thorough picture of the social and political make-up of the developing world be attained. These developments are examined in the following chapters.

NOTES

1. Kevin Clements. *From Left to Right in Development Theory: An Analysis of the Political Implications of Different Models of Development.* (Singapore: The Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1980), p. 6.
2. Most of these scholars, it should be noted, are political scientists by training and not economists (e.g. Samuel Huntington, David Apter, Lucian Pye, etc.).
3. Ronald Chilcote. 'Introduction: Dependency or Mode of Production? Theoretical Issues', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* (London: Sage, 1983), p. 9.
4. Kevin Clements. *From Left to Right in Development Theory.* p. 6.
5. Richard Higgot. *Political Development Theory: The Contemporary Debate.* (London: Croom Helm, 1983), p. 32.
6. Ibid. p. 34.
7. See, especially, Stephen Chilton. *Grounding Political Development.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1991).
8. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* p. 177.
9. Rosemary Galli. 'Colombia: Rural Development as Social and Economic Control', in Rosemary Galli (ed.) *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1981), p. 15.
10. Kevin Clements. *From Left to Right in Development Theory.* p. 6.
11. Andre Gunder Frank. 'Crisis and Transformation of Dependency in the World-system', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* p. 186.
12. Jens Erik Torp. *Industrial Planning and Development in Mozambique.* (Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 1979), p. 14.
13. Katherin Marton. *Multinationals, Technology, and Industrialization: Implications and Impact in Third World Countries.* (Lexington, VA: Lexington Books, 1986), p. 26.
14. Carlos Johnson. 'Ideologies in Theories of Imperialism and Dependency', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* p. 85.
15. Rosemary Galli. 'Rural Development and the Contradictions of Capitalist Development', in Rosemary Galli (ed.) *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* p. 214.
16. Ronald Chilcote. 'Introduction: Dependency or Mode of Production? Theoretical Issues'. p. 11.
17. Ernest Feder. 'The World Bank–FIRA Scheme in Action in Temporal, Veracruz', in Rosemary Galli (ed.) *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* p. 173.
18. Randall Stokes and David Jaffee. 'Another Look at the Export of Raw Materials and Economic Growth'. *American Sociological Review.* vol. 47, no. 3 (June 1982), p. 148.
19. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options: Zambia.* (New Delhi: Vikas, 1986), p. 148.
20. Dale Johnson. 'Class Analysis and Dependency', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* p. 232.
21. Rosemary Galli. 'Rural Development and the Contradictions of Capitalist Development', pp. 215–16.
22. Henry Veltmeyer. 'Surplus Labor and Class Formation on the Latin American Periphery', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* pp. 204–5.

23. Dale Johnson. 'Class Analysis and Dependency'. pp. 244–5.
24. Rosemary Galli. 'Rural Development and the Contradictions of Capitalist Development'. p. 214.
25. See above, Chapter 1.
26. All data is collected from The World Bank. *World Development Report 1990*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), pp. 178–9.
27. Ibid.
28. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options*. p. 145.
29. Richard Higgot. *Political Development Theory*. p. 57.
30. For a critique of the dependency approach, see Carlos Johnson. 'Ideologies in Theories of Imperialism and Dependency'. esp. p. 90.
31. Joan Robinson. *Aspects of Development and Underdevelopment*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), p. 120. The various intricacies of ISI, of course, are far more involved than space here allows. For more on the subject, see Amiya Kumar Bagchi. *The Political Economy of Underdevelopment*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), pp. 120–30.
32. Samuel Mushi. 'Community Development in Tanzania', in Ronald Dore and Zoc Mars (eds), *Community Development*. (London: Croom Helm, 1981), pp. 145–6.
33. Erik Jens Torp. *Industrial Planning and Development in Mozambique*. p. 17.
34. S. C. Dube. *Modernization and Development: The Search for Alternative Paradigms*. (Tokyo: United Nations University, 1988), pp. 6–7.
35. Mohammad Reza Pahlavi. *Answer to History*. (New York: Stein & Day, 1980), pp. 175–7.
36. Vincent Brandt and Man-gap Lee. 'Community Development in the Republic of Korea', in Ronald Dore and Zoe Mars (eds), *Community Development*. pp. 60–1.
37. Bruno Musti de Gennaro. 'Ujamaa: The Aggrandizement of the State', in Rosemary Galli (ed.) *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State*. p. 152.
38. Vincent Brandt and Man-gap Lee. 'Community Development in the Republic of Korea'. p. 67.
39. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options*. p. 174.
40. Ibid. p. 53.
41. Of course, IMF mandates are not without costs. In 1996–7, they sparked massive demonstrations in Indonesia, eventually leading to the resignation of President Suharto. In the late 1980s and the early 1990s, IMF-mandated austerity programmes also led to 'bread riots' in Jordan and Morocco.
42. S. C. Dube. *Modernization and Development*. p. 23.
43. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options*. p. 77.
44. V. R. Gaikwad. 'Community Development in India', in Ronald Dore and Zoe Mars (eds), *Community Development*. pp. 275–88.
45. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options*. p. 41.
46. Donald Keesing. 'Small Population as a Political Handicap to National Development', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.) *Politics in Transitional Societies*. pp. 319–20.
47. Ibid. p. 320.
48. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty, and Development: Urbanization in the Third World*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 44.
49. Katherin Marton. *Multinationals, Technology, and Industrialization*. pp. 20–1.
50. Ibid. p. 22.
51. Ibid. pp. 23–4.
52. Ibid. p. 37.
53. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options*. pp. 5–6.
54. Katherin Marton. *Multinationals, Technology, and Industrialization*. p. 38.
55. Ibid. pp. 41–2.

56. Ibid. p. 43.
57. Ibid. p. 44.
58. Ibid. p. 43.
59. According to one report, for example, in 1996 the government of Botswana allocated US$61.6 million to the Botswana Defence Force (BDF), while five other ministries – Health, Agriculture, Labour and Home Affairs, Commerce and Industry and Foreign Affairs – had to share US$65.2 million. Lekopanye Mooketsi. 'Botswana: Lavish Spending on the Military'. *Africa Information Afrique.* 20 February 1996.
60. See, for example, Bruno Musti de Gennaro 'Ujamaa: The Aggrandizement of the State'. p. 153.
61. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants: The Political Economy of Urbanization in the Third World.* (London: Sage, 1978), p. 110.
62. Joan Nelson. *Access to Power: Politics and the Urban Poor in Developing Nations.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), pp. 25–6.
63. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 110.
64. S. C. Dube. *Modernization and Development.* p. 97.
65. Manning Nash. *Unfinished Agenda: The Dynamics of Modernization in Developing Nations.* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1984), p. 45.
66. Richard Higgot. *Political Development Theory.* p. 35.
67. Dharam Ghai and Cynthia Hewitt de Alcantara. 'The Crisis of the 1980s in Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean: Economic Impact, Social Change and Political Implications.' *Development and Change.* vol. 12 (1990), p. 421.
68. Rose Spalding. 'State Power and its Limits: Corporatism in Mexico'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 14, no. 2 (July 1981), p. 155.
69. See above, Chapter 1.
70. Richard Sandbrook. 'The State and Economic Stagnation in Tropical Africa'. *World Development.* vol. 14, no. 3 (1986), p. 325.
71. Richard Higgot. *Political Development Theory.* p. 37.
72. Concerning the endemic spread of corruption in Third World bureaucracies, Sandbrook writes: 'Unrestrained corruption can pervade the civil service, statutory boards, and public corporations; what begins as occasional acts of public misconduct, such as occurs in all bureaucracies, spreads like a cancer. The result is a pathological condition of "systemic corruption" – an administration in which "wrongdoing has become the norm", whereas the "notion of public responsibility has become the exception, not the rule"' (Richard Sandbrook. 'The State and Economic Stagnation in Tropical Africa'. p. 326).
73. Sara Berry. 'Work, Migration, and Class in Western Nigeria: A Reinterpretation', in Fredrick Cooper (ed.) *The Struggle for the City: Migrant Labor, Capital, and the State in Urban Africa.* (London: Sage, 1988), p. 255.
74. T. G. McGee. 'The Persistence of the Proto-proletariat: Occupational Structures and Planning of the Future of Third World Cities', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* (Chicago: Maaroufa Press, 1977), p. 258.
75. Ibid. pp. 267–8.
76. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 121.
77. Ray Bromley. 'Working in the Streets: Survival Strategy, Necessity, or Unavoidable Evil?', in Joseph Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 164.
78. Ibid. p. 177.
79. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 130.
80. Ray Bromley. 'Working in the Streets: Survival Strategy, Necessity, or Unavoidable Evil?' p. 169.
81. Val Moghadam. 'Industrial Development, Culture, and Working Class Politics: A Case Study of Tabriz Industrial Workers in the Iranian Revolution'. *International Sociology.* vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1987), p. 165.

82. Ibid. p. 164.
83. Katherin Marton. *Multinationals, Technology, and Industrialization.* p. 25.
84. Jonathon Chileshe. *Third World Countries and Development Options.* pp. 125–7.
85. Sara Berry. 'Work, Migration, and Class in Western Nigeria: A Reinterpretation'. p. 261.
86. See below, Chapter 4.
87. Paul Cammack, David Pool, and William Tordoff. *Third World Politics: A Comparative Introduction.* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988), p. 252.
88. See, for example, import and export statistics for Middle Eastern countries in *The Europa Yearbook 1989,* 30th edn (London: Europa Publications, 1989), vol. 1 and 2.
89. Ibid.
90. Wayne Rohrer. 'Developing Third World Farming: Conflict between Modern Imperatives and Traditional Ways'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 34, no. 2 (January 1986), p. 303.
91. Ibid.
92. Ibid. p. 309.
93. Ibid. p. 308.
94. Ibid. p. 93.
95. See below, Chapter 3.
96. Vincent Brandt and Man-gap Lee. 'Community Development in the Republic of Korea'. p. 92.
97. Rosemary Galli. 'Colombia: Rural Development as Social and Economic Control', p. 40.
98. Vincent Brandt and Man-gap Lee. 'Community Development in the Republic of Korea'. pp. 62–9.
99. S. C. Dube. *Modernization and Development.* p. 8.
100. See below, Chapter 3.
101. In order to permit the marketing and distribution of its soft drink in India, the Indian government demanded that the Coca-Cola Co. inform it of the beverage's formula, which the company maintains is secret and known by only a handful of officials. A stalemate ensued, and for years the Indian government refused permission for Coca-Cola's marketing in India. Instead, an Indian firm began marketing its own version of the soft drink, named Kampa Cola. Liberalisation of imports in the 1980s and the 1990s led to the removal of the ban.
102. Yossef Cohen. 'The Impact of Bureaucratic-authoritarian Rule on Economic Growth'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 18, no. 1 (April 1985), p. 133.
103. See, especially, series of chapters in Lucian Pye *et al. Crises and Sequences in Political Development.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971).
104. Richard Sandbrook. 'The State and Economic Stagnation in Tropical Africa'. p. 327.
105. Elizabeth Hartman and James Boyce. 'Needless Hunger: Poverty and Power in Rural Bangladesh', in Rosemary Galli (ed.), *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* p. 206.
106. For more on the relationship between economic development and military rule, see Yossef Cohen. 'The Impact of Military-authoritarian Rule on Economic Growth'.
107. Basudeb Biswas and Rati Ram. 'Military Expenditure and Economic Growth in Less Developed Countries: An Augmented Model and Further Evidence'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 34, no. 2 (January 1986), p. 362.
108. Warwick Armstrong and T. G. McGee. *Theatres of Accumulation: Studies in Asian and Latin American Urbanization.* (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 47.

3 Urbanisation

One of the most immediate and dramatic consequences of industrial development in the developing world is rampant and unchecked urbanisation, which, since the Second World War, has proceeded at a dizzying pace. Even in countries where significant portions of the population still live in rural areas, sprawling metropolitan centres with large concentrations of urban dwellers, cramped houses and narrow streets and high-rise buildings have appeared. Development, in its broadest sense, has entailed not only economic and industrial changes but rapid urbanisation and the growth of cities. In fact, the preference of Third World governments and industrial concerns alike to establish factories and plants near existing large urban areas has resulted in the development of a complementary and mutually reinforcing relationship between the two processes of industrialisation and urbanisation. On the one hand, industrialisation serves as a main locus in enhancing the economic and political powers of existing urban centres as well as population and geographic size. On the other hand, cities have facilitated access to and provided the infrastructure, the skilled and the abundant labour and almost all of the other ingredients that are necessary for industrial growth and development. It is within this context, one which considers industrialisation and urbanisation as intertwined and complementary processes, that both phenomena need to be examined. Industrialisation and its various economic, political and cultural ramifications for developing countries were discussed in the previous chapter. This chapter focuses on the causes, processes and consequences of Third World urbanisation. However, before examining these developments in detail, some general observations regarding the nature and characteristics of urbanisation in the developing world are in order.

Urbanisation is commonly understood as a rise in the proportion of people living in urban as opposed to rural areas. More specifically, it refers to the 'transition from a dispersed pattern of human settlement to one concentrated around cities and towns'.[1] In addition to changes in patterns of residence, the change from rural to urban surroundings carries with it definite, though at times gradual and latent, alterations in the values and the behaviour of those involved. Urbanisation involves considerably more than a mere change in residence from rural to urban areas. It sets

into motion a series of social and cultural processes which fundamentally influence the course and direction of social change and the political culture of the country involved.[2] Rural migrants to the cities, having left their original surroundings for urban areas in search of better jobs and higher living standards, become subjects of an intense social and cultural turmoil set off by urbanisation. Sooner or later, willingly or through force of time, even the more recent arrivals develop an 'urbanised' culture of their own, one which resembles neither the values they adhered to in the countryside nor those commonly held by the urban mainstream.

In addition to providing great impetus for social and cultural change, urbanisation has the potential of serving as means for the accumulation of capital, and therefore economic and political power, not only for rural and urban residents but also for the state, local investors, and multinational firms. Some observers have even gone so far as to refer to cities as 'theatres of accumulation', arguing that metropolitan centres provide both the institutional framework and the *modus operandi* for local oligopoly capital, transnationals, and modernising states.[3] Cities, they argue, are not only 'theatres of accumulation' but

centres from which are diffused the culture and values of westernization. They act simultaneously as centres of operation for modern commerce, finance, and industrial activity, and providers of appropriate environment for capital's expansion and deepening. Cities are the arena in which foreign and local capital markets advertise and sell the philosophy of modernisation, efficiency, and growth through imitative lifestyles and consumerism, and, in so doing, undermine non-capitalist production systems and values. In this sense, diffusion is a further means to enhance and to promote the end of capital accumulation.[4]

Throughout the developing world, urban-based industrialisation has become the dominant economic force, gradually supplanting and replacing rurally based, agro-mining economy.[5] Yet viewing urbanisation as merely a process whereby citizens and the state amass wealth, as implied in the above quotation, is not entirely accurate. Undeniably, compared with rural areas, developing world cities do provide favourable investment conditions through which investors and the state can reap substantial profits, aided by the abundance of cheap labour and by a prevalence of 'urban bias' (discussed below) among Third World policy-makers. Nevertheless, there are other developments with equal or greater significance which also result from urbanisation.

A further characteristic of developing world urbanisation is its lack of uniformity within a given country and between different countries and regions. Despite its seemingly frantic pace throughout the developing world, urbanisation remains a largely fragmentary and sporadic process, affecting some cities and altering their geography and demographic make-up fundamentally while only remotely influencing other, often smaller, cities and towns. The extent to which an existing city, a region or country undergoes urbanisation is dependent upon a variety of factors, ranging

from historic traditions to current government policies, economic capabilities and environmental and demographic considerations. Generally, Latin America as a whole comprises some of the most urbanised regions of the developing world, with the three countries of the Southern Cone – Chile, Uruguay and Argentina – ranking among the most urbanised in the world.[6] Contrarily, Sub-Saharan Africa encompasses a number of very sparsely urbanised countries, contrasting sharply with some of the more heavily urbanised countries in the north, notably Morocco, Algeria, Tunisia and Egypt.[7]

Such striking contrasts in the levels of urbanisation between Latin America and Africa arise partly from the former's almost uniform colonial experience under Spanish rule as opposed to Africa's partition among several competing colonial powers. Population-density levels, access to ports and navigable rivers and the availability of arable land are also important contributing factors, the abundance of which in Latin America greatly facilitated the establishment and growth there of numerous urban communities. Much of North Africa is endowed with similar geographic features, resulting in its relatively higher rates of urbanisation in comparison with the rest of the continent. In Asia, meanwhile, high concentrations of population density in the easternmost countries have resulted in much higher levels of urbanisation there than has occurred in the Middle East, which is marked by vast expanses of desert and a harsh climate.

Even more striking, and ultimately more important for the study of developing world urbanisation, are vast disparities in levels of urbanisation within almost all developing countries themselves. Internal regional urban imbalances will be discussed in greater detail in the following sections. Suffice it to say here that the uneven and largely uncontrolled manner in which urbanisation has occurred in much of the developing world has greatly inflated the population, size and resources of one and at times even two primary cities at the expense of all others. Mexico City's population of 15 million, 16 per cent of Mexico's total population, Seoul's 10.8 million, 24 per cent of South Korea's total population, and greater Cairo's 7.1 million inhabitants, who comprise 15 per cent of Egypt's total population,[8] are some of the more dramatic examples of the overwhelming urbanisation of one city compared with others. There are countless other examples of developing countries where only sparse urbanisation has taken place outside the immediate periphery of the largest city, which is usually the national capital. Countries as diverse and distinctive as Afghanistan and Zimbabwe share the one salient feature of uneven and skewed urbanisation.

Lack of adequate resources and appropriate infrastructural capacities is another chronic feature of most Third World cities. Throughout the developing world, rapid urbanisation often takes place without the necessary structural transformations that are needed to accommodate large populations.[9] Urbanisation places a high financial burden on Third World governments, which need to meet the rapidly

rising demands for urban services such as the provision of water and electricity (in some parts of the developing world, telephone and gas services are still considered luxuries), the building and maintenance of schools and hospitals, the provision of sewage systems and garbage collection, public transport, libraries and the like. Naturally, public expenditures are higher in larger cities than in intermediate-size or smaller towns.[10] Given the public's preference for investing in private enterprises rather than in public services, investment in necessary urban services is left almost exclusively to the government.[11] It is thus up to Third World governments to provide the necessary urban services, often in the face of uncontrollable population growth rate and the scarcity or complete unavailability of the financial and economic resources that such projects require. In Sub-Saharan Africa and in South Asia, for example, as much as 34 and 46 per cent of the urban population respectively does not have access to sanitation (Table 3.1). The difficulties involved are further compounded by the costs associated with industrialisation, since commercial and industrial users place a much greater demand on public services (especially on utilities) than do urban residents. The increasing demands for and strains on the urban infrastructure are in large part directly related to commercial and industrial activities carried out in urban areas.[12] Thus the more rapid and intense the process of industrialisation, the more burdensome and costly is urbanisation likely to be for Third World governments.

Within this context of rising costs associated with urbanisation, the allocation of resources to urban services and to local administrative networks in the developing world has steadily declined in recent years. In terms of numbers, far fewer employees are assigned local government jobs as opposed to jobs in the national government. While on the average some 57 per cent of government employees in the West work for the local government, in the developing world the figure is only 15 per cent.[13] Within the developing world, Asia has the highest percentage of people working in local administration, 37 per cent, as opposed to 21 per cent in Latin America and only 6 per cent in Africa.[14] The few local administrators who do exist often lack sufficient technical and administrative skills, are not given access to enough funds and are often forced to work with run-down and left-over equipment.[15] Their work, meanwhile, is frequently supervised by political appointees rather than elected politicians or experienced policy-makers.[16]

Two reasons underlie this seeming neglect of urban local administration throughout the developing world. To begin with, in developing countries state-building is still an ongoing process and, in many instances, continues to be in its embryonic stages. Thus a considerably greater portion of available resources and manpower is directed towards the building of a stronger state and national government. That is why in Africa, for example, where most countries are only now entering their fourth decade of self-rule, the percentage of people working for the national government is overwhelmingly higher than those in local administration.

Table 3.1 Levels of urbanisation in the developing world

	Urban population (% of total population)		(average annual % growth)		Population in cities of 1 million or more (% of total population)			Population in the largest city (% of urban population)		Access to sanitation in urban areas (% of urban population)	
	1980	1995	1980–90	1990–5	1980	1995	2015	1980	1995	1985	1993
Latin America and Caribbean	57.2	65.3	3.3	2.9	16.6	20.7	21.4	35.8	34.9	66.6	78.6
Middle East and North Africa	52.3	60.2	5.0	4.5	18.6	21.7	23.6	33.1	32.1	91.8	97.7
Southeast Asia and the Pacific	41.0	49.3	3.7	3.4	22.0	25.6	26.1	41.4	36.5	63.5	91.7
Sub-Saharan Africa	22.6	31.6	5.5	5.1	3.3	4.6	6.2	35.5	42.3	47.4	66.4
South Asia	21.0	25.2	3.7	3.7	5.5	9.2	12.5	20.3	20.2	41.5	53.7

Source: Compiled from World Bank. *World Development Indicators 1997.* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1997), pp. 114–16.

Second, there is much greater social prestige attached to jobs in the national government, where wealth, economic mobility and political power are concentrated, than to positions in local administration. Throughout the developing world, those working for the national government are viewed as having a much more important task at hand than those administering local affairs, even if the former duties are highly menial and without much significance. The belief in the greater importance of positions in the national government is due largely to the public's perception of the government as the builder of a strong state. This perception of the importance of positions in the national government is further strengthened by the government's frequent praise of civil servants working in the various cabinet ministries and by other forms of propaganda. The results have been highly inflated national bureaucracies existing alongside understaffed, ill-equipped and neglected local administrations. Fattened bureaucracies, coupled with and reinforced by the incessant propaganda of central governments in praise of civil servants and other state employees, are part of larger processes of political development, industrialisation and, subsequently, urban growth.

URBAN GROWTH

By far the most glaring feature of urbanisation in the developing world has been the incredible rate with which it has proceeded in recent decades. Within a period of two or three decades, sprawling urban centres have appeared in all developing countries, with almost every country having at least one city with several million inhabitants. In the 1970s there were approximately 30 million more people in the cities of industrialised countries than in the cities of the developing world. By 1985, the populations of Third World cities outnumbered those of industrialised countries by some 300 million. By the year 2000, there will be twice as many urban residents in the developing world as in Japan and other industrialised nations.[17] This frantic pace of urban growth in the developing world is primarily caused by two factors, each with its own special significance: natural increases in population and urban-bound migration from rural areas.[18] Some scholars have attributed population growth to what they have labelled as 'vital revolution', a process whereby 'societies with high birth and death rates move to a situation of low birth and death rates', and to 'mobility revolution', which refers to 'the transformation of societies with low migration rates as they advance to a condition of high migration rates'.[19] Others have argued that the rapid rate of population growth in the developing world is part of a cyclical process no different from that which Europe underwent in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in which a three-stage transition occurs: from high birth and high death rates to high birth and low death rates and, eventually, to low birth and low death rates. The developing world, it is argued, is currently in the second phase of the transition, embodying high rates of fertility and low mortality.[20]

Regardless of the terminology used, it is clear that migration and natural population increase are the two highly important factors in bringing about urban growth. Typically, 40 to 50 per cent of urban population growth each year in major Third World metropolitan centres is due to in-migration from the rural areas.[21] According to other estimates, rural–urban migration on average accounts for two-fifths of the urban growth in the developing world.[22] Some observers have argued that the exceptionally rapid rate of population growth in the developing world is due more to natural population increases than to rural–urban migration.[23] Others claim, however, that natural increases within the city become an increasingly important contributor to urban growth as a country urbanises simply because of the sheer size of the urban population as opposed to people in rural areas.[24] This line of argument is, nevertheless, challenged by those who claim that rural exodus is more than compensated for by natural population increases and that rural population continues to grow in absolute numbers despite migration. Although urban centres grew unabatedly, still only about one-fourth of the developing world's population lives in urban areas.[25]

To a large extent, high rates of urban growth in the developing world are due to substantially decreased rates of infant mortality resulting from medical advances in recent decades. At the same time, medical technology imported from the West has also resulted in rises in the life expectancy of Third World residents, with Latin America having benefited the most – average life expectancy there being 63 years – followed by Southeast Asia – 53 years. Due to chronic famine, wars and civil strife, Africa's life expectancy remains at only 45 years, the lowest in the developing world.[26] Nevertheless, as a result of concurrent overall rises in life expectancy rates and declines in levels of infant mortality, the populations of developing countries have in recent decades grown at incredibly high rates (Table 3.2). Improvements in health education, prenatal care, immunisation, sanitation, housing and nutrition, and the availability of medical technology have all combined to lessen significantly the rates of infant mortality in developing countries. However, the effects of social change and improved education have not been sufficiently far reaching to alter popular cultural values associated with high fertility.[27] In most societies, for example, male offspring assure not only the longevity of the family name but also the continued economic security of the extended family, since they are more likely to engage in economically productive activities than are female offspring. As a result, reproduction is encouraged until there are at least one or two male offspring. But even in societies where masculinity is not a major factor in social status and economic activity, economic factors are still of overwhelming importance in determining the size of the family. In some societies wealth often flows from the children to the parents owing to their productive contribution to the household economy. This is especially the case in traditional agrarian societies or in newly industrialising ones, where younger people are more apt to be absorbed into the

Table 3.2 Population and labour force

	Population						Labour force							
	Total (millions)		Average annual growth rate (%)		Aged 15–64 (millions)		Total (millions)		Average annual growth rate (%)		Female % of labour force		Children aged 10–14 (%)	
	1980	1997	1980–90	1990–7	1980	1997	1980	1997	1980–90	1990–7	1980	1997	1980	1997
East Asia and Pacific	3,600	4,903	1.6	1.3	796	1,155	704	979	2.3	1.4	42	44	27	10
Europe and Central Asia	428	471	0.9	0.1	276	311	215	234	0.6	0.5	47	46	3	4
Latin America and Caribbean	358	494	2.0	1.7	200	306	130	206	3.0	2.3	28	34	13	9
Middle East and North Africa	175	283	3.0	2.5	91	162	54	92	3.1	3.2	24	26	14	5
South Asia	902	1,289	2.2	1.9	508	767	389	558	2.1	2.2	34	33	23	16
Sub-Saharan Africa	379	614	2.9	2.7	196	322	171	269	2.7	2.6	42	42	35	30

Source: World Bank. *World Development Report 1998/99.* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1999), p. 194.

industrial economy. In such places it only makes economic sense to sustain high levels of fertility. A fertility transition occurs when the flow of wealth from parents to children becomes of greater importance. Thus, as social and economic structures change, and with them the role and division of labour within the household economy are modified, levels of fertility can be expected to decline.[28] Moreover, the gradual entry of women into the industrial labour force, where jobs tend to be more stable and structured, as opposed to the informal sector, will also result in declining fertility rates. It is thus not surprising to find the highest rates of fertility in regions whose economies lag considerably behind in industrial development, with the highest rates of population growth being found in Africa, followed by Asia and South America (see Table 3.1 above).

In addition to rising rates of fertility and life expectancy and declining levels of mortality, urban growth in the developing world owes much to the increasing numbers of rural migrants flocking to the cities in recent decades. If not necessarily the most important cause of urban growth in the developing world, rural–urban migration is certainly its most conspicuous manifestation. In virtually all developing countries a large and ever-expanding pool of recent migrants from villages can be found in most major metropolitan centres. Recent arrivals from the countryside have become an inseparable feature of the Third World urban landscape. The unimpeded pace with which rural hopefuls jam into the cities is brought about by a number of compelling economic as well as social factors. In all cases there are a number of 'push' as well as 'pull' factors which compel rural inhabitants to venture off into the cities in search of better lives and greater heights of material and cultural enrichment. From the migrants' perspective, escaping family friction and supervision, romanticising about city life and rapid social mobility, and prospects for better employment and higher living standards are all compelling motives to leave rural surroundings for the city. While economic calculations are of great significance in coming to a decision regarding migration, it is often non-economic factors that serve as the 'last straw' which brings the eventual departure about.[29] Broken romances, jealousy over the migration of others, a desire to become an urbanite and a curiosity to explore the universe that lies beyond the village bounds can all add strength to the economic justifications of migrating to the city.

There are a number of specific factors which contribute to domestic migration in particular political and geographic settings. In Africa, for example, much of the domestic migration in recent years has been due to devastations caused by drought, famine, civil war and the negative trend in the terms of trade for exporters of primary goods.[30] In countries where civil wars have settled into chronic and bloody stalemates, both in Africa and elsewhere, many rural residents have found refuge in the relative safety of the cities, where rebel activities are not likely to be as intense as they are in the countryside.[31] Similar displacements have taken place in South and Central America, where the rapid deforestation of the Amazon basin has disturbed

the land and income supply of rural residents and thus accelerated their migration to nearby cities. These developments do not appear uniformly across the developing world. Nevertheless, three broad sets of factors can be distinguished which cause massive internal migration in almost all developing countries. These developments, each varying in strength and significance according to prevailing economic and cultural trends, include the consistent adoption of policies by Third World governments which favour urban as opposed to rural development, the so-called 'urban bias' of Third World policy-makers; the unprecedented growth and development of industrialisation in Third World cities and the ensuing abundance of employment opportunities there at the expense of rural areas; and the allure of city life and hopes of assimilation into the urban mainstream.

The most salient feature of developing-world policy-making has been its unremitting bias in favour of urban-based industrial and economic development, often completely neglecting the economy, demography and the social and cultural make-up of rural areas. Available resources are unproportionately allocated to urban areas, and, besides a few isolated examples such as China's Cultural Revolution and more recently Tanzania's Ujamaa movement, governments have made little or no effort to redress the gross inequalities that exist between cities and villages. 'Urban bias', most observers of Third World urbanisation would agree, is a problem endemic to nearly all developing countries, regardless of the ideological propaganda that emanates from their capitals. As one observer of Third World urbanisation maintains,

> the most important class conflict in the poor countries of the world today is not between labour and capital. Nor is it between foreign and national interests. It is between the rural classes and the urban classes. The rural sector contains most of the poverty, and most of the low cost sources of potential advance; but the urban sector contains most of the articulateness, organization, and power. So the urban classes have been able to 'win' most of the rounds of the struggle with the countryside; but in so doing they have made the development process needlessly slow and unfair. Scarce land, which might grow millet and bean sprouts for hungry villagers, instead produces a trickle of costly calories from meat and milk, which few except the urban rich (who have ample protein anyway) can afford. Scarce investment, instead of going to water pumps to grow rice, is wasted on urban motorways. Scarce human skills design and administer, not clean village wells and agricultural extension services, but world boxing championships in show-piece stadia. Resource allocations, within the city and village as well as between them, reflect urban priorities rather than equity or efficiency. The damage has been increased by misguided ideological imports, liberal and Marxian, and by the town's success in buying off part of the rural elite, thus transferring most of the costs of the process to the rural poor.[32]

In addition to infrastructural inadequacies, rural areas in developing countries suffer from an unproportional concentration of skilled and trained professionals. In many instances the percentage of medical doctors, teachers and engineers residing in cities is incomparably greater than that of rural areas. Most professionals, who would not have attained their exalted positions had it not been for the urban-based educational system, are reluctant to give up the comforts and luxuries of city life for the relative discomforts of villages, unless they are sent there by the government for short periods as part of their tour of duty. Even the educational system in existence in most Third World villages, devised in and directed from urban centres, does not train youngsters to become better farmers or cattle ranchers, or to learn other pertinent subjects. Instead, emphasis is frequently placed on political indoctrination and national integration. They are taught lessons about the national capital and its monuments, about the lives and careers of incumbent political leaders, and are made to memorise the national anthem and appropriate political slogans. The little substantive training that does take place prepares bright villagers for urban jobs.[33]

Related to and in fact a derivative of urban bias is the greater concentration of employment opportunities in the cities. Throughout the developing world industrial complexes are located in the vicinity of major metropolitan areas (see below). Urbanisation and industrialisation have gone hand in hand, reinforcing and encouraging one another. Since people have a tendency to move to regions where there are greater employment possibilities, trends in population distribution and growth are determined by the location of job opportunities and thus by prevailing patterns of industrialisation.[34] Within this context, a perpetuating cycle of urbanisation, industrialisation and migration develops, each reinforcing and accentuating the other. Industrial, economic and demographic centralisation thus ensues, with cities emerging as centres of industrial power and economic mobility. Local and regional identities and economic commitments, even in the remotest areas, are strained as a result of such centralising forces, in turn leading to greater migration away from the countryside.[35] As a result, it is not necessarily the poorest areas that have the highest rate of out-migration, but those areas that are located relatively close to economically thriving centres.[36] Within the context of hopes to maximise economic gains through better employment, migration is seen not so much as a risk but rather as an attempt to avoid the risk of being left behind, with the small-farmer family attempting to diversify its income sources through placing its best-suited member in the ever-expanding urban economy.[37]

The social and cultural dimensions of migration are equally significant. Cities form not only centres of industrial and economic wealth but arenas in which social and cultural values are articulated and dispersed. These values are in turn inculcated among the country's population, urban as well as rural, through the powerful medium of the electronic media. Throughout the developing world radio and television programming reflects not merely urban values but in reality values which point

towards and indeed often owe their genesis to the West.[38] Few if any programmes explore rural life, much less praise its values, and the few rural-oriented programmes that do exist are designed for purely entertainment purposes rather than the examination of rural issues and concerns. From the start, these programmes were intended for urban audiences rather than rural ones. Often in such shows, rural life is patronisingly depicted as simple, pure and healthy, its real ordeals and dilemmas brushed aside by distorted, romanticised representations. Despite widespread illiteracy and under-education both in cities and rural areas, glossy magazines and newspapers also similarly propagate the allure of the city, and most are riddled with sensationalist journalism and act more as conveyors of new social and cultural fetishes than as reliable sources of news and information. The culture of the city reigns supreme, constantly finding its way, through countless raised antennae, into remote villages and towns. To those looking at them from the outside – and even to inside viewers – cities appear as arenas within which all economic and social progress is formulated and realised. The larger the city, and thus the more intense its apparent role as progenitor of social and technological advancement, the greater is its attraction to those who are only too eager to abandon their stagnant lives and squalid rural surroundings. The state's official ideology, meanwhile, its continuous praise of science and technology and its promises of impending industrial miracles only accentuate the desire to become urbanised.

Rural–urban migration embodies a number of further features involving the manner of the move itself, its duration and the ratio of those who migrate by gender, education and other characteristics. Each of these features can have significant demographic and economic ramifications. The manner in which migration takes place, either direct or in stages, can proliferate either the population size of one primary city or those of several smaller ones. Migration may be conducted directly, in the form of a direct relocation from the village to the city, or in stages, when the migrant moves from farm to village, from village to town and from town to city. Owing largely to the costs involved, both material and emotional, the typical migrant manages only one or two stages in his lifetime.[39] That is why smaller cities in the developing world act primarily as rural agricultural service centres and maintain predominantly rural characteristics.[40] Forms of entertainment and other manifestations of culture in these cities revolve around rural idioms, especially as expressed through popular plays and music. The local economy is also geared towards servicing the needs of farmers and rural artisans, who often pass through such cities on their way to market their products in larger cities. Stage migration is, consequently, an important factor in absorbing some of the emotional, social and economic perils associated with migration and prepares the migrant for some of the more challenging difficulties which await in the larger city.[41]

A second feature of migration is the length of its duration and its permanence versus temporary character. Generally, migration is either seasonal and temporary

or permanent and involving gradual, complete assimilation and settlement into the city. Within the context of this dichotomy, three principal patterns stand out: temporary migration of men and women separated from their families; family migration to urban areas followed by return migration to the community of origin; and the permanent establishment of an urban-based family household.[42] Temporary migration usually peaks during the winter months, when most farmers and agricultural labourers are made redundant until the next crop season. Even when agricultural production is uninterrupted by seasonal changes or by natural calamities, very few subsistence farmers can hope to survive entirely on the products of their land or from domestic animals. Thus wage migration has become a permanent part of the village economy, with younger villagers dividing their labour between the informal urban sector and the rural agricultural sector.[43] Such short-term migrants are themselves divided into 'target' and 'cyclic' migrants. Target migrants return to their original rural surroundings and line of work when they reach their specific goals in the city, which almost invariably involve the accumulation of money. Cyclic migrants, meanwhile, combine rural and urban opportunities into a single, integrated field of opportunity and have a lifetime pattern of moving between the urban and the rural environments.[44]

Other features of migration are the differences in the rates of migration across the sexes, levels of education and age. One of the most noticeable characteristics of migration is its division along gender lines. In Asia and Africa male migrants outnumber female migrants, while in Latin America the trend tends to be the opposite.[45] This development is due largely to the widespread prevalence of consumerist and comfort-oriented attitudes among Latin America's middle and upper classes in the face of rampant poverty and indigence of the lower classes.[46] There is thus great demand for domestic help in the cities, a field traditionally dominated by women. In Asia and in most of Africa, on the other hand, the generally positive economic conditions of the 1970s, fuelled largely by the 'oil boom', created numerous job opportunities for manual labourers, especially in the growing construction industry.

Irrespective of gender, the overwhelming majority of migrants everywhere in the developing world tend to be unmarried young adults. Even if married, they usually have very little at stake in their village community, lacking resources or control over sources of power such as land, livestock or seeds.[47] Among young adults, the propensity to migrate rises with the level of education.[48] Higher levels of education give migrants better skills and higher chances of securing positions in the formal sector, even if only at the clerical level. Moreover, better education eases some of the perils of migration, an advantage not afforded to the less educated and poorer members of the community.[49] In general, female migrants are less educated than male migrants, because existing village social structures tend to give higher priority to the education of male children.[50] This in turn reinforces the greater preponderance of male migrants in comparison to females.

The decision to migrate is rarely reached in solitude and with ease. It frequently involves a period of soul-searching and emotional trauma, although the younger city-dreamers are often only too eager to abandon their villages. The intensity and nature of aspirations, information about alternative possibilities, contacts, availability of financial resources and a sense of capacity to cope with a strange environment all influence the decision of whether to migrate.[51] Close relatives are often consulted and their advice is sought, even if only as a gesture of courtesy when a definitive decision has already been made. The advice of those who have already passed through the uncertain road of migration weighs heaviest in the decision to migrate, as they provide valuable information about an unfamiliar and seemingly hostile environment. When the villager does eventually migrate, these 'old-timers' often provide food, shelter, connections, and a general sense of security. Migration, it is important to realise, takes place within a certain cultural milieu of relationships and expectations that support the move.[52]

Even when migration assumes a permanent character and few thoughts of returning to the village are entertained, most migrants retain strong bonds with their place of birth. The basic security of village life, epitomised by relatively inexpensive housing, access to land and opportunities to trade, coupled with emotional and personal ties, combine to retain the attraction of the village and its affairs to those who have migrated.[53] Migrants remain particularly interested in economic developments occurring in their villages, especially concerning matters such as control over, or at least access to, land and water.[54] The economic bonds between migrants and their native community are also reinforced through the remittances which migrants frequently send back to their families. Remittances are either in the form of cash or in basic household goods such as heaters, radios, television sets and other similar durable items which most villagers consider to be luxuries.[55] Such remittances are part of a self-enforcing, cooperative arrangement – an implicit understanding – between the migrant and those family members who stayed behind, and are designed to maximise both sides' mutual benefits.[56] 'Remittances', some observers have noted,

> may be seen as one component of a longer-term understanding between a migrant and his or her family, an understanding that may involve many aspects including education of migrant, migration itself, coinsurance, and inheritance. The family group as a whole can potentially gain from such arrangements, though the distribution of gains between the migrant and home may be a matter for bargaining, and each may be the net beneficiary at different phases. Indeed, it is precisely this sequencing of gains that helps to render an understanding self-enforcing in addition to any feelings of mutual altruism.[57]

Over time, the frequency of remittances tends to decrease as the migrant's length of residence in the city increases.58 However, the village community and kinsfolk rarely lose their original place in the migrant's heart altogether.

SQUATTER SETTLEMENTS

Once the migrant arrives in the city, he or she typically ends up residing in one of the shantytowns located in the periphery of the city. Such shantytowns, also called 'transitional urban settlements',[59] can generally be divided into three different economic levels. The most prevalent are low-income bridgeheads, populated by recent arrivals with few marketable skills and comprised of dilapidated homes and shacks. In these settlements access to the basic necessities of life is all-important. Also prevalent are the so-called slums of hope, in which income becomes available for items other than basic necessities such as food and housing. Radio and television sets are the most sought-after items which frequently find their way into such slums. While comprised of residents who are not as poverty-stricken as some other migrants, these settlements are, nevertheless, also made up of huts that are a far cry from conventional housing. Lastly, a few squatters are able to move out of slum settlements altogether and become part of a group of middle-income status-seekers. Made up mostly of migrants whose ventures into the city have brought them relatively substantial revenues – through such activities as driving taxis or working in shops and factories – these former squatters have relatively more choices of residence and are often able to upgrade the quality of their housing.[60]

Despite the possible social and economic mobility of some rural migrants, most spend their residence in the city in one shantytown or another. They become part of the sea of the urban poor that can be found in any metropolitan area of the developing world (Tables 3.3 and 3.4). In each country or region, squatter settlements are often popularly given condescending names denoting their inferior social and economic status. In Latin America they are commonly referred to as 'barrios', 'barriadas', 'favelas', 'ranchos', 'colonias', 'proletarias' or 'callampas'; in North Africa, especially in Algeria, they are known as 'bidonville' or 'gourbiville'; in India they are called 'bustees';

Table 3.3 Population living on less than US$1 a day in developing economies

Region	Millions		% of population	
	1987	*1993*	*1987*	*1993*
East Asia and the Pacific	464.0	445.8	28.8	26.0
Europe and Central Asia	2.2	14.5	0.6	3.5
Latin America and Caribbean	91.2	109.6	22.0	23.5
Middle East and North Africa	10.3	10.7	4.7	4.1
South Asia	479.9	514.7	45.4	43.1
Sub-Saharan Africa	179.5	218.6	38.5	39.1
Total	*1,227.1*	*1,313.9*	*30.1*	*29.4*

Source: World Bank. *World Development Indicators 1997.* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1997), p. 31.

Table 3.4 Percentage of the globe's poor in developing regions

South Asia	39%
East Asia	33%
Africa	17%
Other	11%

Source: World Bank. *World Development Indicators 1997.* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1997), p. 31.

'kampongs' in Malay; 'barung-barongs' in the Philippines; 'gecekondu' districts in Turkey; and 'halab-abads' in Iran.[61] Despite their different names, however, squatter settlements share a number of strikingly common characteristics.

Regardless of where it takes place, squatting is essentially a struggle for survival by displaced villagers. It is an effort to survive and to succeed in an environment that is radically different from the familiar surroundings of the village community. Although each region and country has its own unique culture and values, the process of becoming part of the urban society by those previously excluded from it bears remarkable similarities across the board. Squatter settlements are established, conduct their internal dynamics and respond to external pressures in a more or less uniform fashion throughout the developing world.

Squatting is an openly defiant act, with squatters taking over almost any urban land which is left undeveloped or whose owners, whether public or private, do not reside near by. The absence of official or private efforts to curtail squatting helps perpetuate the further establishment of such settlements. Over time, the success of land takeovers in turn encourages more squatting by other migrants in search of places of residence.[62] It is, nevertheless, erroneous to assume that squatters like squatting or prefer such settlements to conventional housing. Squatting does, no doubt, involve an element of opportunism.[63] However, there can be no denial of the fact that rapid urban growth in the face of inelastic land supplies pushes up the cost of urban housing beyond the means of recent arrivals from the countryside.[64] Housing famine and urban landlessness compel migrants to reside wherever a place with a semblance of residential dwelling can be found. Seldom are migrants fortunate enough to find accommodation in the centre of the city or in houses that were once occupied by former elites and aristocrats.[65] They are thus forced to occupy land that is left empty, establishing in it shacks made up of whatever materials they can find. Manila's garbage dump, for example, a 22.6-hectare area known as Smokey Mountain, houses some 20,000 people.[66] Squatter shacks are typically made out of cardboard, tinfoil and other types of scrap metal and any other usable materials that can be found. In older and more settled establishments such as those found in Latin America, brick and mud huts are also found. The land available for squatting is almost always located on the periphery of the city, where squatters can

also get some reprieve from harassment by the authorities. The original establishment of squatter settlements on the city's periphery is often based on prior social relationships among the invaders, such as being members of the same ethnic or tribal minority or from the same general geographic area. Subsequent settlements also depend on having some type of common bond with the existing squatters, particularly in the form of shared ethnic or linguistic background.[67]

Within the squatter community itself, there are economic differences and subdivisions. Such differences are often based on the types of dwelling that squatters reside in, and the degree of control and ownership they have over their place of residence. Generally, the squatters' economic powers and status within the settlement grow with the length of their residence. Whereas younger migrants and recent arrivals tend to be more impoverished, those with greater experience in the urban arena and a longer history of residence in the settlement are more likely to be economically better off. While many never gain complete ownership over the land where they reside, they often become its *de facto* owner by default, to the point of renting it to others or converting it into stores and shops. Many, however, are not as fortunate and are forced to engage in all types of demeaning activity, from prostitution to sifting through garbage, in order to eke out a living.

Based on their ownership of and/or residence in various types of settlement, ten broad categories of squatter can be distinguished.

1. The owner squatter, who owns his quarters and has set up on any vacant land he can find. This type of squatter is the most common variety in the developing world.
2. The squatter tenant, usually a recent migrant and very poor, who rents from the owner squatter.
3. The squatter landlord, renting out huts, generally at exorbitant profit.
4. The squatter holdover, a former tenant who has ceased paying rent but is not evicted by the landlord out of fear.
5. The speculator squatter, for whom squatting is a profitable venture, hoping eventually to acquire the land he has squatted on.
6. The store squatter or occupational squatter, who establishes a small lock-up store on the land he does not own, selling mostly small items and some foodstuff.
7. The semi-squatter, who built his hut on private land and has since come to terms with the land's owner.
8. The corporate squatter, often formed out of a collectivity of squatters to protect it from outside intruders, public and private.
9. The floating squatter, who lives on a boat or a junk which is floated into the city's harbour. The float may be rented to other squatters, as in Hong Kong, and often serves as both a family home and a workshop.
10. The cemetery squatter, made-up of poor and recent arrivals who reside in cemeteries (usually over graves that are covered by a tomb) or on the grounds

of temples and other places of worship. This type of squatting is especially common in Islamic countries such as Egypt and Pakistan.[68]

One of the significant characteristics that these different types of settlement have in common is their role as agents of socialisation. This role is fulfilled in two ways. To begin with, squatter settlements often form the first lenses through which migrants see the city. Since squatter settlements are usually the first and often the primary base from which migrants undergo the process of urbanisation, they play an extremely important role in shaping the migrant's perception of and participation in the urban culture. Within this context, shantytowns and squatters give a sense of preparedness and a measure of security to their residents through endowing them with some social and cultural understanding – however distorted and minimal – of the inner workings of urban life. They are, in essence, 'breeding-grounds for a new form of social organisation which is adaptive to the socio-economic requisites of survival in the city'.[69] Moreover, socialisation is achieved in squatter settlements through the development of internal organisations and associations within the squatter community itself. Neighbourhood communities assume greater importance among lower-income levels than among those with higher income, largely because the former have few resources or little time for engaging in outside activities such as travelling or going to the theatre. Leisure activities are thus confined mostly to the neighbourhood, a confinement arising more out of necessity than choice. The associations that spring up in squatter settlements are almost always highly informal and frequently temporary, and are often centred on such activities as sports (often football), cockfights and card-playing, group picnics, or venturing off into the city or spending time in the local coffee house. Regular communal kitchens, with everyone pooling their food to feed the community, are also common in Peru and Brazil. Such informal networks of social organisation facilitate adjustment to the urban environment through providing solidarity and support, economically as well as emotionally and socially.[70] Often lonely and alienated from the surrounding urban culture, migrants may find their squatter settlement to be one of the few arenas from which they do not feel socially and culturally detached. Shantytowns are filled with people in pursuit of similar dreams and confronting the same difficulties.

Within squatter settlements, kinship is by far the most important factor in determining a migrant's social and economic status and his general welfare. When migrants reach the city, they usually move in with a relative or fellow villager who possesses some knowledge of the city. The role of this connection is crucial, for it determines the migrant's place of stay, the type and degree of assistance he receives, his first job or line of work and thus his economic status. Each migrant in turn helps several of his kinsfolk and friends settle into shantytowns by providing them with residence, tips about city life and securing a job, moral support and other forms of assistance. Subsequent moves within the city tend to be made with reference to pre-existing groups of relatives and friends elsewhere.[71] In contrast, migrants who

come to the city without any connections or prior relatives usually end up in even more dire economic circumstances, having to compete with other migrants for scarce jobs and places of residence.[72] Once a stranger in his neighbourhood and to others in his shantytown, a migrant may end up leading the life of a stranger throughout his stay in the city.[73]

Although they are left out of statistical studies, squatter dwellings form a major proportion of urban households and, naturally, are not without value.[74] In Latin America in the 1970s, squatters housed 10 to 20 per cent of the urban population.[75] Given their size, both in terms of population and the geographic area that they cover, squatter settlements can potentially be centres of intense economic activity. Within larger settlements, residents can generate income by serving as shopkeepers, craftsmen, preachers and even dentists and physicians.[76] Even more significant is the marketing of squatter dwellings. Squatter housing markets tend to behave as economically rational entities that operate similarly to conventional markets.[77] Like other strata of society, the poor are rational and engage in trade-offs which improve their living standards.[78] Although their choices are limited, they nevertheless do try to improve their economic lot through the means available to them. One way to accomplish this is by subletting or even selling their dwellings at exorbitant prices.[79] During the first few months after arrival, as a result, much of a new migrant's salary is spent on paying rent.[80] Meanwhile, those squatters who in various ways – by money, coercion or sharpness of mind – lay claim to their place of residence display remarkable vigour and ingenuity in improving their living conditions and their dwellings, thus increasing the monetary value of their shacks.[81]

Despite their role as agents of socialisation and as arenas in which migrants feel a greater emotional and cultural affinity with their surroundings, squatter settlements are far from being uniform and undivided entities. They are often comprised of migrants from different regions, each with distinct ethnic backgrounds and dialects. Often the only characteristic that residents of squatter settlements share is their common struggle to survive in the urban environment. Internally, shantytowns can be sharply divided along ethnic, linguistic, caste, economic and, to a lesser extent, religious lines.[82] Among these differences, ethnic cleavages stand out. Social and economic differences among the poor do exist, but are mostly felt only among themselves.[83] Differences arising from one's caste can also be highly important means of differentiation among the poor and residents of squatter settlements. However, caste and the social and cultural significance attached to it are largely important only in the Indian subcontinent and cannot be considered as a major factor in other parts of the developing world. Religious differences are also important, particularly in instances when a religious minority group happens to be an ethnic minority as well, such as the Sunni Kurds in Iran, the Karen in Burma and the Druze in Lebanon. Lastly, economic differences among members of the same squatter community often also serve as means of causing internal divisions within the

establishment. Such economically based differences originate not necessarily from the extent of the resources which migrants bring into the city but from the different types of job in which they engage after having found a place of residence. The majority of squatters are compelled by force of circumstances to accept whatever menial jobs come their way, be it sweeping streets, working as coolies or becoming domestic servants to the middle and upper classes. Some, however, find their way into the lumpen proletariat and even on to the middle classes.[84]

As already mentioned, by far the most important sources of differentiation among residents of squatter settlements are differences in ethnic background and, consequently, differences in accent and dialect. With the bonds and loyalties of nationhood still fragile in much of the developing world and subject to periodic bursts of regional separatism, ethnicity continues to be a volatile and powerful force in many developing countries. Within the context of migration and squatting, ethnicity's importance is greatly accentuated as it becomes not only a source of identity and belonging but also a means of support and security. The poorer and less educated a person, the more dependent he is likely to become on his co-ethnics for security and progress, as his alternative channels of non-ethnic assistance are limited.[85] When kinsfolk and relatives are not available, migrants and squatters rely on their co-ethnics for assistance and aid. Ethnically based cliques and segregationist tendencies within squatter settlements are thus not rare, and tempered only by the struggles of surviving from one day to the next.

REGIONAL IMBALANCES

Another equally important characteristic of urbanisation throughout the developing world is its acute rate of unevenness within individual countries. In almost all developing countries there are regions with intense concentrations of urbanisation that are located not far from areas with extremely low urban density. Urbanisation within the same country is often a highly uneven process, engulfing some regions to the point of saturation while barely touching others. Between urban centres of the same country there frequently are glaring disparities in the pattern in which industry, economic power and populations are concentrated. Larger cities encompass concentrations of social and political infrastructure – in the form of paved roads, housing, better and more modern facilities, government bureaux, better-equipped libraries and hospitals and so on – while smaller cities receive only token attention and are often left to develop as auxiliaries to larger metropolitan centres. Regional imbalances have, consequently, become some of the most striking features of Third World urbanisation.

Based on their population and geographic size, cities in the developing world can be divided into three types. The most noticeable are large metropolitan centres with highly dense concentrations of housing, roads, population and office buildings.

Examples of such sprawling giants, often called 'primary' cities, are most national capitals in small countries – such as Taipei in Taiwan, Seoul in South Korea, and Lima in Peru – or regional capitals in large countries – Rio de Janeiro and São Paulo in Brazil, and Calcutta, Bombay and Madras in India. 'Secondary' cities, in contrast, are smaller, with populations ranging between 100,000 and 2.5 million. Lastly, there are small cities and towns which are rural–urban interface centres, with populations downward of 100,000 depending on the particular characteristics of the country concerned.[86]

Primary cities can be found in developing countries that are highly urbanised and have achieved considerable advances in industrialisation (e.g. South Korea, Argentina and Taiwan), as well as in countries where high rates of urbanisation coexist with large-scale poverty (e.g. Egypt, El Salvador, Lebanon, Panama, Peru and Chile). Also, in countries that have remained predominantly rural, existing and relatively small enclaves of urban population tend to be concentrated into one primary city.[87] Afghanistan is one such country, where the majority of the population still comprises tribes living in the country's central, mountainous plateau. The urbanised population, meanwhile, is concentrated almost entirely in Kabul, the national capital, as well as in some of the country's much smaller secondary cities. Similarly, most of the African countries located in or near the Sahara Desert, especially Libya, Chad, Niger and Sudan, have one large primary city in the face of mostly rural and tribal populations. Population concentration is by far the most glaring characteristic of primary cities, which are often home to an incredibly large percentage of the national population (see Table 3.1 above). Yet unproportional concentrations of population are only one of the many features that set primary cities apart. Practically everywhere in the developing world, primary cities predominate in the politics, economy and cultural life of the country. Industries, services, capital, resources and political power are all concentrated in such cities, which are often considerably larger in size and population than the next largest city.[88] Whether national or regional capitals, primary cities exert an overwhelming influence over the life of the entire country and have significant impacts on nearby secondary and smaller cities. In larger countries where there are a number of different primary cities the national capital, which is frequently the largest in size and population, often surpasses the wealth, power and concentration of industry found in other primary cities.

The seemingly unrestrained growth of primary cities can principally be attributed to three interrelated developments. To begin with, primary cities receive special attention from governments since they often symbolise national identity, industrial development and worldly stature. For the people and politicians alike, massive and overgrown cities evoke images of national strength and pride, a sense of 'coming of age'. For political leaders, such cities assume special importance since not only are they often the seat of government but, more importantly, are testimony to the

development and military and economic prowess of the country. To turn one of these cities into a nerve-centre of domestic and international trade is often seen as one of the first steps towards building a modern nation-state. A conscious policy is thus promulgated through which one or a few of the country's largest cities are portrayed as symbolic of the nation's pride. This is done not only through concentrating industrial, economic and political power in these primary cities, but also through erecting national monuments and edifices, often in honour of past heroes or present leaders, through which the country's political leadership hopes to signal its present tenure in office and supposed contributions to history. The building of the *Shahyad* (King's Memorial) Square in Tehran by the late Shah of Iran, the gigantic People's Palace in Bucharest by Nicolae Ceauçescu, the *Malagan* Palace by Ferdinand Marcos in Manila and the huge statue of Kim Il Sung in the centre of Pyongyang are all representative of efforts by Third World leaders not merely to salute themselves but to enhance their nation's prestige and pride both among the domestic population and abroad.

The growth of primary cities is further perpetuated by the pre-existence of infrastructures that facilitate further industrial and economic development. Primary cities are more likely to have better resources such as roads, buildings, utilities and other forms of government services. The higher availability of skilled manpower and better educational facilities in larger cities accentuates the concentration of factories, workshops and businesses there in comparison with smaller, secondary cities and towns.[89] Similar considerations also figure prominently in the decisions of multinational firms seeking to invest in developing countries, as these firms often prefer to situate their local operations near national capitals instead of more remote areas. Apart from political considerations, Third World governments for the most part welcome the concentration of economic and industrial activities in primary cities as astute means of achieving national development. It is often assumed that the benefits of investments that are concentrated in large metropolitan centres will eventually trickle down to other parts of the country and reduce urban–rural and inter-regional disparities. The development of the centre is thought to result in the concurrent development of the periphery.[90] This assumption has proved to be erroneous, however, as the growth of large metropolitan centres often produces 'backwash effects' which drain rural hinterlands of their capital, labour and raw materials.[91] At times, the growth of large cities may eventually lead to the growth of smaller ones, especially in cases where the largest city seems to have reached its growth saturation, as has, for example, Seoul, South Korea. However, such a trickling down is unlikely to occur unless the largest city has reached the limits of its growth in terms of demography, geographic space and the capacity of the government to provide public services and utilities. Even when such a point is reached and the ensuing limitations have become insurmountable, neither the general public nor the state has been willing to take the necessary but costly corrective measures.

A final reason for the overwhelming growth of primary cities as opposed to secondary and smaller cities is their higher rate of in-migration from rural areas. Secondary cities have generally played a weak role in absorbing population increases in the developing world or in creating a more balanced spatial distribution of population.[92] At the same time, cities with higher levels of income and more diverse and secure employment tend to have higher in-migration and lower out-migration rates than do other cities.[93] Since there are considerably higher prospects for securing long-term employment in the industrial sector, located as it mostly is in or near the largest city, more migrants choose primary cities as their eventual destination. For them, secondary cities serve only as temporary stopping-off points in which they may earn some money towards their journey on to the largest city.[94] Added to the actual economic advantages of employment in primary cities is the general perception, by both rural and urban populations, that living conditions are generally better in larger metropolitan areas than in smaller cities.[95] This perception, as earlier mentioned, is deliberately cultivated by the government through architectural campaigns and other forms of propaganda directed towards achieving specific political ends.

Despite their allure to rural migrants and to residents of other urban areas, primary cities – whose rampant growth often turns them into 'mega-cities' – frequently lack the infrastructural capabilities and service needed to support their ever-expanding populations. The ensuing problems are often compounded by lack of adequate government resources or by mismanagement by municipal and other public officials. Some of the most common problems that chronically grip mega- or primary cities in the developing world include poor air and water quality, constant traffic congestion, inadequate solid waste disposal, sewage deficiencies and, in some cases, high crime rates.[96] For example, Delhi's Yamuna River collects some 200 million litres of untreated sewage daily, and 97 per cent of drinking water samples in Madras show signs of faecal contamination. Only 2 per cent of the population of Bangkok is connected to city sewers.[97] According to World Bank figures, in 1994–5, an astounding 92 per cent of the population of Paraguay did not have access to safe drinking water, and another 70 per cent did not have access to sanitation. In Myanmar in the same years, 61 per cent did not have access to safe drinking water and another 58 per cent did not have access to sanitation.[98]

It is often in primary cities that two of the latest features of the urban landscape of the developing world have appeared, namely gated communities for the super-wealthy and growing throngs of street children. For a variety of reasons, most of which are economic, an increasing number of children from squatter settlements as well as from other poor areas of the cities make the streets their home. According to estimates by the United Nations Children's Fund, one out of every ten children living on the streets in the developing world comes from a squatter settlement.[99] Most try to eke out a living however they can – shining shoes, selling gum, scavenging through garbage to find recyclable goods such as paper and plastic,

etc. – and many resort to working as prostitutes, pickpockets or petty thieves. In many war-ravaged countries of Africa, especially Sierra Leone, Angola, Mozambique and Liberia, children are routinely drafted by force into rebel armies, and sometimes even into government forces, and made to fight wars. As Table 3.2 shows, in Sub-Saharan Africa as much as 30 per cent of the labour force is made up of children between the ages of 10 and 14. In Thailand, according to a research study by Mahidol University, in 1997 some 185,000 children under the age of 15 were involved in some type of illegal work activity, mostly in the sex industry.[100]

Despite their often exaggerated sense of self-confidence – a necessity if they are to survive the hostile urban environment – street children frequently fall prey to unscrupulous older migrants who act as pimps or as their ring leader. Protection from the elements is also hard to come by, especially for those scavenging, and many often suffer from skin and respiratory problems of one kind or another. A far more immediate danger that street children face, especially in countries like Brazil, is being killed by civilians or police officers who consider them a nuisance. In much of the developing world, especially in places where mortality rates are high and poverty is rampant, human life is generally treated with less value than is the case elsewhere. Those at the lowest rungs of the economic ladder are especially considered worthless, a notion reinforced by the stigma of prostitution and petty theft. Many are routinely killed, therefore, by rival gangs, shopkeepers or police officers acting on the shopkeepers' behalf. In Rio de Janeiro, for example, on average three street children are murdered every day.[101]

At the opposite end of the scale are gated communities that, although still few, are beginning to spring up in the more affluent suburbs of primary cities in a number of developing countries, especially in African and South American countries where urban crime is rampant. Repeated and highly publicised episodes of child kidnappings and demands for ransom have pushed many wealthy urbanites into gated, almost impenetrable and often self-contained housing communities. These communities, like Rio's Barra da Tijunca neighbourhood, often resemble heavily armed fortresses that have their own private armed guards, elaborate security equipment, and high walls that set them very much apart from the rest of the urban landscape. Private security firms that have proliferated not only in Rio but in cities as diverse as Bogota, Cairo and Nairobi no longer cater exclusively to visiting business executives from abroad but to a growing domestic clientele as well. Naturally, property values in gated communities are astonishingly high, well out of the reach of ordinary middle classes, and thus residence there is considered highly prestigious for those who can afford the expense.

After primary cities come secondary cities, next in size and often considerably smaller in geographic area, population and significance. Secondary cities lack much of the political status, social and cultural sophistication and economic vitality and diversity of primary cities, although the quality of social services there is still much better than in smaller towns and in villages.[102] Public services do exist in secondary

cities and are on the increase, at times owing to local initiative and finance, though their growth is not as fast as in the largest cities. In contrast to primary cities the economic base of secondary cities is dominated not by big industry and huge manufacturing plants but by the informal tertiary sector and by small-scale industries. This does not mean that secondary cities are incapable of having and supporting large-scale manufacturing establishments, and some do. For the most part, however, secondary cities grow without the benefit of these establishments.[103] Bureaucrats, office workers, teachers and other civil servants form a considerable portion of the employed classes in secondary cities. However, the proportion of such white-collar employees in secondary cities is much lower compared with those found in primary cities. Instead, jobs in services and in small-scale industries, mostly in family-owned and -operated stores and workshops, and in the informal tertiary sector, such as various types of street vending and temporary employment, form the major types of economic activity in which residents of secondary cities engage. Stores selling small consumer goods such as bicycles, clothes, watches, automobile parts, herbs and rugs, as well as shops specialising in fixing flat tyres, taking photographs and carpentry, are where the majority of employment opportunities in secondary cities lie. Such a predominance of small-scale industry appears to be a mixed blessing: on the one hand, it does not generate enough income or employment, even for those who own and operate businesses, and its rate of profits returned is not great. On the other hand, small-scale industry provides low-cost goods and services for those with low income and acts as a potential source for further investments.[104]

Examining the various types of economic activity that predominate in secondary cities is important in understanding the demographic and sociological make-up of their residents. A sizeable portion of the population of secondary cities is comprised of long-term residents who migrated there from nearby villages in their youth and decided to stay. Most secondary-city residents are, therefore, only first- or second-generation urbanites and have relatives and kin in surrounding towns and villages. There are also a number of migrants en route to primary cities who temporarily stay and work in secondary cities in order to augment their available resources before moving on. Since secondary cities often form the geographic link between outlying villages and small towns and the primary city or cities, they serve as important transportation and communication links.[105] This factor makes them a favourite stopping-off area for migrants, many of whom find temporary employment in the vicinity of the city's bus terminal, where there is usually a flurry of informal economic activity, or in the local bazaar or marketplace, where low-skilled jobs in the tertiary sector abound. Generally, the paucity of opportunities for upward economic mobility in secondary cities reduces their retention rate of migrants and, instead, increases their rate of poverty and underemployment.[106]

While Third World governments allocate considerable resources and investments for establishing, maintaining and modernising social and economic infrastructures and public services in primary cities, secondary and smaller cities often suffer from official negligence and structural disrepair. Government-run services such as the public transportation system, utilities, schools and medical clinics and hospitals that are located in secondary cities tend to have lower quality and standards than those found in primary cities. In addition to the sparsity of direct government investments secondary cities are less likely to become regional bases for international or even domestic trade, a factor accentuated by the reluctance of most multinational firms to base their local operations there. Nevertheless, there are a few secondary cities in the developing world that receive special government attention either owing to their potential for foreign and domestic tourism or because of their historic or political significance. This special attention is often crystallised in the form of well-kept public services and impressive resort complexes that are geared more for foreign tourists than domestic visitors. Coastal towns with a favourable climate are often among such secondary cities to which Third World governments pay special attention, especially in Latin America and the Caribbean (Ocho Rios or Montego Bay in Jamaica), as are those cities that are outgrowths of ancient and historic places or events. Similar favoured treatment is also often given to smaller cities that happen to be birthplaces of prominent politicians and national leaders (Tikrit in Iraq, Saddam Hussein's birthplace).

Last in terms of urban population, economic and industrial strength, and political and administrative significance are small cities and towns. These are often geographically located between outlying villages and the regional secondary or primary cities, serving mostly as agricultural service and distribution centres. Such cities often grow out of existing rural centres or newly established industrial growth poles that are frequently centred on a single plant, such as an oil refinery, a silo, a salt mine or a sugar-cane factory. With the growth of population and industrial infrastructures over time, these old villages or new towns gradually come to assume something of an urban character. However, most small cities and towns are merely overgrown villages that have paved roads and the other public amenities from which most rural areas have yet to benefit. Economically, the employment base of small cities is slightly different from that of secondary cities since most of the economically active population in small towns is in the employ of a single large plant or factory around which the economic life of the community revolves. Similar to secondary cities, however, small cities and towns have numerous family-owned and -operated shops and stores. Nevertheless, great variations in wealth and status among the inhabitants of these cities are often difficult to detect.

CONCLUSION

As the above examination demonstrates, urbanisation is accompanied by a number of fundamental structural difficulties with which most Third World governments are unable to deal adequately. These problems include the seemingly endless stream of rural migrants to major metropolitan areas, their subsequent residence in sprawling squatter settlements located on the periphery of cities and their contribution to uneven rates of population growth and varying degrees of urbanisation within the same country. For the most part, Third World governments have been unable to halt or at least to slow down the rate at which these developments have been taking place. In most of the developing world the unimpeded persistence and growth of such difficulties arise from the government's preoccupation in bringing about rapid industrial development, often with little regard for the ensuing consequences. Embroiled in a race to lessen their industrial and technological inferiority vis-à-vis the West, Third World governments frequently ignore or pay insufficient attention to the less desirable side-effects that arise from development. Even in countries where the negative consequences of hurried industrial development and rampant urbanisation have been detected, there is often a conspicuous lack of political will and conviction to deal with them in a decisive manner.

The unimpeded flow of rural migrants to the cities is clearly one such ramification of Third World urbanisation which, for a variety of reasons, has not been curtailed. Migration of rural inhabitants, and with it their subsequent residence in subhuman conditions in squatter settlements and ghettos, is a significant problem which, if left unabated, can and has resulted in widespread social and political disruptions. More importantly, the misery which migrants unwittingly undergo during and after their migration to the cities – the deprivation and degradation which they had never experienced before – can under no circumstances be justified in the name of progress and development. Third World cities can hardly support their indigenous populations, and they are completely incapable of supporting the everexpanding pool of migrants. Migration is, undoubtedly, an extremely serious and volatile problem, one which Third World governments desperately need to tackle but are hopelessly ill-prepared for.

Four broad policy measures can be adopted to curtail rural–urban migration: direct control over population mobility by the central government; increasing rates of rural income vis-à-vis urban income; rural development policies; and the promotion of rural education.[107] Each of these policy initiatives requires strong commitment and the allocation of considerable resources by the government, requirements that few Third World governments are willing to meet even if they have the resources to do so. For example, establishing direct and effective control over the entire population and monitoring the movement from rural areas to the cities requires an enormous bureaucratic machinery. Nevertheless, two governments, China and North Korea,

have long established severe restrictions on population mobility and have met with notable successes. For example, the population of the North Korean capital, Pyongyang, has remained constant at approximately 1,500,000 for almost ten years, and in Shanghai the size of the city's population decreased from 7.2 million in 1957 to about 5.7 million in 1972–3.[108] In North Korea and China control over the mobility of the population is established by an overwhelming bureaucracy that controls almost all aspects of the people's lives. Temporary visits to major Chinese cities by those living in rural areas are allowed but long-term residence is illegal and requires registration with the appropriate authorities. Avoiding such registration is all but impossible.[109]

Despite the workability of such drastic measures to stop rural migration in China and North Korea, such policies remain highly costly and are too controversial to be practised by less authoritarian governments. They are also far less easy to enforce in countries that lack the overall totalitarian doctrinal beliefs and political mechanisms of the Chinese and North Koreans. Much more practical and considerably less costly is the attempt to bring greater parity in the rates of income and the general levels of economic well-being that exist in rural and urban centres. As discussed earlier, the principal reasons underlying rural–urban migration are economic. Increasing rural income levels by themselves will not help and is likely to increase migration since more villagers will be able to afford to migrate. Instead, what is needed are adequate measures that would hamper the growth of urban income while maintaining the purchasing power of the public. Narrowing the income gap between the urban and rural areas through stabilising urban incomes is one of the most effective ways of reducing the flow of migrants.[110] At the same time, increasing the productivity levels of rural areas through the promulgation of rurally oriented development programmes, thus increasing the general wealth of rural residents, narrows the income differentials of rural versus urban areas and reduces the rate of internal migration.[111] Concurrent with the promotion of rural development is the need to place greater emphasis on rural education, not merely in the number of rural teachers and schools but, more importantly, in the quality of teaching. Instead of preparing bright young villagers for jobs that can be found only in the cities, rural schools need to reorient their focus in the direction of indigenous rural conditions and other relevant matters. Inculcating nationalist values through the educational system and the selective teaching of subjects are practised by almost all governments. However, doing so at the expense of teaching young villagers how to become better farmers, as is so often done in the developing world, only deprives rural areas of their most promising inhabitants.

NOTES

1. Andrei Rogers. 'Sources of Urban Population Growth and Urbanization, 1950–2000: A Demographic Accounting'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 486. Also see Jacques Ledent. 'Rural–Urban Migration, Urbanization, and Economic Development'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 509.
2. See below, Chapters 4 and 5.
3. Warwick Armstrong and T. G. McGee. *Theatres of Accumulation: Studies in Asian and Latin American Urbanization.* (London: Methuen, 1985), p. 41.
4. Ibid. pp. 41–2.
5. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants: The Political Economy of Third World Urbanization.* (London: Sage, 1978), p. 61.
6. Richard Hay. 'Patterns of Urbanization and Socio-economic Development in the Third World: An Overview', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds) *Third World Urbanization.* (Chicago: Maaroufa, 1977), p. 81.
7. Ibid. p. 79.
8. Data compiled from Barry Turner (ed.) *The Statemen's Yearbook, 1997–1998.* (New York: St Martin's, 1999).
9. Charles Becker and Andrew Morrison. 'The Determinant of Urban Population Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 36, no. 2 (January 1988), p. 259.
10. Johannes Linn. 'The Costs of Democracy in the Developing Countries'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 628.
11. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 138.
12. Johannes Linn. 'The Costs of Democracy in the Developing Countries'. p. 630.
13. Richard Stern. 'The Administration of Urban Services', in Richard Stern and Rodney White (eds) *African Cities in Crisis: Managing Rapid Urban Growth.* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989), p. 22.
14. Ibid.
15. John Herbert. *Urban Development in the Third World: Policy Guidelines.* (New York: Praeger, 1979), p. 10.
16. Ibid. p. 9.
17. Ozzie Simmons. *Perspectives on Development and Population Growth in the Third World.* (London: Plenum, 1988), p. 47.
18. T. G. McGee. *The Urbanization Process in the Third World: Explorations in Search of a Theory.* (London: G. Bell & Sons, 1971), p. 16.
19. Andrei Rogers and Jeffrey Williams. 'Migration, Urbanization, and Third World Development: An Overview'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 464.
20. Allen Findlay and Anne Findlay. *Population and Development in the Third World.* (London: Methuen, 1987), p. 30. For a detailed critique of the demographic 'transition' theory, see Ozzie Simmons. *Perspectives on Development and Population Growth in the Third World.* pp. 92–100.
21. John Herbert. *Urban Development in the Third World.* p. 7.
22. Josef Gugler. 'Overurbanization Reconsidered', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), p. 74.
23. Samuel Preston. 'Urban Growth in the Developing Countries: A Demographic Reappraisal', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 14.
24. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 105.
25. Andrei Rogers and Jeffrey Williams. 'Migration, Urbanization, and Third World Development: An Overview'. p. 25.

26. Allen Findlay and Anne Findlay. *Population and Development in the Third World.* p. 16.
27. Ibid. pp. 26–7.
28. Ibid. p. 32.
29. Joan Nelson. *Access to Power: Politics and the Urban Poor in Developing Nations.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979), pp. 50–1.
30. Rodney White. 'The Influence of Environmental and Economic Factors on the Urban Crisis', in Rodney White and Richard Stern (eds) *African Cities in Crisis: Managing Rapid Urban Growth.* p. 11.
31. Mass resettlements and other demographic dislocations are particularly commonplace in countries where guerrilla warfare and protracted civil wars have been waged for many years, such as in Afghanistan, Peru, El Salvador and Mozambique.
32. Michael Lipton. 'Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 40.
33. Ibid. p. 43.
34. Johannes Linn. 'The Costs of Democracy in the Developing Countries'. p. 632.
35. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 89.
36. Ibid. p. 99.
37. Oded Stark and David Lavhari. 'On Migration and Risk in the LDCs'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 31, no. 1 (October 1982), p. 192.
38. See Chapter 4.
39. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 101.
40. Dennis Rondinelli. *Secondary Cities in Developing Countries: Policies for Diffusing Urbanization.* (London: Sage, 1983), pp. 63–4.
41. Ibid. p. 163.
42. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty, and Development: Urbanization in the Third World.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982), p. 60.
43. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 93.
44. Joan Nelson. *Access to Power.* p. 53.
45. Ibid. p. 60.
46. Warwick Armstrong and T. G. McGee. *Theatres of Accumulation.* p. 47.
47. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty, and Development.* p. 59.
48. Gary Fields. 'Place to Place Migration in Colombia'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 557.
49. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* pp. 96–7.
50. Joan Nelson. *Access to Power.* p. 81.
51. Ibid. p. 61.
52. Julian Laite. 'The Migrant Response in Central Peru', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 64.
53. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 104.
54. Julian Laite. 'The Migrant Response in Central Peru'.
55. Samuel Preston. 'Urban Growth in the Developing Countries: A Demographic Reappraisal', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 27.
56. Oded Stark and Robert Lucas. 'Migration, Remittances and the Family'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 36, no. 3 (April 1988), pp. 465–6.
57. Ibid. p. 478.
58. Dennis Rondinelli. *Secondary Cities in Developing Countries.* p. 162.
59. Brian Berry. *Comparative Urbanization: Divergent Paths in the Twentieth Century.* (New York: St Martin's, 1981), p. 88.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid. p. 83.
62. Charles Abrams. 'Squatting and Squatters', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds) *Third World Urbanization.* p. 293.

63. Ibid. p. 294.
64. Allen Kelley and Jeffrey Williamson. 'The Limits to Urban Growth: Suggestions for Macromodeling Third World Economies'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 598.
65. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 149.
66. Harry Richardson. 'Inefficiency and Welfare in LDC Mega-cities', in John Kasarda and Allan Parnell (eds) *Third World Cities: Problems, Policies, and Prospects.* (London: Sage, 1993), p. 43.
67. Ibid. pp. 146–7.
68. Charles Abrams. 'Squatting and Squatters'.
69. Larissa Lomnitz. 'The Social and Economic Organization of a Mexican Shantytown', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 242.
70. Wayne A. Cornelius. 'The Political Sociology of Cityward Migration in Latin America: towards Empirical Theory', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds) *Third World Urbanization.* p. 223.
71. Larissa Lomnitz. 'The Social and Economic Organization of a Mexican Shantytown'. p. 245.
72. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty, and Development.* p. 58.
73. Ibid. p. 123.
74. Emmanuel Jimenez. 'The Value of Squatter Dwellings in Developing Countries'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 4 (July 1982), p. 751.
75. Bryan Roberts. *Cities of Peasants.* p. 137.
76. Ibid. p. 151.
77. Emmanuel Jimenez. 'The Value of Squatter Dwellings in Developing Countries'. p. 752.
78. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty and Development.* p. 87.
79. Charles Abrams. 'Squatting and Squatters'.
80. Andrei Rogers and Jeffrey Williams. 'Migration, Urbanization, and Third World Development: An Overview'. p. 474.
81. Brian Berry. *Comparative Urbanization.* p. 88.
82. Alan Gilbert and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty, and Development.* p. 142.
83. Joan Nelson. *Access to Power.* p. 141.
84. Anthony Leeds. 'Housing-settlement Types, Arrangements for Living, Proletarianization, and the Social Structure of the City', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds) *Third World Urbanization.* p. 333.
85. Joan Nelson. *Access to Power.* p. 217.
86. Dennis Rondinelli. *Secondary Cities in Developing Countries.* p. 48.
87. Ibid. pp. 28–9.
88. Ibid. p. 19.
89. Ibid. p. 93.
90. Ibid. p. 178.
91. Ibid. p. 16.
92. Ibid. pp. 59–60.
93. Gary Fields. 'Place to Place Migration in Colombia'. p. 557.
94. Dennis Rondinelli. *Secondary Cities in Developing Countries.* p. 159.
95. Ibid. p. 39.
96. Harry Richardson. 'Inefficiency and Welfare in LDC Mega-cities'. p. 43.
97. Ibid. p. 44.
98. World Bank. *World Development Report, 1997.* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 1997), pp. 78–79.
99. Carol Bellamy. *The State of the World's Children 1997.* (New York: UNICEF, 1997), p. 41.
100. 'Indochina's Street Children'. *Comtex Newswire.* 11 February 1997.

101. Carol Bellamy. *The State of the World's Children 1997.* p. 40.
102. Dennis Rondinelli. *Secondary Cities in Developing Countries.* p. 78.
103. Ibid. p. 147.
104. Ibid. pp. 151– 3.
105. Ibid. p. 153.
106. Ibid. p. 39.
107. Richard Sabot. 'Migration and Urban Surplus Labor: Policy Options', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 96.
108. Martin King Whyte. 'Social Control and Rehabilitation in Urban China', in Josef Gugler (ed.) *The Urbanization of the Third World.* p. 266.
109. Ibid.
110. Richard Sabot. 'Migration and Urban Surplus Labor: Policy Options'. p. 98.
111. Ibid. p. 103

4   Social change

The institutional and infrastructural changes that occur in the developing world have paramount effects on the daily lives of people. The establishment of factories, the building of roads and new housing units, the fiscal and economic policies adopted by the state, the large-scale movement of rural inhabitants towards urban areas – all signify the *structural* changes taking place throughout the developing world. Concurrent with, and reinforcing, such changes are somewhat less discernible yet equally significant alterations in people's attitudes, views and general cultural orientation. It is within the context of a changing environment – politically, economically, as well as industrially – that what is generally known as 'social change' occurs. Thus a complete understanding of politics and society in the developing world is impossible without examining the processes associated with social change. The study assumes added importance in the context of the developing world, where political systems, industrial infrastructures and social and cultural value systems tend to be highly elastic and impermanent. It is this very elasticity of norms and values that leads not only to social crises and intrasocietal imbalances, but also to political instability, upheavals and even revolutions. The manner and processes through which social change is brought about are equally important, as are the ramifications of social change on the various social classes and on other emerging social and economic groups.

Changes in social conduct and cultural outlook on the one hand, and in industrial and economic infrastructures of society on the other, often develop simultaneously and as a consequence of one another, frequently reinforcing each other. There has long been an intense academic debate over the primacy and greater political relevance of social and cultural changes as opposed to industrial and economic ones. Ultimately, the significance attributed to one approach over another often depends on the doctrinal lenses through which the subject is studied. However, particularly in so far as the study of political and sociological characteristics is concerned, minimising the importance of either socio-cultural or industrial–economic developments, whether independently or at the expense of one another, is at best academically short-sighted. Social change is fostered by complex and interrelated

dynamics that arise out of both industrial and economic forces as well as social and cultural factors. Within this framework, an examination of processes and ramifications of social change in the developing world assumes great importance.

Simply put, social change refers to the 'alteration of a social system over time'.[1] It entails changes in the social and cultural underpinnings of a society.[2] More specifically, social change results in changes in attitudes, views and the social and cultural outlooks of those whom it affects. As I have noted elsewhere, 'one of the effects of social change is the lack of persistence of norms (i.e. the expected pattern of behaviour)'.

> There are many conflicting varieties of accepted, or rather competing, modes of social behaviour in a society undergoing social change and it becomes impossible to detect a single and identifiably consistent set of norms. There is, therefore, conflict not only between the differing social values that prevail in society but also between norms. Rural immigrants, industrial labourers, wage-earners, the salaried middle class, and even the wealthy elite are all confronted with the enigmatic problem of how to behave properly in the presence of others with equal or superior social standing. The accepted and expected patterns of conduct and behaviour undergo such rapid changes, and new social groupings and segments develop at such rapid rates that the society as a whole cannot retain an interrelated set of norms. Each social group acquires its own set of norms, along with its attached values, and thus there often develops a vast gap between the value system of one group as opposed to those of another.[3]

Social change is not, however, confined to mere behavioural and attitudinal changes. Cultural confusion, for lack of a better phrase, is only one side-effect of social change. Social change leads to tensions and strains,[4] painfully reminding social actors of their constant need to change and to adapt to new and radically different circumstances. Changes brought on by industrial development require new thinking, a new outlook on life. And yet old attitudes and values are not the only items compromised by the advent of social change. Social relations change, be they those that bind together kinship networks or, for example, relations between employers and employees. New social groups spring into existence, each unique in its characteristics and social and economic positions. Previously non-exsitent social groups, who owe their very genesis to industrial development and modernisation, come into being, having distinct cultural orientations and value systems. Mobility increases, not only geographically but, more importantly, socially and economically.

The example of a new road linking a remote village to a neighbouring town well illustrates the process of social change as induced by industrial growth. The possibility of travel, especially to a place where there are greater and more diverse employment opportunities, disrupts prevailing social relationships and attitudes, many of which would not have changed otherwise. The need to travel and thus to

spend less time in the village community disrupts, among other things, the traditional relationships between members of extended families that still continue to prevail in most Third World villages. Other aspects of the affected villagers' lives also change, such as their perception of the surrounding environment, attitudes towards riding the bus or resentment towards strangers, and many other, less obvious social and cultural differences that are brought on by a desire for social and economic mobility. How the villager was made aware of the possibility of social and economic advancement in the first place is itself a matter of crucial importance, discussed in later pages. Once exposed and subjected to alternative value systems and modes of behaviour, whether by free will or by the force of circumstances, the villager is confronted with a changing social and cultural environment, becoming a participant in the process of social change. He is faced with choices he never had to make before, must behave and think differently from what he is used to, and is forced to live in a constantly changing environment. His very actions, meanwhile, further reinforce and add to the strength and intensity of the process of social change. He is at the same time a product and a proponent of social change.

An analysis of social change cannot be complete without taking into account a number of central attributes, such as the magnitude of change, its direction, time span, rate and the amount, if any, of the violence involved.[5] While hardly quantifiable, an appreciation of these attributes is crucial to understanding the very nature of the social changes taking place and the context within which they occur. Throughout the developing world, with the important exception of post-revolutionary states, the general direction in which social change has taken place is alternately referred to by most scholars as towards 'formalism', 'modernisation', 'structural complexity' or, rather crudely, 'Westernism'.[6] Social change brings about important shifts in the prevailing choices and the behaviour of social actors. Such changes involve a general erosion of particularistic exclusiveness (e.g. races or castes), with achievements and merits replacing the importance of ascriptive criteria.[7] The society as a whole becomes more adaptive, being able not only to generate continuous change but also to absorb changes from outside its own institutions. 'Modernization, from a sociological view', it has been argued, 'consists of a process of proliferation in which the basic elements of all social systems, the roles and institutions, are rapidly increasing.'[8] Moreover, there occurs a general increase in the formalisation of institutional arrangements because:

> traditional practices can no longer be depended upon to provide guides to action. Other means of administration must be utilized. This is accompanied by increasing formalization, which involves the continual encompassing of larger areas within the framework of formal organizations, social units whose base rests on a written charter and similar instrumentalities.[9]

The advent of formal organisations and procedures reduces the central role played by clientalist and patrimonial practices. Patrimonial societies, common throughout the developing world, are based on 'a highly flexible and paternalistic public order in which the spoils of office are used by the ruling groups to reward friends, co-opt potential and actual opponents, to satisfy local and regional allies, and generally to incorporate newly-emerging groups into the system'.[10] Such practices still predominate in the social, political and economic lives of most developing countries, in some more than in others, but they have been subject to strains of late owing to the valuational changes brought on by social development.

Some observers have equated the advent of social change with Westernism, believing that a general abandonment of older, more traditional values and modes of behaviour automatically means their replacement with those prevalent in the West.[11] This assumption is correct in some but not all aspects. The general growth of formal organisations and practices in the developing world is indeed parallel to a similar process that occurred in most Western societies some time ago, where affluence and opportunity replaced the need to rely on personal relationships and informal networks to accomplish desired goals.[12] Thus the move from informality towards formality, interpreted narrowly, is synonymous with Westernisation. It also happens to be the case that most of the mechanisms through which social change is diffused, whether they are trips abroad, television and radio sets, the internet or facsimile machines, or official government policies, were created and are often geared towards the promotion of values that are generally associated with the West. The weakening of kinship bonds as a result of the break-up of extended families and their conversion into nuclear ones, the abandonment of traditional attire in favour of uniforms or a certain dress code, the primacy given to symbols associated with the modern state (like the flag and the national anthem) over other traditional symbols or forms of folklore, and the emergence of allegiances and loyalties to secular bureaucratic and political figures instead of local, tribal or ethnic patrons, are all examples of the more subtle undercurrents lessening the incredible social and cultural gaps between the developing world and Western countries. Often the Westernising effects of social change are not nearly as subtle: the popular adoption of Western-style pop music, fashion, housing, foodstuffs, even speech and literature. Whether blatant or less obvious, the Westernising effects of social change are immense and undeniable.

But automatically to equate social change with Westernisation is inaccurate, for while social change may result in Westernisation, it doesn't necessarily follow that it does. While most Third World governments promote Western social and cultural values, others, although relatively few, try to direct their societies' social change in the opposite direction by promoting culturally indigenous, radical, 'progressive' and at times anti-Western values. In the broadest sense social change involves the transformation of values. What specific direction that transformation points towards varies from case to case. That authoritarian state structures are often needed to

nurture the evolution of politically motivated norms and values attests to the pervasive nature of social change. Post-revolutionary governments in the former Soviet Union, China and Iran, and the culturally insular government of Saudi Arabia all offer examples of states which, either under the pretext of guarding against 'bourgeois' influences or those of 'the infidels', have with varying degrees of success tried to engineer social change in order to attain specific, non-Western, popular cultural outlooks.

The spread of social change in its various manifestations, be it formalism of an institutional or a social nature (i.e. formalism in relationships among social actors), or social and cultural Westernisation, is by no means a uniform process, affecting certain social strata or ethnic groups more than others. Some groups are more eager to abandon the old and embrace the new. Similarly, some values are less resilient to change than others. Certain values and attitudes – such as kinship bonds – are highly tenacious and largely resist the onslaught of change, while others are eagerly abandoned and replaced.[13] The underlying causes for the acceptability of certain new values among some social groups are discussed later in this chapter. During the process of social change all values do not necessarily change, or change equally, among those affected. It is within this context that an understanding of the magnitude of social change is important. In fact, because of the very lack of uniformity inherent in the process of social change, there are often great variations within the prevailing norms and values of the same culture. A practice considered taboo by some segments of society may be a daily routine for others within the same society (such as the wearing of the veil by some women and cosmetics by others in the Arab world), or a set of values widely accepted in one part of the country may be frowned on in other parts. Selective application of social change, coupled with the deliberate promotion of certain values aimed at target audiences, both of which are commonly practised by Third World states, intensifies intra-society cultural differences. Dislocated social systems are, as a result, a prominent feature of societies in the developing world.[14]

Ensuing social and political conflicts – and thus instability – are inevitable. Social change is an inherently destabilising process, creating not only imbalances within the values of a society but sharp and deeply entrenched conflicts between those who hold such differing values. The process of social change gives rise to new social classes whose position in the social structure may be anomalous and who may, therefore, express considerable social and cultural dissatisfaction, even though their conditions relative to other strata might have improved.[15] Members of the lumpen proletariat or the new middle classes are cases in point. The more intense the process of social change, the more acute are the differences between the various social groups likely to be, whether between the working and the middle classes or between particular social classes and those in power. Intra-society conflicts or frictions between various social classes often crystallise in the form of segregated

neighbourhoods, tribal or inter-ethnic rivalries or the development of prejudicial values directed against tribal, ethnic or religious minorities. The overall result is an intensification of social cleavages and cultural differentiations.

The disruptive effects of social change do not stop at the social and cultural planes but reach into the political sphere as well. Social change has the potential of disturbing the political process in two ways. It can nurture beliefs and values that are contradictory to those promoted by the state, or result in the creation of new groups demanding the right to political participation and state accountability. Social change often results in the promotion of values that undermine the legitimacy of existing political systems, particularly in cases where the state does not actively promote a set of rigid socio-cultural guidelines. Prior to the latest wave of democratisation, values related to democratic rights and greater political representation were not necessarily those that Third World states championed. But, even then, they were widely popular among significant segments of society. Throughout history, social and cultural 'dissynchronisation' has been one of the most salient causes of revolutions and other forms of political upheaval.[16] Moreover, the growth of formal practices and the gradual shift towards a participant society exposes the state to new forms of competition for which it is not prepared. Groups that had hitherto been on the sidelines begin moving towards the centre in the hope of participating in the political process.[17] The weakly articulated institutional apparatuses of the state are incapable of absorbing the influx of aspiring political participants or of fulfilling their demands.[18] Political conflict ensues, either in the form of regime changes or, in extreme cases, in the form of revolutions.

INSTRUMENTS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

Social change may result from any one of four phenomena: modernisation, diffusion, indigenously initiated alterations within the social system or through what some scholars have called 'culture lag'. Brief mention was made earlier of the effects that technological modernisation and industrial development have on entrenched values and norms. Closely linked with modernisation is the phenomenon of 'culture lag', caused by differential rates of change among the various parts of modern culture.[19] The lag in the rate of change in the 'material culture' as opposed to 'adaptive culture' (i.e. customs, beliefs, laws, etc.) leads to 'cultural maladjustments' and to social change.[20] A much more drastic way in which social change is brought about, particularly in the developing world, is through diffusion with other cultures, a linkage often created via the electronic media and also, though to a lesser extent, by travel and literature. Indigenously induced social change may be political or sociological in nature, though political dynamics often play a more prominent role in causing social change. But sociological developments are not without significance. For example, social change can occur when a society becomes unable to cope

adequately with the various forces that are engendered in it, therefore rendering structural and systemic changes inevitable. Both Karl Marx and Talcott Parsons, for example, saw factors indigenous to the social system as the main cause of social change; while Marx focused on the 'contradictions' between the forces and the modes of production, Parsons examined the 'differentiations' and the 'variations' of a society's 'subsystems'.[21] Government policy initiatives are also commonly used to instil certain values among the population and to alleviate or at least discredit some others. The inculcation of specific values by the state becomes even more intense in post-revolutionary polities, where new ruling elites seek even harder to find socially and culturally justifiable values for their political doctrines and social agendas. A similar overall cultural shift occurs during wars of national liberation, when previously cherished cultural symbols are discarded, at times even ridiculed, and are replaced by new ones.

Industrialisation contributes to social change by necessitating alterations in values, personal habits, kinship bonds and other forms of relationship, and in creating new social classes with new characteristics and patterns of life. More specifically, industrialisation results in the appearance of new employment opportunities and migratory movements, changes the ecological and environmental surroundings with which people are familiar, and leads to the creation of new systems for organising and controlling people in their multiple relationships. New groups of people are formed, as are new collective interests around which their lives are organised. Monetary and contractual agreements assume considerably greater significance than before and new patterns of income and consumption begin governing people's lives.[22] The ensuing social changes, particularly in the developing world, where an industrial heritage has been noticeably absent, are of unparalleled proportions. Especially in Third World cities the overwhelming majority of the social classes owe their very existence to either the process of industrialisation itself or to its various ramifications. Migrants and seasonal workers, industrial labourers, plant managers, factory owners and so-called industrialists all come into being precisely because of the appearance and spread of industrialisation. Other groups, such as bureaucrats and civil servants, bankers and financiers, and import–export merchants and other middlemen, are also formed as a result of industrial development. Each of these groups has its own values and related work ethics, its own patterns of income and consumption, and its own social and economic interests and pursuits.

The role of industrialisation as an agent of social change can be well illustrated by the example of migrant workers. The establishment of a new factory on the outskirts of a large metropolitan area invariably results in the diversion of resources away from rural areas and the agricultural sector and, instead, into those urban areas where industrial infrastructures are already widespread.[23] The resulting rural depression and urban growth disrupt class formations in the rural and urban areas. Farmers and peasants find agricultural activities less profitable and jobs in the

industrial sectors become increasingly more appealing. Migrants are formed, soon comprising a class of their own with distinct pursuits and characteristics. Failure to become fully absorbed into the industrial labour force compels most to seek odd jobs of all sorts, many of which would probably never have existed had it not been for industrialisation and its ramifications: handymen, car minders, window cleaners, drivers and so on. Those who are successful in joining the industrial labour force soon find some of their deeply entrenched values compromised by their new predicaments. The extended family is no longer the central part of their life and economic livelihood as it once was, being replaced now by fellow workers, employers, managers and the like. At times, religious principles and rituals are sidelined for the sake of social relationships and economic necessities. And one's priorities and desires are shifted radically, shaped by evolving circumstances and changing needs.

Industrial development has similar effects on other social classes, especially on the middle classes and the economic elite. They too find their social and cultural values changed owing to the onslaught of industrialisation, their priorities shifted and their social and economic relationships altered. Since Third World industrialisation has come to be an overwhelmingly urban phenomenon, its most acute contributions to social change affect those groups that are in one way or another linked with the urban environment. Industrialisation brings about social change in the rural areas by effecting a reorganisation of social and economic relationships: the peasant becomes a member of a different social class, be it migrant labour, the proletariat or the civil service, groups that are more closely in touch with the city than the village. While values prevailing in rural areas are changed as a result of industrially induced social change, their immediate consequences are not as apparent as they are in metropolitan centres.

Of the groups in the developing world whose social positions are especially affected by social change, women stand out. This observation is important, for it deals not with socio-economic or ethnic stratifications but rather with differences in gender roles and the varying social positions traditionally ascribed to the different sexes. The introduction of women into the labour force is one of the most important contributions of industrialisation to social change. Similar to the male population, women's introduction into the labour force has been either a direct result of industrialisation or due to its numerous ramifications. In most developing countries, over three-quarters of the assembly industry's labour force is made up of women, reaching as high as 85 per cent in the electronics industry.[24] Positions created to facilitate the administrative aspects of industrialisation similarly involve the heavy participation of women, especially lower-ranking positions – such as clerical jobs – that do not require much technical knowledge and do not command authority. Again, traditional values such as the importance of motherhood, women's exclusion from the public domain, men's dominance of formal employment opportunities and earning money, and other traditional practices and values are eroded as the general

social and economic positions of women are somewhat ameliorated through industrialisation.

There is, nevertheless, considerable debate among observers of the developing world as to whether participation in the industrial process actually improves the status of women or merely changes the façade of their exploitation. Throughout the developing world, women's entrance into the labour force has been circumscribed and limited to participation at the lowest social and economic echelons. While women comprise the vast majority of assembly workers, typists, clerks and other non-technical, non-authoritative personnel, managerial jobs requiring diplomas or special degrees are almost exclusively the domain of men. Women are frequently pushed into the marginal economy, with their upward social mobility limited and their productive roles increasingly dependent on men.[25] Moreover, the large number of women in industrial plants, especially on assembly lines, does not necessarily attest to their emancipation from exploitative labour practices or social norms. Transnational companies, for one, are alleged to prefer female labourers because women in the labour force tend to be less demanding and more docile.[26] Whether positive or negative, the profound effects of industrialisation on the status of women in the developing world cannot be denied and have dramatically altered the social and economic composition of the Third World's urban landscape.

Closely related to industrialisation's effects on social change is the phenomenon known as culture lag. Similar to industrialisation, social change is brought about through culture lag because changes in one aspect of society necessitate parallel adjustments in other aspects. 'The various parts of modern culture', proponents of the culture lag theory argue, 'are not changing at the same rate, some parts are changing much more rapidly than others.'[27] Changes in one part of culture, industrial relations, for example, require readjustments and changes in other cultural components, such as education. A differential rate of change eventually leads to changes in social values, relationships and other manifestations of social change. On a purely theoretical level, it is difficult to distinguish the different ways in which industrialisation and culture lag result in social change. Both approaches are based on essentially the same premise and envisage similar results. Nevertheless, an argument could be made that while industrialisation brings about changes to social norms because of *technological* advances, culture lag does so via changes in *material culture* (i.e. cultural forms associated with material objects, such as driving).

The effects of industrialisation and culture lag on changes in the social make-up and the cultural orientation of Third World societies are enormous. They are, however, far surpassed in magnitude by the dramatic consequences of diffusion with other cultures.[28] Few cultural norms and symbols emerge independently from within a society. More often, they are borrowed from other cultures or are heavily influenced by them. The passage of traits native to one culture into another, to which they have hitherto been alien, causes changes in social systems. Some of the

mechanisms through which diffusion usually leads to social change include ethnic movements, military conquests, missionary activities, commerce, revolutions and gradual infiltration.[29] With the overwhelming role played by the electronic media today, especially within Third World societies, the cross-cultural diffusion of values and norms is made even more commonplace.[30] Due to the special social and cultural characteristics of societies in the developing world, several other practices and developments also lead to diffusion with other cultures. Chief among them are education, travel, perceptions and images.

The importance of diffusion on social change in the developing world can hardly be overstated. In early modernisers modernisation was mostly piecemeal and by innovation. In late-modernising societies, in contrast, many modern institutions and practices are imposed on traditional societies almost overnight and often on a wholesale basis.[31] In the developing world diffusion is marked by a one-way flow of cultural influence from the West and into Third World societies. The cultural diffusion that occurs in the developing world has a decidedly one-way trajectory: it accentuates the prevalence of Western cultural traits in Third World societies. The underlying causes for this one-way flow of influence are largely derived from the economic power behind Western cultural values. These are either directly imposed through colonial or neocolonial arrangements, or are inculcated and given increasing popularity by indigenous elites who are, for one reason or another, enamoured with the West. The growth and spread of Western industries in the developing countries further adds impetus to the growing acceptance of Western norms and values. The existing economic, political and sociological factors progressively allow new values to penetrate individuals and social classes. Some have labelled this phenomenon 'sociological propaganda' since it propagates new values.[32] The sociologist Jacques Ellul, for example, argues that

> Such propaganda is essentially diffuse. It is rarely conveyed by catchwords or expressed intentions. Instead it is based on a general climate, an atmosphere that influences people imperceptibly without having the appearance of propaganda; it gets to man through his customs, through his unconscious habits. It creates new habits in him; it is a sort of persuasion from within. As a result, man adopts new criteria of judgement and choice, adopts them spontaneously, as if he had chosen them himself. But all these criteria are in conformity with the environment and are essentially of a collective nature. Sociological propaganda produces a progressive adaptation to a certain order of things, a certain concept of human relations, which unconsciously molds individuals and makes them conform to society.[33]

This propagation and acceptability of Western values is in turn facilitated by a general sense of cultural inferiority vis-à-vis the West prevalent throughout the developing world.[34] In almost every developing country, the average citizen

commonly believes that prevailing social values (not to mention political despotism) are the main reasons for the technological gap with the West.[35] As the next chapter demonstrates, a number of developing states themselves or intellectual figures within them have sought to alleviate their societies' cultural insecurities. Nevertheless, throughout the developing world Western cultural products continue to gain widespread acceptance and popularity at the expense of indigenous norms and values. Given their deeply entrenched nature, general feelings of insecurity about social values increase the likelihood of their replacement with other, seemingly more advanced and supposedly better values.

In the developing world some of the mechanisms through which diffusion with Western cultural values takes place have proved especially potent. They include the media and other means of communication – particularly the electronic media and various visual media such as cinemas, television and video tapes – travel, education and missionary activities. Recent revolutions in communications technology – such as the spread of the internet, electronic mail and satellite television – have further facilitated the penetration of Western values into the developing world.

Of the various media for the dissemination of information and values, the role of the electronic media as a tool for cultural diffusion is most significant. This importance is due primarily to the crucial role of the media in the developing world, not only as one of the main mouthpieces of governments' official ideologies and propaganda, but as the primary disseminator of information relevant to the overall process of development.[36] In many developing countries much of the process of political legitimation is done through the media. The use of television as a specifically political tool was one of the main rationales for its appearance and operation in much of the developing world; in Iran television was introduced in order to allow for the broadcast of the late Shah's coronation in 1967; in Uganda to broadcast the meetings of the Organisation of African Unity; and in Senegal in order to cover the 1972 Olympic Games in Munich, thereby increasing the state's overall legitmacy.[37] Since the initial, hurried embrace of the electronic media for propaganda purposes, the state's use of the media as a tool for the promotion of its own values has gradually assumed a more subtle character. Once the more mechanical aspects of political institutionalisation have been accomplished, states delegate most of their propaganda and ideological functions to the media, guided, none the less, by a commercial rationality.[38]

In many countries of the developing world, television programming is based on the French, British or American model. In most Latin American countries the American model prevails, where commercial financing is mixed with libertarian ethics. The British model, which like the British Broadcasting Corporation comprises a public service company supported by licence fees, can be found in most of Britain's former African colonies and in India. In most other developing countries an extreme version of the French example exists, where pervasive state control and financing

are supported by marginal financial contributions from private industry in the form of commercial advertisements. While these models have not been particularly suited to indigenous social and cultural conditions, their adoption is hard to resist because of the pervasiveness of the colonial heritage, their continued popularity among the urban middle classes and the widespread lack of original models to follow.[39]

Largely because of the adoption of Western models or, more commonly, imported television series and shows – with the important exception of post-revolutionary states – television in much of the developing world serves as a major tool for the promotion of Western values and culture. American or European variety shows, documentaries, nature programmes, sports events, soap operas and other television series, especially those produced in the United States, inundate Third World televisions and are shown at times when the audience is at a maximum.[40] Feature movies produced in Italy, France and particularly the United States are also extremely popular, especially among young people, and form one of the most popular forms of entertainment. In recent years videocassette recorders have broadened the Western cultural penetration in the developing world and have facilitated its growth in remote regions and distant villages.[41] Videos have gained particular popularity in Asia, Africa and the Middle East, where extensive government controls over television programming have accentuated the appeal of movies and shows from abroad. In Latin America, in contrast, where commercial television stations operate with little or no interference from the state, VCRs do not have the popularity which they enjoy in other parts of the developing world.[42] The prevalence of VCRs in the developing world is, nevertheless, especially important since it undermines the government's monopoly on entertainment (and thus its ability to engage in overt or subtle propaganda) by providing alternative channels for entertainment.[43]

As far as social change is concerned, the effect of Western movies on Third World societies is even greater than it may appear, because the audience is exposed to value-assumptions that are often implied rather than expressed.[44] People learn how to live and work through the demonstration effect that Western movies and shows have.[45] To achieve the (often fictional) style of life that is portrayed in Western movies, which viewers in the Third World readily associate with the luxury and affluence of life in the West, becomes a goal in itself. The ideals of the movies are taken for realities, and blurred images of Western life are fantasised and sought after. Clichés are formed, not all of which are conducive to one's self-esteem and pride. To the more impressionable groups, especially the young and the rural immigrants, the clichés are highly damaging: those portraying good characters in the movies are North American while the 'bad guys' are American Indian, Japanese, German, Chinese or from other countries. The 'good guys' are white, unmarried, rich, usually a detective, a policeman or a soldier, while those portrayed negatively are frequently black or Indian, poor, and servants or workers.[46] Not surprisingly, the majority of stories imagined by Third World children take place in the United States and their heroes and heroines have English-sounding names.[47]

The promotion of social change in the direction of Western values is not confined to entertainment or, for that matter, to the electronic media. News programmes in the developing world are filled with events and developments taking place in the West, with scant attention paid to internal affairs or news about other developing countries.[48] Although filled with news about other countries, the increasing availability of the BBC World Service, the Voice of America and Cable Network News (CNN) International has done little to increase awareness about other developing countries, but, instead, has eased the penetration of Western values into the developing world.[49] Preoccupation with what is happening in the West extends to the printed media as well, with much analytical commentary discussing not domestic issues but international developments such as European unification, American diplomacy, space flights and the like.

Like the electronic media, most journals and magazines in the developing world devote much of their attention to promoting Western values and perceived notions of life. They at times demonstrate equal or even greater concern for rumours adrift in the Western entertainment industry than for local personalities or events. Domestic literature is similarly compromised. Novels and dramas are frequently translated from the major European languages, especially English and French, rather than produced domestically. None of this, of course, is to imply that American or European commercial interests are solely responsible for the erosion of indigenous social and cultural values in the developing world. The demands of domestic consumers, especially the middle classes, are just as important in determining which programmes and broadcasts are popular and which ones are not.

Travel to other countries, especially to Europe and the United States, has largely the same effects as those of the electronic media and the cinemas. Owing to the expense involved, however, the society-wide impact of travel is limited and encompasses only those social classes able to afford trips abroad. More consequential and far-reaching are the efforts of missionaries, whose religious teachings are invariably intertwined with their social and cultural backgrounds. The intense Christianisation of the Americas and pre-independence Africa through missionary work had a profound effect on the social and cultural make-up of both continents. To this day, there continue to be large Christian missions throughout Africa, operating like towns and running their own schools and hospitals. Through permeating most aspects of life, these missions have dramatically affected and changed local cultures, especially through stigmatising local rituals such as dances and ceremonies and ridiculing native deities.[50] Political independence in Africa and elsewhere has not halted the activity of Western missionaries, although it has in some cases led to greater sensitivity to the local culture on the part of the missionaries involved. Still, the social changes that result from missionary activity are profound. A case in point is the missionary activities of members of the Mormon Church. Mormonism is a distinctly American religion that was born and has flourished in the

United States, with Utah and Salt Lake City as its Zion.[51] As a world-view, Mormon principles are designed specifically for an American way of life, although adaptation to local conditions is not ruled out.[52] Yet despite its decidedly American underpinnings, Mormonism continues to grow and to win converts in many Third World countries, especially in Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, the Caribbean and East Asia.[53] Mormon missionaries from around the world, who receive their missionary training in Provo, Utah, cannot help but act as agents of social change in the countries in which they operate.

Even more widespread than the effects of missionaries on social change are the ramifications of education in the developing world. The role of Third World universities as agents of social change is particularly acute, although education at all levels instils new values and challenges prevailing ones.[54] Throughout the developing world, education serves as a means for the integration of foreign values into the indigenous culture in several ways. To begin with, a growing number of Third World educators and students alike study in the West and adopt Western values and assumptions, which they in turn pass on to their students and peers.[55] But even those who receive a domestic education are subject to exposure to foreign, mainly Western, values. The educational systems of almost all developing countries are based on either the European or the American models, depending largely on the country's colonial legacy or its recent political history.[56] In fact, throughout Africa, Asia, Latin America and even in the Middle East most secular schools were first established by Christian missionaries from the West who were as much agents for Westernisation as they were teachers. Although the passage of time has led to the secularisation of most of these former missionary schools, it has not necessarily ended their adherence to and in turn inculcation of Western values, albeit through subtle and non-blatant mechanisms. Western assumptions about libertarianism, rationalism and progress underlie the educational systems of many developing countries, particularly at the university level.[57] The spread of literacy and education to increasing numbers of Third World inhabitants only accentuates the process of social change that is already under way with intensity.

Apart from missionary activities, which bring about social change largely through the execution of religious edicts and principles, travel, literature and the media compel people to change their social and cultural values through the demonstration effect. New patterns of conduct and social relations are presented, idealised and then emulated. Social change is brought about largely without the conscious efforts of those it affects. This mostly voluntary process is often complemented by the government's active promotion of policies that are designed to alter social values in specific directions. It is true that with few exceptions, found mostly in Latin America, Third World states dictate the contents of their media and determine what the public is allowed to read and see. Complementing this somewhat concealed promotion of social change are policies and overt initiatives aimed at accelerating

the process. The bluntness with which states promote certain values over others varies from one political system to another. Post-revolutionary states, seeking to reinforce their political legitimacy through social and cultural links, are most vociferous in denouncing some aspects of the prevailing culture and praising others. China's Cultural Revolution is an extreme example of a massive and brutal campaign designed to 'purify' the Chinese culture in the post-revolutionary era.[58] Similar but lesser-known campaigns followed the revolutions in Russia, Cuba, Algeria and, more recently, Iran.[59] The purpose of such campaigns is more than merely to bestow popular legitimacy on the new political leadership. Rather, they are designed to alter the society's values and culture at the most fundamental levels in a manner supportive of the new leaders' ideologies and beliefs. In order to carry out their cultural indoctrination campaigns governments use whatever tools they have at their disposal, be it the media, the pulpit, the educational system or, if need be, coercive bodies such as the army and the police.

In most contemporary developing countries, however, the promotion of cultural values takes place with less intensity than it does in post-revolutionary states. Governments try to induce social change through policy initiatives rather than loudly proclaimed campaigns and ventures. This is not an easy task, owing to the difficulties involved in designing and implementing plans and programmes that aim to change the very lives of people.[60] The areas targeted for the most change are often villages and other rural areas least affected by social change. Frequently, professionals or paraprofessionals are sent into the countryside to initiate and oversee community development projects. These agents of change may perform a number of basic functions, such as community education, organisation and mobilisation of the community and its resources, demonstration of innovative technology, teaching new irrigation techniques or health and hygiene, or helping with the acquisition of goods and services that are not found locally.[61] In many instances, when government resources are scarce or the political will to bring about change is lacking, priests or other religious figures act as agents of social change. The assumption of temporal as well as religious duties by clerics in the developing world is especially prevalent in low-income urban neighbourhoods and in villages.[62] Although often inadequately trained and paternalistic in dealing with those they seek to help, priests have come to assume important roles in the community development of many developing countries. They frequently act as a community's leader, doctor, organiser, thinker and planner.[63]

The effectiveness of these initiatives in bringing about social change varies from case to case and country to country. Development projects in the developing world are often designed by Western or Western-educated planners, usually with financial assistance from foreign donors, and are frequently impervious to local needs and necessities.[64] Even when the policies and plans that are carried out meet the objective conditions of their intended targets, their success is not guaranteed.

The availability of development projects in rural areas, for example, does not necessarily lead to their use by local villagers. This is symptomatic of an incomplete process of social change, whereby local customs and traditions have not changed although industrialisation has led to significant material advancements. Western-style medical clinics in remote parts of Saudi Arabia and AIDS clinics in India and throughout Africa are seldom used by local inhabitants, who in both cases prefer traditional healing methods over modern medicine. In Botswana, for example – where until 1994 only four of an estimated 125,000 people with the HIV virus had gone public about their disease – for years traditional healers and their patients thought AIDS was a hoax or easily curable.[65] In these and in other similar cases values have not changed to a sufficient degree as to make new practices or realities socially acceptable. Social change might have occurred, though without having altered some of the more ingrained cultural beliefs and values of the population.

It is precisely this fragmentary nature of social change that calls forth the examination of another of its facets: which social groups are most susceptible to social change and how the process as a whole affects the various social classes. The selective adoption of values by specific groups and the broader ramifications of social change continually alter culture and society in the developing world.

MANIFESTATIONS OF SOCIAL CHANGE

The onslaught of social change and its extent and intensity have resulted in the development of several specific social and cultural characteristics in the developing countries. Although each is unique in its culture and values, Third World societies share a number of common social and cultural traits that have resulted from social change, which has affected Third World societies at two particular levels. On the one hand, it has resulted in a significant and continued alteration of Third World cultures and values. On the other hand, it has led to the appearance of a number of previously non-existent classes, each of which has its own social and cultural characteristics. These two developments, which complement and reinforce one another, have significantly influenced many of the social and cultural features that Third World societies currently possess.

Social change involves the transformation of values and beliefs among individual members of society. As such, it has far-reaching psychological ramifications for those affected. Changing values, particularly those that are deeply entrenched and legitimised through generations of acceptance, entail considerable psychological anguish and discomfort, often manifested in the form of counter-culture or escapist movements and sharp inter-generational disagreements. Anomie, cultural disorganisation, confusion and tension are common psychological consequences of social change.[66] More specifically, social change results in a fragmentation of attitudes and beliefs, the development of a sense of inferiority within and between

societies, the appearance of social differences based on language and dialect, place of birth, gender and status, and the emergence of new social classes.

Social change leads to a weakening of prevailing social values and their growing ambiguity. The individual undergoing social change is confronted with values which place priority on values hitherto uncommon, which often directly contradict one another. Pressures acting on the individual compel one to retain previously held values or to adopt new ones, determine overall attitudes and cultural orientation. In the developing countries, where the conflicting forces of modernisation on the one hand and traditional values and cultural heritage on the other are by nature strong, the psychological dilemmas caused by the clashing of norms are even more tormenting. Thus confronted with conflicting values and compelled by the force of circumstances, the individual's values and attitudes are compartmentalised, applying one set of values at one time and another in a different circumstance. In a sense, he or she undergoes a fragmentation of attitudes.[67] This is commonplace in Third World societies, particularly among groups most directly involved in the process of development. Industrial development and modernisation force these groups to apply certain values in their professional conduct, especially in so far as employment and economic matters are concerned. Yet the same individuals, who have adopted and vigorously apply modern values in their professional conduct, are often highly traditional in their private outlook and personal conduct. The developing world is full of examples of social actors such as merchants who adopt modern values in running their business but continue to remain authoritarian at home.[68] The prevalence of fragmentation of attitudes is reinforced by the ability of individuals undergoing social change only partially to reconstruct their cultural values and patterns of social behaviour.

> By introducing various rationalizations, [people fragmenting their attitudes] simply compartmentalize a difficult incongruity in [their] environment and behave as if the situation subsumed under the conflicting views were unrelated. However, where major social change is taking place there is less reinforcement for moderate compromise and less opportunity for evasion of social pressure. . . . In a very real sense, development means that evidence constantly piles up to remind the partially adapted individual of the contradictions and limitations of many attitudes.[69]

Fragmentation of attitudes allows the individual to hold and to practise different values without the debilitating moral and psychological dilemmas of having inconsistent beliefs. Once this fragmentation is accented and the contrast between values grows sharper, there is a tendency to change values completely and to acquire an entirely new frame of reference. Thus the partial change of attitudes

gives way to a more complete attitudinal change.[70] The individual is no longer confronted with conflicting values, his or her many beliefs and actions now being underwritten by principles that are consistent and uncontradictory.

Acceptance of new values is a matter of degree.[71] Even when the individual resolves the psychological dilemma of either adopting fragmented values or completely embracing one set over another, his or her adherence to the new values is not complete and unconditional. This resilience of values and beliefs is particularly evident in cases where they have been passed on by successive generations, with many values continuing to retain their popular acceptance despite scientific advances that negate them. Beliefs in supernatural forces that govern various aspects of individual and social life predominate in Third World societies and are commonly held by social groups regardless of their economic standing or degree of exposure to social change. 'Collective representation' is the term that some authors have given to these persistent beliefs and attitudes that often border on superstition.[72] These collective representations are transmitted to all or most of society from one generation to another. Often with no rational basis whatsoever, they revolve around mystic forces and arise from such items as myths, magic, occultism, religious practices, customs, habits, behaviour and specific historical events. The individual is believed to stand in some sort of relationship with the universe. The universe is in turn considered to be an ensemble of hidden forces which influence and are influenced by man in a manner different from that which can be considered logical and empirical.[73]

Examples of collective representation can be readily found throughout Third World societies, especially in the villages or in marginal urban areas. In parts of Southeast Asia people often consider themselves invulnerable against bullets if they eat certain types of food, and in Malaysia the failure of the rice crop is often attributed to the attitudes of government officials.[74] Throughout the Middle East a temporary hesitation and rest are believed prudent after sneezing. African societies are particularly fertile with such ritualistic beliefs that have no scientific basis. Most often, such beliefs and attitudes are not conducive to industrial development or to the growth of social habits which encourage modernisation. Collective representations have an especially strong hold in rural areas and in low-income urban centres, where the process of social change has not had the same intensity that it does in other areas. Irrigation practices, planting seeds, seeking employment, finding buyers for one's products or other economic activities are thus strongly affected by beliefs that arise from collective representation.[75] Of the side-effects of the reliance on magico-animistic rituals and beliefs, one of the most important tends to be lack of self-confidence and, in many cases, fatalism and passive resignation.[76] Maladies arising from illness, natural disaster or harmful farming methods are blamed on oneself, or seen as the wrath of forces beyond one's control, and little thought is given to their prevention in the future.

Another significant psychological ramification of social change in the developing world is the development of a society-wide sense of inferiority vis-à-vis other social classes and members of other societies. As a result of interactions among unequals, an inferiority complex grips not only those social classes which for one reason or another feel humble in relation to others, but also entire populations of countries who, on the whole, generally consider themselves socially and culturally inferior to people from another, usually more powerful and industrially advanced country. Insecurity about one's worth, whether individual or collective, arises when the values ascribed to others are idealised and are striven for. A constant attempt is made to become or at least to emulate those whose values appear as attractive and appealing. Throughout the developing world, a society-wide sense of insecurity and inferiority can be found at both the international and the intranational levels. Naturally, the less wealthy and industrially developed a country, the more acute and pervasive such sentiments tend to be. Not surprisingly, however, the very existence of such a sense of inferiority in relation to others is rarely admitted or discussed by scholars or the political leaders of developing countries.

Equally pervasive in the developing world is intranational inferiority complex, which pervades all levels of society and is one of the most noticeable characteristics of each social class. Third World societies are marked by ceaseless struggles of members of one social class to imitate and eventually become part of a more prestigious class. Rural inhabitants try to become industrial labourers; members of the middle class seek to join the upper middle class and the *nouveau riche*; and the upper middle class try to break into the upper classes and become part of the elite. While economic motives and considerations are important, it is the *culture* of each succeeding group that the lower stratum seeks to imitate and their values that it tries to adopt. Each social class considers itself culturally inferior to those with higher social standing and economic power, primarily because the latter's greater exposure to social change has supposedly endowed them with superior values and has turned them into more 'cultured' individuals. A relationship that can be best described as 'psychological feudalism' exists between those with prestige and affluence and the less wealthy classes. Individuals with power or with greater exposure to values that society idealises often expect others, whom they view as their subordinates, to be loyal and faithful. Patron–client-like relations, which already mark most of the political and economic relationships found in developing countries, also characterise the social and cultural patterns of interaction that emerge between most social classes. People with economic power and more modern values often demand and frequently receive deference from others who are generally considered and who in fact consider themselves to be inferior. That such social and cultural hierarchies frequently come into conflict with professional norms has not, for the most part, impeded their continued pervasiveness.[77]

The idealisation of certain values, and efforts to become part of the classes that hold those values, are in turn replicated at the national level by the state, which

often acts not only as a political protector but also as a patron of the 'national culture'. Through the media, literature or official propaganda, with varying degrees of subtlety, a certain style of life is portrayed as the ideal. As earlier discussed, the image that is most commonly portrayed and which subsequently shapes the cultural aspirations of countless Third World inhabitants is that conveyed through Western films and movies. And the more one is subjected to social change, the more Westernised one is likely to become, having thus inched closer to embracing values that society idealises.

It is this idealisation of Western values and norms that, in turn, leads to a feeling of inferiority in comparison with the West. Just as the lower social classes in the developing world try to imitate higher ones by embracing their values, so do the middle and upper classes try to become more Western by embracing as many aspects of the West's culture as possible. This imitation of the West is apparent in three specific aspects of Third World culture: language, science and knowledge, and values. Linguistic imitations of the West are particularly prevalent in the Indian subcontinent and Africa, where in many countries (depending on their colonial heritage) English or French is preferred over the native language.[78] In the newly independent countries of Central Asia Russian tends to be similarly more prevalent compared with local languages. Similarly, fluency in a Western language is a sign of great social prestige and a goal to which many in the developing world aspire. To some extent, this linguistic underdevelopment can be blamed on colonial penetration. But the continued use of certain Western words in preference to their native equivalents is today more a matter of social prestige than colonial influence. Equally pervasive is a lack of congruity between one's knowledge of the West compared with awareness of one's own history and heritage. Third World elites – and even some intellectuals – often know much more about the West than they do about their own country. They have travelled more widely among Western capitals than through their own country's various towns, and are frequently better versed in Western philosophy and literature than in their own history and cultural heritage. Both of these aspects of cultural underdevelopment, the linguistic and the scientific, are symptomatic of a third facet of social change, namely preference for Western values over indigenous ones.

What ensues are distorted cultural identities ridden with inferiority complexes and constant attempts to become better imitators of Westerners. Regardless of their merits, domestic cultural products are inevitably felt to embody some sort of flaw because they are not from the West. They are, in any case, seen as innately inferior to whatever cultural products have come from the West. By and large, few domestic cultural items are consciously retained and even fewer are cherished. Pride is taken in one's degree of Westernisation rather than in the retention of identity and heritage. Because of their apparently superior values, average Westerners are believed to know more and to have more wisdom than the average

citizen of a developing country.[79] Those Third World citizens who have had greater exposure to the West are considered luckier, wiser and generally better than the rest, although they are still not true Westerners and thus continue to remain inferior to them. Nevertheless, those with more extensive contacts with supposedly superior cultures are eager to flaunt the norms and values associated with them. Throughout the developing world, for example, those with even the slightest knowledge of a European language, especially in the lower-income areas, are always eager to converse in it or to communicate with visiting tourists. In many developing countries, Western-educated physicians also indicate on their office signs the name of the country where they received their degrees, a practice that domestically educated doctors refrain from. The foreign-educated doctor is believed to be a better physician. By virtue of being under his care, the patient also derives more prestige as opposed to visiting a doctor with a domestic degree. Similar deference is shown to foreign-educated engineers, teachers, economists, linguists and the like.

Another significant ramification of social change is the acquisition of new norms and values by emerging social groups and classes. At the broadest level, people in the developing world can be divided into the two general categories of rural inhabitants and urban residents. Rural inhabitants can be broken down into tribes, landless labourers, small shopkeepers, landowning peasants and feudal lords. In the urban areas, meanwhile, most residents are recent migrants from villages who exist on the fringes of society, industrial workers, members of the urban poor, belong to one of the layers of the middle class or have reached elite status through economic mobility and wealth. Within these various groups, those residing in rural areas are least exposed to social change owing to their general geographic remoteness and the inaccessibility of means through which non-indigenous values could be disseminated and popularised. Particularly excluded from the process of social change are nomadic tribes – numerous as they are in Central Asia, the Middle East and Africa – whose seasonal migration and lack of permanent residence, as well as their lack of access to sources of cultural diffusion such as radio and television sets, help preserve many of their traditional values. For values to change, extensive and lengthy exposure to alternative norms is necessary, a factor negated by the nomads' constant relocation from one place to another. In recent decades, the intensity of social change in Third World villages has drastically increased owing to official efforts aimed at community development and closer contacts with the cities. Electricity has brought with it radios, television and recently even videocassette recorders to many remote villages.[80] Moreover, those landless labourers who venture into the cities in search of becoming urbanised themselves serve as means of social change for those they leave behind but with whom they remain in contact. The new values with which the migrants have become acquainted are passed on to the village community, where they gradually gain partial or even full acceptance.

It is in the urban areas where social change is most intense. All urban residents are entangled in the process of social change at one level or another. Each social class is attempting to overcome its sense of inferiority by adopting the values of those ahead of it: the upper and the middle classes constantly try to model their life on their counterparts in the West; the working classes and the lumpen proletariat seek to enhance their social standing by adopting the values of the middle classes; and those partially exposed to urban values seek to become complete urbanites by permanently emigrating to the cities. In the process each group hurriedly abandons its own values and norms and clings on to the values of the group which it seeks to join. Not all old values can be easily compromised, nor can all of the new ones be understood or wholeheartedly embraced. Fragmentation of attitudes is one of the least socially disturbing developments that arise as a result. Equally likely in such circumstances of valuational adjustment are counter-culture movements, proclivity towards mass hysteria, confusion and even rebellions.[81] It is within these contexts that the importance of social change transcends the social and cultural arenas of life and reaches into the political realm.

CONCLUSION

There is a direct correlation between social change and political instability. The connection between these two phenomena is all the more pronounced in developing countries owing to the particular characteristics that mark their societies and their political structures. Social change leads to the transformation of values that prevail throughout society. It further compels people to actively seek the adoption of those values. People in the developing world seek to emulate the West by altering their own cultural frame of reference in a way that would correspond to the West's. Consumerism encourages the mass consumption of Western goods. Literature, the media and government propaganda praise the virtues of Western ways and patterns of conduct. And the public itself formulates perceptions of what life in the West is like and tries to apply them to its own life. What is excluded from all of this are Western values governing political conduct, especially in the remaining non-democracies of the Middle East, Southeast Asia and Africa. These states try to expose the public to the social and cultural values of the West but not to its political principles. They want their peoples to become Westernised socially and culturally but not politically. The ensuing contradictions and conflicts are cause for much political upheaval and turmoil.

Attitudinal changes are by themselves insufficient to produce serious political crises. Several political dynamics must also work for concurrent changes to take place in the political structure.[82] Nevertheless, social change has the potential seriously to undermine the values that legitimate the political leadership's mandate. Values change, some more so than others. Values pertaining to kinship, gender and

religion may demonstrate great resilience and continue to remain unchallenged among many sectors. But political values rarely have great strength of their own and have little resilience. The latest wave of democratisation notwithstanding, in many developing countries political legitimacy continues to be derived from the barrel of a gun rather than from historically rooted practices and commonly respected beliefs.[83] Indeed, when exposure to the West takes place, dominant political principles are among the first values to be questioned and challenged. Social change challenges the legitimacy of the political establishment by bringing into question those values on which the body politic is based. By nature, social change is an inherently destabilising process, upsetting the dominant values, relationships and habits of the societies it affects. Such destabilisation of values occurs not only in the social and cultural domains but in politics. In fact, the delegitimation of (all too often shallow) political values may be more acute than that affecting deeply rooted social and cultural norms. Social change brings into question the validity of those values with which the political establishment justifies its continued existence and its political agendas. The strength of the valuational challenge to existing political realities, and the forcefulness with which the public is prompted to enforce a congruence between differing political values and political realities, depend on the political culture within which these processes are taking place. It is this political culture which to a large extent determines the viability of new political values and the demise of the old.

NOTES

1. Hermann Strasser and Susan Randall. *An Introduction to Theories of Social Change.* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981), p. 23.
2. See Wilbert Moore. *Social Change.* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963).
3. Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran: Roots of Turmoil.* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 96.
4. Wilbert Moore. *Social Change.* p. 3.
5. Hermann Strasser and Susan Randall. *An Introduction to Theories of Social Change.* p. 16.
6. See, for example, William Friedland. 'A Sociological Approach to Modernization', in Chandler Morse *et al. Modernization by Design: Social Change in the Twentieth Century.* (London: Cornell University Press, 1969), pp. 34–84; and J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World, Disparity and Development.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).
7. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* pp. 8–9.
8. William Friedland. 'A Sociological Approach to Modernization'. p. 37.
9. Ibid. p. 38.
10. Vicky Randall and Robin Theobald. *Political Change and Underdevelopment: A Critical Introduction to Third World Politics.* (London: Macmillan, 1985), p. 79.
11. This line of thinking is particularly prevalent among a growing number of Third World political leaders and intellectuals, who, at times in collusion, try to devise and implement cultural policies conducive to inculcating specific, Western values. I have explored this question in more depth in *Cultural Politics in the Third World.* (London: UCL Press,

1999). In the sense used in the present work, by the 'West' I mean the countries of (or the norms prevalent in) Western Europe and Canada and the United States.

12. Vickey Randall and Robin Theobald. *Political Change and Underdevelopment.* p. 59.
13. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 165.
14. See Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.* (London: Longman, 1983), chapter 4, especially pp. 61–3.
15. William Friedland. 'A Sociological Approach to Modernization'. p. 74.
16. Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.* p. 65. Also see below, Chapter 5.
17. Majid Al-Haj. 'The Changing Arab Kinship Structure: The Effects of Modernization in an Urban Community'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 36, no. 2 (January 1988), p. 254.
18. William Friedland. 'A Sociological Approach to Modernization'. p. 74.
19. Heimann Strasser and Susan Randall. *An Introduction to Theories of Social Change.* pp. 69–73.
20. W. F. Ogburn. *Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature.* (New York: Viking, 1950), pp. 200–1.
21. For T. Parson's 'neo-evolutionary' theory of social change see his *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives.* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966), and 'Evolutionary Universals in Society', in T. Parsons (ed.) *Sociological Theory and Modern Society.* (New York: Free Press, 1967).
22. Herbert Blumer. *Industrialization as an Agent of Social Change: A Critical Analysis.* (Hawthorne, NY: Aldyne de Gruyter, 1990), p. 54, see also pp. 42–9.
23. See above, Chapter 2.
24. Armand Mattelart. *Transnationals and the Third World: The Struggle for Culture.* David Buxton, trans. (South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1983), p. 111.
25. Susan Marshall. 'Politics and Female Status in North Africa: A Reconsideration of Development Theory'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 32, no. 3 (April 1984), p. 501.
26. Armand Mattelart. *Transnationals and the Third World.* p. 112.
27. W. F. Ogburn. *Social Change.* p. 200.
28. William Friedland. 'A Sociological Approach to Modernization'. p. 38.
29. A. L. Kroeber. 'Diffusionism', in Edwin R. A. Feligman and Alvin Johnson (eds) *The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences III* (New York: Macmillan, 1937), p. 140.
30. Wilbert Moore. *Social Change.* p. 86.
31. William Friedland. 'A Sociological Approach to Social Change'. p. 39.
32. Jacques Ellul. *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes.* Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner, trans. (New York: Vintage, 1973), pp. 62–70.
33. Ibid. p. 64.
34. See below, Chapter 5.
35. An insightful essay on the subject appears in the anthology of works by Jalal Al-e Ahmad, the late Iranian intellectual. See Michael Hillmann (ed.) *Iranian Society: An Anthology of Writings by Jalal Al-e Ahmad.* (Lexington, KY: Mazda Press, 1982), pp. 116–21.
36. Douglas Boyd and Joseph Straubhaar. 'Developmental Impact of Home Video Cassette Recorders on Third World Countries'. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media.* vol. 29, no. 1 (Winter 1985), p. 6.
37. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 203.
38. Armand Mattelart. *Transnationals and the Third World.* p. 82.
39. Douglas Boyd and Joseph Straubhaar. 'Developmental Impact of Home Video Cassette Recorders on Third World Countries'. pp. 7–8.
40. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 203.
41. Douglas Boyd and Joseph Straubhaar. 'Developmental Impact of Home Video Cassette Recorders on Third World Countries'. p. 12.

42. Ibid. p. 16.
43. Ibid. p. 11.
44. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 200.
45. Nathan Keyfitz. 'Development and the Elimination of Poverty'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 653.
46. Recollecting aspects of culture in pre-revolutionary Cuba, a Cuban intellectual writes: 'In Cuba you learn to watch films before you learn to walk, and I learned in the worst possible way, watching Tarzan taming blacks and wild animals and "honorable pale-faces" massacring "evil" Apaches' (Pedro Perez Sarduy. 'Culture and the Cuban Revolution'. *The Black Scholar.* vol. 20, nos 5–6 (Winter 1989), p. 20). In recent years the American movie industry has taken some steps towards preventing the negative portrayal of racial and ethnic minorities, but stereotyping still continues, if not necessarily against more traditional minorities (African-Americans and women, for example), against new groups whose negative portrayal has yet to be taken up by the 'political correctness' (PC) movement (Arabs, Latinos, etc.). Moreover, most television stations and broadcasting corporations in the Third World continue to buy and to rerun older movies from the West made before steps were taken to rectify negative portrayals based on race, ethnicity or nationality.
47. Armand Mattelart. *Transnationals and the Third World.* p. 83.
48. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 199.
49. CNN International is a case in point. Despite the global visions of its founder, Ted Turner, the network's programming continues to be overwhelmingly American in content, tone and orientation, with the exception that most of its news anchors have British or Australian accents.
50. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 52.
51. For a balanced discussion on Mormonism, see Leonard Arrington and Davis Bitton. *The Mormon Experience: A History of the Latter-day Saints.* (New York: Vintage, 1980).
52. Klaus Hansen. *Mormonism and the American Experience.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981), chapter 2.
53. Leonard Arrington and Davis Bitton. *The Mormon Experience.* p. 286.
54. Armand Mattelart. *Transnationals and the Third World.* p. 6.
55. See, for example, Hyung-Chang Kim. 'The Americanization of Higher Education in Korea'. *Asian Profile.* vol. 17, no. 2 (April 1989), p. 132.
56. In West Africa, universities and institutions of higher learning tend to be based on the French model, a factor derived from the region's colonial experience with France. In South Korea, however, and in other countries whose recent political history has drawn them politically and culturally close to the United States, universities are mostly based on the American model.
57. Hyung-Chang Kim. 'The Americanization of Higher Education in Korea'. p. 133.
58. For a comprehensive discussion of China's Cultural Revolution, see Immanuel Hsu. *The Rise of Modern China.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), chapter 28.
59. See John Dunn. *Modern Revolutions: An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972). On Iran's 'Cultural Revolution', see Shaul Bakhash. *The Reign of the Ayatollahs: Iran and the Islamic Revolution.* (London: I. B. Tauris, 1985), pp. 110–14.
60. Elizabeth Howe. 'Responsive Planning and Social Development Programs in the Third World'. *Journal of Planning Literature.* vol. 2, no. 4 (Autumn 1987), p. 385.
61. Trudy Brekelbaum. 'The Use of Paraprofessionals in Rural Development'. *Community Development Journal.* vol. 19 (October 1984), p. 233.
62. Bidum Kuyunsa. 'The Priest as a Change Agent'. *Community Development Journal.* vol. 19, (October 1984), p. 259.
63. Ibid. p. 255.

64. Elizabeth Howe. 'Responsive Planning and Social Development Programs in the Third World'. p. 388.
65. Enole Ditsheko. 'Traditional Healers Thought AIDS Was a Hoax'. *Africa Information Afrique.* 14 March 1996.
66. Mahmoud Dhaouadi. 'An Operational Analysis of the Phenomenon of the Other Underdevelopment in the Arab World and in the Third World'. *International Sociology.* vol. 3, no. 3 (September 1988), p. 227.
67. Douglas Ashford. 'Attitudinal Change and Modernization', in Chandler Morse *et al. Modernization by Design.* p. 158.
68. On a trip on board a Middle Eastern airliner, a colleague reported a pilot who repeatedly recited verses from the Koran to ensure a safe voyage. As far as the passengers could tell, there was nothing abnormal or seemingly unsafe about the flight.
69. Douglas Ashford. 'Attitudinal Change and Modernization'. pp. 158–9.
70. Ibid. pp. 159–60.
71. Ibid. p. 140.
72. Syed Hussein Alatas. *Modernization and Social Change.* (London: Angus & Robertson, 1972), p. 54.
73. Ibid. p. 56.
74. Ibid.
75. Ibid. p. 58.
76. Ibid. p. 61.
77. Ibid. p. 101.
78. Mahmoud Dhaouadi. 'An Operational Analysis of the Phenomenon of the Other Underdevelopment in the Arab World and in the Third World'. p. 220.
79. Although not always the norm, English-language universities in many developing countries, for example, prefer to hire professors from the West rather than qualified candidates from other Third World countries.
80. Douglas Boyd and Joseph Straubhaar. 'Developmental Impact of Home Video Cassette Recorders on Third World Countries'. p. 12.
81. Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.* p. 65.
82. See below, Chapter 6.
83. See below, Chapter 6.

5   Political culture

Social change brings with it alterations in the prevailing values of Third World societies and inevitably results in a certain degree of political instability. Through social change, the cultural orientations of a population are altered, with new norms of conduct and of thought, new ways of life, gaining increasing legitimacy among various social classes. The previous chapter discussed how these valuational changes affect the social and cultural characteristics of developing countries. It is now important to examine the relationship between social and cultural values on the one hand and the body politic on the other. The nature and ramifications of the nexus between culture and polity can be best understood through political culture. By examining the role and significance of political culture in developing countries, this chapter explores the popular political perceptions and orientations that prevail throughout the developing world, the means through which these attitudes are formed and the effects they have on political behaviour and participation.

There has recently been considerable scholarly debate on the conceptual definition of political culture and the role it plays in the political process.[1] At the most elementary level political culture refers to the cultural values that govern political behaviour. In their pioneering work on the subject Almond and Verba defined political culture as the 'particular distribution of patterns of orientation toward political objects among the members of the nation'.[2] They saw political culture as the connecting link between micro- and macro-politics, with popular political perceptions and orientations having direct bearing on a country's political institutions and prevailing patterns of political behaviour.[3] Thus political culture affects 'the conduct of individuals in their political roles, the content of their political demands, and their response to laws'.[4] Along similar lines, a number of other definitions have also been put forward, seeing political culture as 'the particular pattern of political orientation to political action in which each political system is embedded',[5] 'the overall distribution of citizens' orientations to political objects',[6] or as 'all the important ways in which a person is subjectively oriented toward the essential elements in his political system'.[7] More recently, a somewhat different interpretation of political culture has been offered, arguing that it consists of 'all publicly common ways of relating' to political symbols.[8]

Regardless of the terminology used, political culture entails the collective political attitudes of a population, their views and orientations towards the body politic in general and towards specific political events, symbols and activities. Political culture is part of the more general culture of a society and as such is deeply affected by it,[9] and its orientations are implicit, unconscious and often taken for granted and treated as *a priori*. Political participants do not consciously reflect on the doctrinal orientations or political characteristics that are brought on by political culture, and are not even aware that political culture expresses itself in their daily activities and thoughts.[10] As such, political culture is a shared and society-wide framework for political orientation and encompasses the society in its entirety.[11]

The tenets of political culture are brought on and nurtured through political socialisation, the process whereby political values, attitudes and beliefs are learned and adopted.[12] It is through this process of learning that political orientations are formed and political initiatives and responses formulated. Agents through which political socialisation typically occurs involve political institutions and experiences such as historical events, political parties, the bureaucracy and other governmental organs (e.g. the police and the army), as well as non-political institutions such as family, school and place of work. Political orientations are formed through daily experiences with these institutions or the memory of specific political events as maintained through symbols. Parades and celebrations marking the anniversary of military victories or revolutions, ceremonies to inaugurate a new president or to crown a monarch, and elections, plebiscites and other political rites serve to instil specific values in a nation's political culture.[13] In some instances the early, largely subconscious socialisation that takes place through non-political organs such as the family and school is often more salient than the purposive socialisation one undergoes in later years. Adults are, nevertheless, more likely to have definite orientations towards politics because of the greater likelihood that they come into direct contact with specific political objects.[14]

Momentous or lengthy historical events are also quite influential in shaping a nation's political culture, especially those that affect great masses of people directly and profoundly. Wars of liberation, revolutions, civil wars, prolonged periods of economic depression or intense growth and other events that cause people to become deeply involved in the political process are examples of historical experiences that dramatically shape the character of a nation's political culture.[15] In specific relation to the developing world history is replete with recurring instances of mass-based political involvement. Even for younger generations who did not directly participate in such events the legacy of national liberation movements (e.g. throughout Africa), international wars (Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Israel, India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, etc.), civil wars (in Africa and elsewhere), intense industrialisation (South Korea and other countries of Southeast Asia), military coups (throughout Africa and South America) or internal revolutions (China, Cuba

and Iran) are kept alive through propaganda and political indoctrination. Moreover, non-democratic governments frequently attempt to tailor a political culture suited to their needs and objectives. The campaign to create a new 'political man' and a 'political religion' takes many different forms, from the Maoist extreme of Cultural Revolution to subtle nuances embedded in school textbooks, national monuments, the media or, more blatantly, in official propaganda. The process of transforming an existing political culture or building a political culture entirely anew is one of the central tasks undertaken by states in the developing world.

POLITICAL CULTURE IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD

In the developing world the forging of a new political culture is an essential part of the process of nation building. More specifically, political legitimation greatly depends on the strength and weakness of cultural values which support political institutions and practices. The internalisation of state-approved norms and values is a crucial requisite for gaining political legitimacy, and new orientations are necessary to support new institutions and new forms of political activity.[16] Moreover, political culture helps to define political roles, expectations and objectives, thus giving overall contextual coherence to the political system and its relationships with the general population.[17] This contextual coherence is particularly important in the developing world, where political institutions are generally weak and political roles are vaguely articulated.[18] Thus official state ideology and propaganda have become pervasive facts of daily life in much of the developing world, permeating everything from lessons taught to schoolchildren to personal matters such as marriage and death.[19] At a more fundamental level political culture helps to construct a new national identity and averts an identity crisis. Through its use of symbolism and its role as legitimator of the polity, political culture helps bind together political systems that are otherwise torn by parochial allegiances, rapid social change, geographic space and ethnonationalist sentiments.[20] In countries where tangible or perceptual symbols of national identity are lacking or have little popular legitimacy, political culture strengthens prevailing political institutions and their links with the larger society.

Despite efforts aimed at creating a new political culture or transforming the old one, and at times precisely because of such efforts, the political culture of most developing countries is marked by discontinuities and lack of coherence. Fragmented political cultures are, in fact, one of the marked attributes of Third World political systems. 'Reforming' political culture – as the state sees fit – is a long and socially costly process, particularly if parochial units remain intact and serve as refuges from discontinuities in society, economy and politics.[21] Partial and incomplete socialisation into a political culture makes new political values and institutions appear as alien and possibly even hostile. In these instances the political culture

becomes fragmented, with little consensus emerging as to the 'rules of the game' and the manner in which political life should be conducted.[22] Fundamental political principles are never agreed upon and thus major differences in political orientations and beliefs continue to persist. Under such circumstances parochial loyalties maintain supremacy over national ones, often to the extent that the central government is unable to gain widespread popular legitimacy. There is also a lack of widely accepted and operative civil procedures for goal attainment and conflict management, thus increasing the likelihood of political violence, unreconciled conflicts and repressive politics. Moreover, weak and unstable national governments coexist side by side with social paranoia, political distrust and civil disorder.[23]

In addition to the partial application and/or adoption of a political culture by the body politic and the society fragmented political cultures result from a number of social and cultural characteristics. Divisive factors include the many facets of social pluralism, such as a multiplicity of races, languages, ethnic and social groups and religions. Deferential allocation of resources, location of administrative centres and political movements and parties committed to furthering the causes of local constituents further accentuate differences in political orientations and lack of agreement over fundamentals.[24] Rapid and intense industrialisation, wars, revolutions and major and far-reaching shifts in government policies are also likely to disturb the coherence of cultural norms and upset the uniformity of an existing political culture.[25] In these instances people are suddenly thrown into a political whirlwind and the political orientations to which they have become accustomed are disrupted by sudden and fundamental shifts in politics. Also, a fragmentation of political culture can occur due to the implementation of new policies with profound effects on the people's daily lives, such as the Cultural Revolution in China or, even more dramatically, Nazi policies in the Third Reich. The establishment of new political forms, such as South America's industrialisation-inspired corporatism, or the prevalence of attitudes of self-sufficiency, at times to the point of belligerence, in countries where wars have 'toughened up' public attitudes (especially, for example, in Israel), can also potentially alter all or certain aspects of a prevailing political culture and lead to its transformation. The more intact the tenets of the prevailing political culture, the more resistant to transformation it is likely to be and the more likely are parochial units to serve as refuges from transformative powers or as institutional centres of resistance.[26]

Fragmented political cultures, found in most developing countries, are more prone to political instability and disruption as compared with integrated ones. Unlike fragmented political cultures, integrated ones are marked by diffuse political trust among social groups and a conspicuous absence of the social paranoia that characterises fragmented cultures.[27] Depending on the strength of existing political institutions, as well as the measures a state is willing to take in order to maintain power, fragmented political cultures lead to either strict conformity or intransigence

and open revolt. The political system is inherently unstable, subject to violent overthrow, or maintained through highly coercive means.[28] Requiring considerable energy and much sacrifice in terms of human life, revolutionary overthrow of systems with fragmented political cultures is less likely than submissive conformity by most of the population.[29] In such circumstances, where coercion inhibits the possibility of open rebellion against the alien world of politics, often the individual retreats into parochial units such as family, neighbourhood, village community or tribe.[30] The outside world, especially since it is dominated by the political establishment, appears increasingly threatening. State institutions are seen as increasingly hostile and irrelevant, and their ideology and propaganda as sophistical and even offensive. Politics becomes a field of practice for the vain. Official political activities bear little resemblance to accepted cultural practices, their underlying assumptions viewed as alien and inconsequential. Obedience to authority thus becomes ritualistic, arising out of compliance without commitment or cognition.[31] Opportunism and self-serving behaviour within and through state institutions replace political dedication and commitment.

Cultural anomie is only one of the characteristics of political culture in the developing world. To begin with, within each developing country there is often a plurality of political cultures. Third World political cultures are frequently marked by a sharp dichotomy between the political culture of the elites and that of the masses, each differentiated from the other by its unique features and characteristics.[32] Mass political culture is formed by attitudes and orientations towards politics of the population as a whole, including the participating citizens and the rank-and-file members of both authoritative and non-authoritative structures which do not significantly control the output of the political system.[33] Elite political culture, on the other hand,

> involves the attitudes, sentiments, and behavior of those who through the operation of political recruitment function have been brought to active roles in the political system and have a direct effect on the output of the system. The elite political culture thus involves those in authoritative structures but also the leadership elements of the non-authoritative structures and processes.[34]

The 'elite', with their distinct political culture, do not necessarily need to be political elites as the above definition implies. Throughout the developing world's differentiated societies, there are considerable differences between the masses of people on the one hand and economic, social and intellectual elites on the other, each of which has orientations that are markedly different from those of the popular masses.[35] Similarly, elite political culture may not necessarily be supportive of prevailing political forms, as it may belong to a growing nucleus of elite intellectuals who, if not openly oppositional, do not actively support the political establishment. The incompatibility of this intellectual elite's political culture with that of the masses

leads to the former's psychological alienation from the general public, complicating their quest for identification with and leadership of the masses.[36] The affinity of the political elite's culture with that of the masses depends largely on the degree to which the polity has undergone popular legitimation. The weaker the link between state and society, and the more fragile the legitimacy of political institutions and practices, the sharper are the differences between the elite and the mass political cultures. The state–society nexus is weak in much of the developing world (see below) and there are, as a result, often stark differences between the political cultures of the elites and those of the masses.

In addition to its divisions into fragmented and integrated, mass and elite, political culture can be divided into the three variations of parochial, subject and participant.[37] In parochial political cultures, there are no specialised political roles (e.g. leadership, headmanship, etc.), and political orientations towards these roles are the same as religious and social ones.[38] Increasingly rare in the contemporary world, parochial political cultures can be found in tribes and traditional polities with extremely diffuse and unformulated political structures, or in religious sects for which religious leadership is closely linked with community and political leadership. In subject political cultures, the type most commonly found in non-democratic polities, the person is aware of specialised state authority, but does not take part in it and is merely subject to the government's administrative output. There is only a one-way flow of information between the political establishment and the larger society, and people's negative or positive orientations towards political objects matter little.[39] Subject political cultures are prevalent in countries ruled by authoritarian states, where conformity and blind obedience to administrative directives reign supreme. In participant political cultures, on the other hand, social classes take an essentially activist role in the political process, whether in its support or its defiance.[40] Participatory democracies, populist governments and even authoritarian states on the brink of revolutionary overthrow, in all of which there is a high rate of cognitive public participation in politics, have participant political cultures.

The degree to which the public is cognitively aware of politics and is active in it is key to whether a political culture is parochial, subject or participant. In parochial political cultures the public is unaware or is only dimly aware of politics and is largely detached from the political system. In subject political culture, the public's awareness of and participation in the political process are limited to the system's outputs as meted out through the bureaucracy, the executive and the judiciary. In participant political cultures, however, the public is highly aware of the intricacies and nuances of the political system and actively participates in the political process.[41] Of course, these different political cultures are not mutually exclusive and do not exist in complete isolation from one another. Especially in the developing world parochial tendencies often coexist side by side with subject or participant political cultures. This is particularly the case in urbanising societies, where participant or subject political cultures among the urban population may coexist with widespread

parochial tendencies in the countryside. What determines the overall character of a political culture is the predominance of one form over another.

Considerable variations within and between developing countries notwithstanding, Third World political cultures are often highly fragmented, are marked by either extremes of participant, subject or parochial tendencies, and are frequently sharply divided between the political culture of the elites and that of the masses. Throughout much of the developing world, there is a striking absence of a shared understanding as to what the generally expected limits and potentialities of political action should be.[42] The fragmentation of political cultures arises out of incomplete or misdirected political socialisation, the resistance of old orientations to the onslaught of new ones, and the resulting emotive nature of political conduct. Fragmentation is accentuated by the persistence of traditional values and the slow legitimation of new political principles and institutions, despite massive and at times even violent attempts by Third World governments to transform the existing political culture. More commonly, however, the methods used to inculcate a new political culture include latent propaganda or overt mobilisation through the mass media, the official party, the bureaucracy and the school system. Through these efforts, states in the developing world hope to discredit old political orientations and instil new ones in their place.[43]

Most studies of political culture have concentrated on Western, predominantly democratic political systems.[44] Taking the collective political orientations of the population as the axiom of political culture, most scholars have thus concentrated on open manifestations of political sentiments such as patterns of voting behaviour in order to examine the political culture of a particular country.[45] The political characteristics of most developing countries, especially those of non-democracies, automatically disqualify many of these studies as applicable methodological guides to the study of their political cultures. Except in a few isolated instances, true political sentiments and orientations in the developing world are hardly expressed through institutionalised means such as voting patterns or public-opinion polls. It is through more subtle mediums of expression – not merely political expression but cultural, folkloric and even artistic expression – that political sentiments and orientations are expressed. Literature, music, films and even religion are some of the powerful carriers of political messages in the developing world. When open political expression is inhibited, such alternative means of expression become heavily loaded with political symbolism. As a result, in many developing countries, especially in the remaining non-democracies, there is more meaning to cultural idioms than meets the eye. Within such a context, an examination of political culture in the developing world needs to focus not merely on the orientations underlying political behaviour but on the more subtle tools that serve as proxies for overt political sentiments. Only through an examination of popular idioms such as literature and religion can an adequate understanding of political orientations in the developing world be reached.

POLITICAL ORIENTATIONS

A study of political culture involves examining public sentiments and orientations towards political objects. In this endeavour a distinction needs to be made between orientations towards politics in general and towards existing political arrangements in particular. Although at times the two may converge, *political orientations* and *regime orientations* in the developing world are not necessarily always the same. A fine distinction separates the two. Political orientation refers to those collective sentiments that govern the public's general outlook towards politics as a field of practice, as an abstract science and as a general guideline for the attainment of community or national power. Regime orientation, however, refers to public sentiments towards the specific political actors who currently hold the reins of power, the institutions they have established and the laws they have devised. In so far as regime orientations are concerned, the objects of attention are obvious and currently at work. Orientations towards politics, on the other hand, are orientations towards the *field* of politics rather than towards specific, existing objects. Admittedly, one's general views towards politics are heavily influenced by the prevailing political environment. That is why it only makes sense to talk of such a distinction in closed, authoritarian political systems, where outwardly manifest orientations towards the political system are almost invariably different from sentiments towards politics as a field. For this reason, the distinction between political orientations and regime orientations is particularly significant in authoritarian hold-outs in the developing world.[46] In these cases orientations and sentiments towards politics are primarily expressed through three main idioms: ideology and doctrinal beliefs; religion; and popular cultural forms such as music, the arts and literature. Through these mechanisms, sentiments and orientations towards political objects (including political institutions and practices) are expressed, often in codified language but at times expressly.

Within the three idioms for the expression of political sentiments, ideology has particular significance. This significance arises from ideology's express concern with politics, thus bestowing it with particular importance in providing a conceptual frame of political thought and orientation towards society at large. Throughout the developing world, as elsewhere, ideologies and doctrines are viewed as systematic blueprints which lay out procedures for the attainment of political power and the dispersion of that power once acquired. To the politically minded, ideology provides the conceptual framework within which political objectives can be formulated and initiatives towards their achievement launched. Ideology is an 'all-embracing political doctrine, which claims to give a complete and universally applicable theory of man and society, and to derive therefrom a programme of political action'.[47] Moreover, within Third World societies, ideology helps define values, both political and otherwise.[48] To political diehards, ideologies are more than purely political blueprints; they are guidelines to social and cultural values. They provide universes within

which constellations that govern one's life reside. As such, in closed and authoritarian political systems found in the developing world, non-official ideologies are often perceived by the political establishment to be highly threatening conceptual frameworks for political opposition.[49] They provide for alternative methods of thinking about political objects and do not endorse, while not necessarily negating, the valuative justifications with which political incumbents legitimise their rule.

Largely because of the circumstances under which they are formulated, political ideologies in non-democracies are marked by high degrees of dogmatism, intolerance for competing ideologies and a lack of in-depth understanding by their propagators. Particularly in countries where political liberties are severely curtailed, public familiarisation with 'unofficial' ideologies takes place in a clandestine and haphazard fashion. Secret meetings and underground 'discussion groups', pamphlets and protracted speeches, banned books and essays, and association with students or returning immigrants from abroad with different political outlooks often sum up the means through which most individuals living in non-democracies come into contact with ideologies other than the state's. At best, only a superficial understanding of an ideology could hence be attained. Catchphrases and fragmented notions thus become the embodiment of the public's understanding of a particular ideological framework. Yet this superficiality does not inhibit an ideology's acceptance by certain social groups and even its widespread popularity. Ideologies are adopted and followed not necessarily because of their deep understanding and dynamic applicability to local conditions, but because they are for the most part in contradiction to the prevailing mode of political thinking as propagated by the state. Intellectuals and political activists adopt a certain ideology as much for its rejection of the existing polity as they do for its principles and valuational merits. Ideologies provide an alternative to existing political principles and values. That much is understood and appreciated. However, the intricacies of these conceptual alternatives are often hardly clear, and frequently even unimportant.[50] Moreover, nuances in human nature, which enhance the appeal of that which is forbidden, further accentuate the attraction of non-official and politically suppressed ideologies. This is particularly true of ideological alternatives in the developing world, where adherence to a doctrinal framework other than the state's often symbolises political opposition and open-mindedness.

A more fundamental reason for the legitimation of alternative ideologies in non-democracies lies in the social and cultural ramifications of rapid industrialisation and a realisation of economic backwardness vis-à-vis the West. In instances where rapid social change has disrupted traditional cultural norms, and diffusion and industrialisation have brought on feelings of inferiority and backwardness, extremist ideologies offering quick and radical solutions find a ready and eager mass of believers.[51] Feelings of inferiority are compensated for by dogmatic denunciation

of the existing order and promises of a future more glorious than that which the West possesses. Whether through religious imagery and theological reasoning (as in Iran), the 'science' of Marxism–Leninism or the warped logic of Nazism in the Third Reich, the extremist ideology finds adherents because it offers a precise and codified blueprint for the attainment of the earthly heaven that it promises.[52] More importantly, it is a means through which a lost sense of identity could be regained. With social and cultural values in disarray, with indigenous sources of identity ravaged by the unrelenting forces of social change, an ideology could offer the medium through which the self can once again be discovered and asserted.[53] How this ideological self-assertion is articulated depends on various historical, national, social and cultural characteristics. Depending on specific features and experiences, greatness may be found in a race (as in the cases of Nazism, apartheid, Negrotude and Jewish Zionism), a religion (witness Islam's role in the Muslim world), a political doctrine (communism and Arab socialism) or an identity forged across international boundaries (pan-Africanism, pan-Arabism and the *Ummat* – Islamic community). In each case they restore a lost sense of identity and, even more than that, an identity inflated by greatness and chauvinistic pride.

The risks involved in believing in ideologies other than the one advocated by the regime are often too great in many non-democracies for any meaningful segment of the population to adopt and adhere to them openly. Additionally, strict government control of the mass media, coupled at times with unrelenting police repression, often significantly curtails the means through which political aspirants can formulate and then propagate their ideologies among the population. Yet political factors are not alone in curtailing the spread of alternative political ideologies. Social and cultural considerations weigh equally heavily in determining whether a particular society is receptive to alternative, non-official ideologies at all, and, if it is, what those ideologies are most likely to be. Can, it is necessary to ask, any alternative political doctrines be nurtured in societies like many of the ones found in the developing world, where illiteracy and repression inhibit political education, organisational mobilisation and the introduction and spread of ideologies which do not have official backing? Are Third World social conditions conducive to the mass-based popularisation of ideological frameworks that are different from, if not necessarily opposed to, the state's? In mass-based movements a plethora of political dynamics, in particular the hegemony of ideological standard-bearers over the masses, determines the ideological orientations of the dominated social classes.[54] When, however, political circumstances make the social acceptability of alternative ideologies unfeasible, much less allow for their growth and popularity, ideologies find expression through other socially accepted norms.

In many parts of the developing world, especially in non-democracies, religion fulfils exactly this surrogate function. The political importance of religion in the developing world arises out of its socially pervasive character. Religion is a perennial source of political action and meaning because of the ability of religious metaphors,

places and rituals to sum up and intensify popular experiences.[55] Moreover, religion performs a pivotal role as a social unifier, providing the language and sets of ideas which people across all social levels can readily hear and easily understand. The fusion of political objectives into religious practices is at times an inadvertent development that arises out of prevailing social conditions. Latin American priests' assumption of additional responsibilities aimed at rectifying social and economic injustice inflicted against the urban poor and the peasants, a phenomenon especially prevalent in the 1980s, testifies as much to the acuteness of prevailing social circumstances as it does to an inter-marriage of religious and political convictions.[56] No doubt, however, many political activists in the developing world also find in religion a convenient mechanism for popular legitimation and mass mobilisation. The specific political character and orientation that a religion may acquire depends most of all on the interpretation of religious principles by those preaching them to the masses. Thus the specific direction of religion's political legitimation is up for grabs and is determined by the patterns of domination in culture, politics and economy.[57] Expressly revolutionary political interpretations of religion, notably Liberation Theology in Latin America and the beliefs of the Moslem Brotherhood in Egypt and in other Arab countries, are just as likely to be countered by strict conservatism of the kind preached and practised by the Vatican and by the House of Saud. Similarly, in the developing world and elsewhere, religion has been as much a tool for political oppression as it has been for political dissent and agitation. Thus the fusion of religion and politics does not necessarily guarantee the former's doctrinal colouring one way or another. Religion may be, and in fact in recent years it often has been, used as a language of political discourse. Such a language is not, however, inherently revolutionary or conservative. Such characteristics vary depending on the social, political and historical contexts within which the coalescence of religion and politics takes place.

Despite the absence of a systemic relationship between religion and political orientation, a number of factors in the developing world have pushed religion into a politically oppositional role. Political repression, corruption, feelings of exploitation at the hands of foreigners and other political grievances have combined to shape religion's political ethos overwhelmingly in the direction of political opposition. This politically oppositional posture is especially true of religions that have so far not attained institutional, political power, such as Catholicism in Latin America or Islam in pre-revolutionary Iran. The more politically institutionalised a religion, or the closer the affinity of religious institutions to political ones, the more politically conservative a force is religion likely to be. Israel, Saudi Arabia and post-revolutionary Iran all offer examples of cases where the close amalgamation of religious and political institutions reinforces the conservative character of both religion and the body politic. Conversely, the greater the gap between religion and politics in non-democracies, the more is religion likely to be opposed to the political establishment and be of a revolutionary nature. Ostensibly secular societies – such

as pre-revolutionary Iran, present-day Egypt and those in South and Central America – are most amenable to religious political activism and, at times, even radicalism.

In countries where repression predominates and civil and political liberties are non-existent religion's growing concern with actual or perceived injustices has been gradual and for the most part implicit. Massive outbursts of religiously tainted political sentiments, of the kind that erupted in Iran in the late 1970s and that sporadically flare up in other parts of the Middle East, are the exception not the rule. For the most part, religion's concern with political themes in the developing world has occurred through a re-evaluation of core theological principles and their application to everyday life. From Africa and Asia to Latin America, religious doctrines have been reinterpreted in order more adequately to fit the life patterns and the daily concerns of those they affect. In the Philippines, for example, religious authorities have attempted to portray a more activist character of Christ in recent years, emphasising his role as a subversive trying to create a new brotherhood and a new era.[58] Similar reinterpretations of religious doctrines have occurred throughout Africa, where an ongoing process of religious indigenisation is aiming to make religion more attuned to the continent's cultural and political realities.[59] In apartheid South Africa, where political repression was extreme, the politically oppositional role of religion was even more accentuated.[60]

Nowhere has the politically oppositional role of religion been formulated in such a comprehensive and systematic manner as was the case in Latin America in the 1970s and the 1980s. In countries otherwise as different as El Salvador, Chile, Colombia and Brazil the common concern of religion with political repression led to the birth of a brand of Catholicism known as Liberation Theology whose concern was and continues to be the welfare of the masses at the most local level, in villages and in neighbourhood communities most dramatically afflicted with political injustice and economic inequity.[61] The basic interlocutor of Liberation Theology is not the unbeliever but the poor, its problem less atheism and idolatry than suffering.[62] Its emphasis on grassroots movements is accentuated by the proliferation in recent years of Base Ecclesial Communities, groups that meet regularly to read and discuss the Bible, pray and celebrate liturgies.[63] Both developments, however, have come to spearhead causes such as literacy, leadership, initiative and self-help, thus undermining the pervasive influence of the Catholic Church and its more conservative priests. Liberation Theology has emerged as an indigenous language of political discourse, indeed of political dissent, aided to a great extent by the relentless political repression which much of Latin America experienced in the 1970s and most of the 1980s. Once an alternative conceptual framework within which political sentiments could be formulated was found, i.e. Catholicism, a number of developments helped transform it into a mass-based ideology. Agrarian proletarianisation, large-scale urbanisation and the growth of literacy and mass communication combined to provide circumstances that were conducive to Liberation

Theology's growth as a mass-based, non-official political ideology.[64] The growing political democratisation of Latin American countries beginning in the 1980s has lessened Liberation Theology's concern with political repression, secular ideologies and organisations increasingly assuming the functions which Liberation Theology once entrusted to itself. Nevertheless, continued economic growth and development, and the resulting perpetuation of inequities and economic miseries, will keep Liberation Theology alive as an agenda for opposing the (economic) status quo.

In more subtle and less discernible ways political orientations and sentiments are also expressed through various cultural forms, especially through music, literature and the arts. Unlike in religion and ideology, the political message embedded in cultural forms is often implicit and coded. Unable to voice their political sentiments openly in non-democracies, political aspirants and agitators frequently resort to cultural means to get their message across to the people, often using such diverse tools as music, films and plays, novels and short stories and even paintings. The perpetrator may be an artist renowned for his or her work, an intellectual who has to rely on artistic abilities to bypass government censors and get a message across to the people. The decipherer, meanwhile, needs to be equally skilled in order to be able to look beyond the surface appearance of the art and grasp its deeper meaning. Thus the whole affair of using cultural forms as mediums of political discourse, as links between ideological protagonists and the larger society, is a decidedly elitist affair. Yet political sentiments are often expressed through art and their message is indeed understood by many. Not every work of art in non-democracies is, of course, the bearer of some deeper meaning and message. On the contrary, disillusionment over phenomena such as political repression, economic and social dislocation and cultural alienation has resulted in a proliferation of escapist forms of entertainment in many developing countries.[65] Nevertheless, especially in countries where the open expression of political sentiments is a risky venture, it is worth looking to see if a work of art, especially in the literary field, is trying to convey more than its obvious message. Developing countries are thronging with artists who use their talents to express their political sentiments, albeit in coded and disguised language. Often artists use their essays, films, plays or songs merely to comment on their society and culture, eschewing political commentary for fear of prosecution. But concealed and subtle forms of political expressions are still prevalent. During the height of repression in Turkey in the 1960s and the 1970s, Aziz Nassin managed to write a plethora of biting commentaries on the state of Turkish society and politics. Ahmad Shamlu had achieved similar literary feats in Iran in the 1950s and the 1960s. Before the wave of democratisation that swept across Eastern Europe in the late 1980s, the Czechoslovak playwright and future president Vaclav Havel was in a similar predicament. Egypt's Naguib Mahfuz continues to this day to elude government censors and write piercing commentaries on aspects of Egyptian life. Guatemala's Nobel Peace Prize winner, Rigoberta Menchu, is another case in point. And the list continues.[66]

A further characteristic of political orientations in non-democracies is their highly emotional nature. In almost all non-democracies ordinary, everyday experiences with politics have resulted in intensely emotional political sentiments. The coercion experienced at the hands of the police and the army, the anguish and disillusionment arising from the state's economic and industrial policies and the frustrations stemming from the bureaucracy's inertia and inefficiency all combine to make sentiments towards politics intensely emotional. This emotive nature of political expressions is reinforced by the absence of organised, institutionalised ways through which political sentiments and feelings could be expressed. To avoid the risks involved, political sentiments are often expressed through double-talk or in secret meetings and clandestine groups. Such methods by nature involve considerable emotional intensity. Moreover, political education, clandestine as it is, may take place through participating in or observing mass-based, emotionally charged movements that are often spurred by dramatic, extreme and even violent language.[67] Although the frenzy of a politically excited mob is an extreme example, the basic undercurrents remain the same. Political aspirants frequently dramatise the deeds of their past heroes, often to the point of mythicising them, and using them as models for themselves and for those they call to action. Melodrama becomes an important part of their political dogma and a main *modus operandi.* In cases where there has been a personalisation of the political system by incumbents, a similar glorification of personalities resonates into opposing aspirants. The contest for political power becomes as much a contest between myths and personalities as one between differing systems of thought and belief. Men become goals in themselves, viewpoints become ideologies and emotions replace principles.

The intense, emotional nature of political sentiments in non-democracies leaves little room for meaningful discourse and mutual respect among those with varying political orientations. Mention has already been made of the highly dogmatic nature of ideologies in the developing world, being largely viewed by their believers as inflexible and unchangeable sciences. The believers are rigid in their doctrinal outlooks, seldom seeing the need or the rationale for the existence of other ideologies and political persuasions. A similar dogmatic sectarianism permeates political orientations. Everyone thinks that others with different orientations are hopelessly misguided and uninformed. Within a society, in fact, competing tendencies and orientations may sharply divide collective political perceptions and sentiments. Adherents of communist ideologies look with extreme contempt at those who give religion political colourings, and vice versa. Those who favour liberal economic policies find virulent opposition from, and themselves sharply oppose, those advocating centralised economic planning. Among the masses at large, at least, there is little room for ideological compromise or even mutual understanding.[68] An ideology and a set of views about the larger world of politics are expressed and only

partially understood through clandestine or heavily refined mediums (such as religion or the arts), and then they are largely viewed as the unchangeable truth.

REGIME ORIENTATIONS

While *political orientations* refer to the public's perceptions of and tendencies towards the world of politics in general, *regime orientations* entail the more specific feelings and sentiments that are directed towards existing political incumbents. The two reinforce one another and are at times even inseparable. One's understanding of *politics* is, indeed, shaped and heavily influenced by prevailing political institutions and practices which govern society and determine its laws and regulations. In parochial and subject political cultures especially there is seldom the ability or the necessity to differentiate between orientations towards current power-holders and orientations towards politics in general. Yet the two are indeed different and have different characteristics. In non-democracies political orientations are seldom expressed openly and often find expression through religion or various cultural forms, are frequently highly emotional and are, consequently, largely fragmented. Regime orientations, on the other hand, are for the most part tied to the fulfilment or the frustration of expectations. They are marked by reductionist tendencies which see politics as a game controlled by forces far more powerful than those which people can collectively influence. Moreover, rumours play an important part in the understanding of and perceptions towards the prevailing power structure. Lastly, political cultures throughout the developing world demonstrate a striking lack of interpersonal trust, itself symptomatic of political repression and the ensuing apprehensions and fears that mar attitudes towards political structures and institutions.

Political cultures in non-democracies are extensively influenced by long periods of disappointed expectations and resulting dissatisfied political attitudes. Such negative attitudes towards the existing polity arise from prolonged periods of economic uncertainty coupled with political repression.[69] The economic flux that is an inescapable facet of Third World development and the predominance of restrictive and oppressive political institutions in non-democracies give rise to a general sense of economic and political dissatisfaction. In few non-democratic political systems, with the exception of populist states, is there any degree of genuine public support for those in power. Most people are either politically passive or hold highly cynical views towards political incumbents. Cynicism of this sort is historically perpetuated and is passed on from generation to generation through pre-adult socialisation, becoming part of distinctive cultural patterns.[70] Such patterns transcend more than mere political cynicism and lead to a host of characteristics involving the broader tenets of political culture. Interpersonal distrust and scepticism, the perception of politics as a controlled and cruel game played by giants at the expense of the

masses, and the consequent dogmatism of such vitriols as communism or anti-Americanism are all derived from the predominance of negative perceptions towards existing political arrangements.

The example of anti-American sentiments merits further elaboration. The anti-Americanism that has become an ingrained part of political cultures in the developing world, especially in non-democracies, is most directly traceable to negative dispositions towards local states in power. In most parts of the developing world, anti-American sentiments have grown because of American overidentification with unpopular, authoritarian rulers.[71] In the Middle East the friendly ties between the United States and unpopular regimes like the Iranian monarchy or President Sadat in Egypt are main causes for the widespread resentment towards American policies in the region.[72] In Africa anti-Americanism resulted largely from the cordial relations between the United States and South Africa's former white-minority government, whose racial policies of apartheid stirred passionate hatred throughout the continent.[73] American heavy-handedness in Central America and the Caribbean to sustain unpopular regimes, especially during the Reagan administration, also accounted for the prevalence of anti-American sentiments in Latin America.[74] American policy-makers' tendency to personalise relations with foreign heads of state, who in the non-democracies are mostly despised at home, does not help the United States' image.[75] There are, of course, anti-American sentiments in the developing world that are issue-specific (e.g. the Palestinian question and perceptions of anti-Islamism), ideologically inspired or the result of government propaganda.[76] Yet the United States' close identification with non-democracies, which are already subject to much public resentment anyway, reinforces anti-American feelings and sentiments in many parts of the developing world.

To a large extent, political cynicism and anti-American sentiments have combined to inject into the political cultures of non-democracies analytically reductionist tendencies. Politics is reduced to a conspiracy between overbearing forces that are impervious to local demands and indigenous movements. It is seen as a conspiratorial game, with the principal adversaries being the global superpowers and their puppets, the local rulers. Political activism is considered to be futile, unable to influence the tide of events which shape the country's political structure and destiny. Domestic affairs are viewed as reverberations of international deals conspired and struck in Washington, London, Paris or Beijing. This line of thinking is a much less scholarly, homebrewed version of the dependency theory of economic development, seeing politics in much the same light as economy, as the dictates of powerful patrons to helpless clients. The protagonists of such thinking, however, are not merely scholars and intellectuals but the people at large, from the working classes upward, especially those who have reached a level of social, economic and political sophistication sufficient to express political sentiments. Ironically, many of these social classes are themselves beneficiaries of the government's economic policies (e.g. bureaucrats and civil servants, teachers, entrepreneurs and merchants, physicians and the like),

and are, for the most part, uncritical, even perhaps unaware, of the overwhelming influence of multinational corporations in their country's economy.

The widespread currency of politically reductionist sentiments is largely the product of the political history of those countries in which colonialism was most prevalent. The Middle East and Africa especially have been arenas in which colonial giants have shaped history and, at one point or another, have ruled as they pleased. Whether it was the Ottomans, the French or the British, the former omnipotence of colonial powers has left an indelible impression on the minds of most Third World inhabitants. The lingering inability of most post-colonial countries to stand on their own economic and political feet after independence, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, has merely accentuated the public's suspicion of colonial hands at work. Blatant and covert actions by the American Central Intelligence Agency, the British Secret Service and the former Soviet Union's KGB in carrying out their agendas in various parts of the world have further given credence to the perception of Third World politics as a superpower game.[77] These operations have over the years given a measure of justification to the conspiratorial vision of politics in the developing world. But to discount every political development and turmoil as a plot conspired by an intelligence agency is as misdirected as is an uncritical endorsement of the dependency theory of economic development. Much of the reason for the prevalence of conspiratorial political views in the developing world is the public's inadequate understanding of the social sciences (see below). Unable to comprehend the complex economic, political and social dynamics at work in their societies, most Third World inhabitants see a convenient culprit in the superpowers, using their countries' tumultuous histories to justify their views.

A further characteristic of political culture in non-democracies is the lack of interpersonal trust, which in turn displays itself in public orientations towards the existing regime. Political repression, manipulation, corruption, instability and insecurity have all combined to nurture a strong sense of distrust among the politically minded in the developing world. The omnipresence of state intelligence agencies in many non-democracies – or at least perceptions of their omnipotence – is hardly conducive to the flourishing of trust among the people and between people and the political establishment. People have little faith that their desired political ends can be achieved through existing institutions, do not trust political aspirants to invest their energies in positive directions if they were to attain power, and have little faith in the fruitfulness of political activism altogether. The political cynicism arising out of reductionist thinking reaches into and affects interpersonal relations, particularly on the political plane. The scarcity of economic resources and fierce competition for greater access to them, practised by all social classes alike, further accentuates the sense of interpersonal distrust and scepticism.

A final factor in the analysis of regime orientations in non-democracies is the role played by rumours. As impersonal communication systems are not adequately

developed in many developing countries, rumours play an important role in disseminating information and ideas.[78] More specifically, rumours proliferate where information and data on political personalities and events are either completely non-existent or at best fragmentary. The very secretive nature of political elites in almost all non-democracies invites speculation about their intentions, actions and personalities. In many non-democratic countries, for example, little is known about the personal lives of political leaders, such as their marital status, number of children or wealth, or about their personal rapport with one another.[79] Any slight indication that may lead the public to form an opinion one way or another can also cause much elaborate theorising and speculation. In many non-democratic developing countries rumours are equally prevalent in relation to the government's policy intentions. This is particularly evident in countries where the public is kept in the dark about the government's intentions, with officials either being impervious to public opinion or not having developed institutions through which they could effectively articulate their intended policies for the people. The prevalence of conspiratorial views towards the political establishment only helps to reinforce the forcefulness of rumours. A road expansion project may be seen as a means to enhance the favourable position of a government minister (or his tribe), or viewed as a tool for extending government control in previously remote areas.

Whether through manipulation by political actors or by exposure to the writings and speeches of intellectuals, the process of forming ideas and orientations towards political objects takes place through political socialisation.[80] It is through political socialisation that one becomes aware of the prevailing political environment and forms orientations towards existing political arrangements as well as towards politics in general. Much of political socialisation, especially in the non-democratic countries of the developing world, where the state tends to be omnipresent, takes place through specific governmental organs charged with instilling a certain political outlook among the population. Some Third World governments have bureaux and departments that are specifically designed for creating politically supportive attitudes among the population. Post-revolutionary Iran's Ministry of Islamic Guidance is an example of a government body entrusted with the specific task of augmenting the state's ideological base of support among the population.[81] The Information or Interior Ministries of a number of other Third World governments perform similar functions. In these and in other instances the media are particularly instrumental in shaping the public's orientations towards current political incumbents and their doctrines. Even in those countries where the media have traditionally enjoyed a measure of independence from the government, as in India and a number of Latin American countries, they still continue to serve as tools for political socialisation by creating political sentiments among the public. Even if the intent of a given article in a newspaper or an entertainment show on television is not expressly political, the implied message is in one way or another frequently

supportive of the status quo, unless, of course, the artist is using those mediums to express opposition to the system.

EDUCATION

Parallel and concurrent with all of this is the role of the educational system in non-democratic countries, from the most elementary level to the universities, which play equally paramount roles as agents of political socialisation. Through the educational system, non-democratic states try to socialise children and students into the official political culture and to familiarise them with political norms that are supportive of their policies and agendas.[82] This was most widely practised by colonial powers who used the educational systems of their colonies as mechanisms for recruiting civil servants and bureaucrats.[83] This they did without trying to assimilate the local population into the colonial culture.[84] However, their enduring legacy in indigenous political cultures cannot be denied. Formal, linear education (advancing from one level to the next) has become commonplace in the developing world while traditional methods of non-formal education have been almost completely abandoned.[85] Moreover, there is heavy emphasis on learning things that are 'Western', even in the humanities and the social sciences, while indigenous and proven advances in fields such as animal husbandry, herbal medicine and local techniques are discarded and ridiculed.[86] Publishing has especially become a field dominated by Western corporations and literary giants, and an understanding of the Western languages has become essential for keeping up with the latest scientific and technological advances.[87] For their part, non-democratic governments have discovered the overwhelming importance of education in shaping orientations towards politics, and have turned their educational systems into tools for perpetuating their own stability and longevity.

The most blatant efforts at political socialisation take place at the elementary and middle-school levels of education. Non-democratic states place considerable emphasis on curriculums that introduce children to basic facts about politics and important political leaders. Memorising the national anthem and the names of the capital, the ruling party and principal political actors is often an important part of early formal education. The teaching of an officially approved version of history assumes paramount importance, with highly selective emphasis on those aspects or eras supportive of the existing regime at the neglect of darker, less flattering periods. In instances when monumental historical events contradict the current state's ideological underpinnings and its legitimacy, merely different interpretations are applied. Auxiliary disciplines which further support the status quo are also created and made part of the school curriculum. Religious studies is one such typical subject, as are somewhat less prevalent courses such as civic sciences and social studies. These and similar subjects, which inundate college and high-school

classrooms in many parts of the developing world, are designed to create politically supportive orientations among students.

Efforts at moulding the political orientations of university students have been somewhat different. By nature, university students have always been prone to questioning the state's authority and have consistently been among the first groups to voice their displeasure over the political establishment, often not hesitating to use extreme and violent measures. In restrictive polities such as those in Iran, Egypt, Turkey, South Korea and China universities and even high schools have at one time or another been oases of political activism and discontent. In countries with a long tradition of student activism, such as South Korea, taking part in student demonstrations and sit-ins is considered to be a rite of passage and a sign of intellectual maturity. Part of the reason for this activism on the part of students lies in their exposure to alternative political ideologies and to doctrines which call into question the legitimacy of current officeholders. Students have relatively easier access to banned or restricted books that are almost impossible to find outside university campuses. The very fact that they are students also puts them in greater contact with like-minded peers, enabling them to acquire a sense of community and togetherness which they would not have otherwise had. Moreover, by the virtue of their elite position as university students, they see themselves as entrusted with a mission to rectify the wrongs of their society. This sense of mission is clearly evident through the clandestine publications of those university students who have risen in revolt against their countries' leaders. Among Iranian students in 1978, 1979 and 1980, Egyptian students through the late 1970s and the early 1980s, Chinese students in spring 1989 and Kenyan students in 1996–7, to name a few, the establishment of social justice, democracy and economic equity was of primary importance.[88] In South Korea, similarly, university students have been forerunners in the call for reunification with North Korea.[89]

Containment of the university student population and control over what they read and think are thus of great importance to virtually all non-democratic states. However, because of their greater intellectual sophistication, official efforts to influence their political orientations have also been more sophisticated and less blatant. Most commonly, university students are discouraged from studying the social sciences and, often through special grants and scholarships, are encouraged to study technical and scientific subjects. The fact that universities in the developing world have consistently demonstrated greater eagerness to train students in the natural and technical sciences rather than in the social sciences only partially reflects their desire to catch up with the West technologically. Keeping students ignorant of the social sciences in order to lessen the likelihood of their political activism is also an element of the equation. That is partly why, according to one estimate, over three-quarters of all political scientists and two-thirds of all psychologists are from the United States.[90] Most Third World universities which

do have active programmes in disciplines other than the natural sciences, meanwhile, concentrate on largely non-political subjects such as philosophy, law, jurisprudence, literature, ancient history and economics. In cases where instruction in the social sciences does take place, an overwhelming majority of the concepts and notions taught are imported from the West and are seldom modified, thus being largely irrelevant to indigenous circumstances.[91] A deliberate effort is made to present subjects such as political science and sociology as almost purely abstract and irrelevant to prevailing social and political circumstances.

The difficulties of attaining a viable and academically credible education at both primary and higher levels are compounded by a lack of sufficient and relevant textbooks and the general weakness of the publishing industry in the developing world. Most developing countries have neither the massive literate population nor the well-developed library facilities that provide the demand for large-scale book publishing. Furthermore, only in recent years have most of the basic elements necessary for publishing been built and developed, such as equipment and editors, having been largely non-existent before.[92] Only a few developing countries with long literary traditions, most notable of which are Mexico, India and Egypt, have made some inroads in publishing. Otherwise, it remains a largely infant industry in the developing world. According to one estimate, some 80 per cent of the world's book titles are published in the industrialised countries of the West.[93] Moreover, major European languages have come to dominate publishing, discouraging publishers from aggressively translating titles into languages other than English, French and Spanish. As a result, more than half of the total published titles are produced in only eight European countries.[94]

In non-democratic countries, it is within the context of manipulated curriculums and controlled schools, large-scale and institutional discouragement of the social sciences and inadequate literary resources and fledgling publishing industries that intellectuals, those merchants of ideas, emerge. It is their role, as traders in the market of ideas, which makes them instrumental in shaping a country's political culture and the orientations of its people towards issues both political and otherwise. As a distinct social class, Third World intellectuals share a number of characteristics with their Western counterparts. Broadly, intellectuals have been defined as those 'qualified, and accepted as qualified, to speak on matters of cultural concern'.[95] They are, however, inherently different from academics and scholars. While intellectuals 'predicate societal action', academics focus on the 'seminal diffusion of ideas to students'.[96] There is also a distinction between intellectuals and the intelligentsia. Intellectuals are usually a part of the intelligentsia; while the intelligentsia are simply better educated, intellectuals trade in and reflect on ideas. The intellectual, therefore, is essentially defined by virtue of his or her relationship to social and cultural values. Through the utilisation of ideologies, intellectuals elicit, guide and form the expressive dispositions of a society,[97] thus either reshaping

or reinforcing certain norms and values around which matters of social and political controversy revolve. Intellectuals speak against their society's dominant cultural frame of reference and choose deliberately to estrange themselves from the cultural superstructure. Such estrangement often arises out of the intellectuals' alienation from their surrounding environment and from other social groups with whom they cannot communicate and for whom they largely remain enigmatic and little understood. As a result of their social alienation and psychological frustration, intellectuals often become politically oppositional and view themselves as future leaders of a political movement.

The role that intellectuals play in modernising societies differs from that of intellectuals in more advanced, industrially developed ones. As modernisation requires the transformation of both the industrial infrastructure and the cultural values that govern a society, intellectuals in such a polity acquire a special relationship to the rapidly changing body of social and cultural values. In modernising societies, intellectuals' support for or opposition to the values at hand is at a more fundamental and grassroots level. Such values have either not been fully adopted by the general population or their adoption and popular social acceptance can be easily challenged by other, contending values. In modern societies, in contrast, where values have long been adopted and form an integral part of the accepted norms of society, the intellectuals' support for or opposition to such values is not as fundamental to their popular acceptability or rejection as is the case in modernising societies. In modernising countries, therefore, intellectuals exert a much higher degree of social influence. As the contention between values is more polarised in countries that are undergoing rapid social change, so is the influence of intellectuals, owing to the nature of their position in relation to those values. The more polarised the divergence among values, and the more fragile their acceptability among members of society, the greater is the significance of intellectuals.

Despite the theoretical definitions attached to them as a social class, a number of intellectuals in the non-democratic countries of the developing world have for the most part become politically passive, socially isolated and uncaring, and intellectually indolent. Even if they were to be seen as 'social commentators or as "microjournalists" who perforce [have] a development orientation',[98] many still fail to live up to their theoretical definition. Many intellectuals living in non-democracies have estranged themselves from the dominant social and cultural frameworks of their societies, but they make little or no efforts to bring themselves closer to the population through 'social commentary' or 'macrojournalism', much less by political activism or social engineering. This inactivism is brought on mostly by prevailing political and social circumstances, but also partly by the lethargy and inaction of many intellectuals themselves. Repressive politics and manipulated educational systems severely stunt the growth of intellectuals as a social class.[99] Moreover, most developing countries are notorious in lacking the resources and the

infrastructure within which intellectual activity can flourish and independently grow. In few developing countries have there been many investments in building libraries, promoting reading habits, glorifying past thinkers, supporting lectures and scholarly debates or encouraging publishing.[100] As a result, there is not an environment within which intellectualdom as a field can grow and flourish. Some observers have even gone so far as to assert that, as a social class, Third World intellectuals do not really exist.[101]

It is within these overall social contexts that political and regime orientations in the developing world are formulated. Specifically, non-democratic states use the educational system as a viable and potent tool for political socialisation, tailoring it to maximise their political longevity and augment their ideological and doctrinal legitimacy. Most notably, primary education is often taught through thick doctrinal lenses in an effort to ensure the continued adherence of future generations to prevailing political arrangements. In higher levels, especially at the university level, the educational system becomes selective in the disciplines it covers, encouraging natural and technical sciences at the expense of fields which invite independent thinking and social and political inquisitiveness. The result is a population largely ignorant of the social sciences and an intellectualdom vastly separated from the rest of society. The intellectuals, who are in charge of enlightening the people about their miseries and introducing them to alternatives, have become mostly apathetic, preferring to undergo oblivion or to emigrate rather than risk the dangers associated with social and political involvement. A few, as will be discussed later, have indeed attempted to create a sense of political awareness among their peoples. But their efforts, rather inadvertently, have been largely limited to creating a viable national identity within which political orientations can be formed and expressed.

NATIONAL IDENTITY

National identity is the way in which we view our national self-worth and is the measure of pride in one's nationality. It is an integral part of political culture, affecting the way we perceive dominant political arrangements and the broader field of politics in general. Political culture is heavily influenced by the sense of national identity which people have of themselves. A perception of themselves as a collective political community, as a nation, heavily influences the way in which people perceive their roles and relationships vis-à-vis political objects. The orientations and sentiments people have towards politics in general and towards existing political arrangements in particular are formulated within the context of the views they have of themselves and their concept of their own identity. It is this sense of identity which largely determines how people behave politically and in turn view their political environment. To an extent, political and regime orientations are captive to, or are at least heavily influenced by, one's sense of national identity.

The connection between national identity and orientations towards political arrangements assumes special importance in the developing world, where both developments are highly fluid and in constant flux owing to changing social and political circumstances. The lack of a persistent set of norms and social values, a result of social change, makes it difficult to form solid opinions about what exactly one's identity is, both at a personal level and nationally. The ensuing identity crisis finds equal disillusionment on the part of political and regime orientations, which are by nature fragmented and incoherent, sectarian and highly changeable. An examination of national identity is thus key to understanding the political cultures prevalent in the developing world.

It is often asserted that development entails a cultural transformation in the direction of reaffirmation of national identity and tradition.[102] Growing economic advancement and political sophistication are assumed to foster a sense of life satisfaction and lead to generally positive attitudes about the prevailing social and political environment.[103] However, such developments have almost completely bypassed the developing world and have instead taken place in Western democracies.[104] Many of the social and political characteristics found throughout the developing world have not only failed to result in a strong sense of national identity and life satisfaction in many countries, but have, adversely, fostered feelings of disappointment and identity crisis. Political repression, rapid industrialisation, the growth of urban-based populations, economic dislocation and social change prompt people in the developing world to question not only their prevailing social and political values but, more importantly, their very identity as a nation. The development of a national identity crisis in developing countries is even seen by some as 'a phase of growth that the political system must inevitably experience whenever its basic forms are substantially changed. It is a sign of growth and change, not of weakness and abnormality.'[105] Whether an impediment to development or an inevitable and necessary part of it, national identity crisis has become a universal characteristic of political development, especially in Sub-Saharan Africa, where political institutionalisation remains weak and threatened by centrifugal forces.[106]

There are three fundamental causes for the development of national identity crisis in the developing world. Most commonly, crises of national identity can occur when there is not a unanimous and clear appreciation of the geographic boundaries of a nation and a common acceptance by people that they share a distinctive and common identity.[107] This is a particularly pressing problem for a number of African countries, whose boundaries were drawn arbitrarily and without great concern for their inhabitants' socially and culturally varied heritage. Even in highly developed and centralised states (such as India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran and Turkey in Asia, and Honduras, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Colombia, Peru and Bolivia in Latin America) national boundaries mean little to peripheral ethnic groups

who periodically migrate across international borders. The problem is most acute in Africa, however, where in many cases national identities have not yet effectively been formed. In cases where geographic boundaries have long been formed and nationalist sentiments have gained strength, parochial allegiances and loyalties to sub-national groups can still create crises in national identity.[108] The division of one's loyalty between the central state on the one hand and one's ethnic background and race on the other can throw into confusion the sources with which one identifies. Again, Africa south of the Sahara provides numerous examples of nations torn by sub-national loyalties. The continent is, however, by no means alone. Ethnic strife has become a regular feature of life in India, the Commonwealth of Independent States, Central and Eastern European states, and several countries in Central America, where Mosquito Indians frequently clash with central governments in an effort to maintain their unique, indigenous identities.

Another prevalent cause of national identity crisis is the ongoing process of social change and industrial development.[109] Social change leads to feelings of rootlessness and uncertainty over which values to choose. Incomplete processes of political institutionalisation on the part of the state and political socialisation by the population add to the difficulty of developing a coherent identity towards political objects and even towards one's nationality. Constant comparison with other countries and nationalities, disappointment and often resentment against existing sources of identity and the inability to pinpoint a coherent set of characteristics of various social classes all combine to impede the development of a strong sense of national identity. This is a problem that is endemic to all modernising societies, regardless of the popular acceptability of their geographic boundaries or the strength or weakness of their parochial tendencies. It is an inevitable ramification of social change and, more specifically, of cultural diffusion. The development of an almost uniform 'middle-class culture' throughout the developing world, which has as its cornerstone the emulation of Western social practices and cultural norms, is further cause for the questioning of indigenous sources of identity.[110]

Periodic attempts have been made by social and political actors in the developing world to alleviate identity crises and to forge a strong sense of national identity. Most blatant have been the efforts of various states which, often through coercive means, try to foster a sense of identity among the population which is compatible with their political agendas and doctrines. Monuments are erected, national leaders and past heroes are glorified, nationalist sentiments are stressed, national sports teams are cheered on and ethnic and parochial loyalties are supplanted by nationalist ones.[111] Nationalist sentiments are engineered with the express intent of supporting the political status quo. The emergent national identity is consequently tailored to fit a political culture most supportive of existing political arrangements. In this sense the relationship between national identity and political culture assumes particular importance. The former becomes a tool for the maintenance of the latter, an artificial creation suited to particular, narrow political needs.

More independent efforts at asserting national identity or forging a new one are made by a minority of Third World intellectuals. Despite the passionate beliefs and writings of some of these scholars and literary figures, only a few have gone on to attain national fame and become able to express their views to a wide range of audiences. For the most part, political repression has prompted Third World intellectuals to eschew discussing sensitive political topics such as national identity and self-assertion. There are, nevertheless, a few who have assumed the responsibility of critiquing their societies and have tried to foster new national identities. Mexico's Octavio Paz is a prime example. Through studying the Mexican character, Paz criticises the inferiority complex of his countrymen and urges them to become aware of their heritage and unique identity.[112] 'To become aware of our history', he writes, 'is to become aware of our singularity.'[113] For Mexicans, Paz argues, the uniqueness of their identity lies in their Indian heritage.[114]

Few Third World scholars and intellectuals have gone on to achieve the fame and recognition in their societies that Octavio Paz has achieved in Mexico and even beyond. Yet such identity-conscious intellectuals do exist, albeit few in number, and their cries of 'return to the self' do occasionally gather steam in their respective countries.[115] But despite the passionate writings and speeches of these and other intellectuals who try to make the public aware of their national identity and heritage, often at great risk, their efforts remain largely ineffective in forging a national identity or in overcoming their country's collective identity crisis. Political repression often prompts them either to tone down their social criticism or to abandon the subject altogether. In cases where their commentary is formulated in relatively free environments and openly expressed, as in Paz's case in Mexico, they find themselves addressing audiences who are overwhelmingly illiterate and are either suspicious of their intentions or impervious to their message. It is one thing to pinpoint identity crisis and write about it; it is quite another to get the message across to disillusioned and lost masses.

Within the context of largely ambivalent and uncertain national identities political cultures in many developing countries take shape and are formulated. For the most part, Third World inhabitants feel ambivalent about their identity and national self-worth, viewing themselves as inferior to the West. In their desperate search to find sources with which to identify, most blindly emulate the culture and the norms of the West. Yet emulation at best resolves their sense of cultural inferiority. Their alienation from the act of governance still remains. Many, meanwhile, are manipulated, their sentiments and orientations tossed around by politicos hoping to further their own legitimacy. For its part, intellectualdom remains mostly on the sidelines, its infrequent cries of self-discovery seldom heard and rarely understood. What emerges is a political culture tainted by contempt for the political self and disdain for existing, politically dictated identifications.

CONCLUSION

Political culture is the bond between politics and society, the medium through which the two interact and interconnect. It is that aspect of culture which specifically deals with politics, be it particular political objects and arrangements or the broader field of politics in general. In examining political cultures in developing-world non-democracies, varied as they are, one factor consistently stands out. Regardless of social, cultural and political characteristics that are unique to individual countries, throughout the developing world there is an almost uniformly weak nexus between state and society. Consequently, regime orientations are extremely weak despite often massive efforts to inject political acculturation through bureaucratic and even coercive means. The regime's ideology and doctrine have little genuine acceptability among the population and are often forced on them by various means. Most commonly, people need to prove their ideological 'purity' through special exams that are designed to filter out non-believers from government jobs and universities and to bar them from access to other privileges. Similarly, participation in the political process is often merely perfunctory, taking place out of fear or opportunism rather than a genuine sense of civic duty and obligation. Voting for pre-approved candidates is compulsory, if not by law by the fear of what may ensue if one refrains from it. Taking part in government-sponsored marches and demonstrations also become part of a ritualistic allegiance to the political system.

Within this context of forced loyalties to the state and to its principal figures, two important ramifications arise. First, the ensuing orientations that develop among the population are usually extremist. The majority of people refrain from politics, believing 'unseen hands' to be at work and viewing politicians as mere pawns in the hands of others. They are, for the most part, either caught up in the economic struggle to survive the tumults of industrialisation or are preoccupied with seeking its benefits. Alongside the politically apathetic majority, however, are minority groups who are either actively supportive of the regime and wholeheartedly believe in its legitimacy and doctrinal agendas, or are quietly opposed to it and will work for its (possibly violent) overthrow if given an opportunity. Those who are vociferous in their support for the state are motivated by sheer opportunism, by a genuine adherence to the state's doctrines or, as is frequently the case, by a convergence of the two. Regardless of their doctrines or structural features, states always find support among a certain sector of the population, even though that sector may be extremely small and in a socially disadvantageous position. Such bases of support can be found among merchants and industrialists who favour certain economic policies, or civil servants who find job security through the existing bureaucracy, or youths who support a state's extremist ideology. At the opposite extreme, there are those who see through the state's manipulations and are not only unimpressed but are prompted to advocate a radical overthrow of the system. What prompts these political aspirants to oppose the system, openly or quietly, varies from case to case.

They are, however, mostly driven by the same factors that motivate the state's supporters: ideological beliefs and a desire to wield power. The extremism that divides opponents and supporters of the state extends even to cases where there are open and free elections, as in Latin America, with support for candidates being sharply divided along highly polarised, ideological lines.

The second ramification that tends to ensue from political cultures in the non-democratic countries of the developing world, and directly linked to the first one, is the proclivity towards the development of revolutions. The emergence of revolutionary circumstances is the most enduring and significant by-product of political culture in non-democracies. The weak links that bond the political system to society at large, the general cynicism that pervades the population, the predominance of dogmatism and sectarian tendencies and the ready existence of a group, albeit at times small, eager to articulate its opposition to the state all combine to make Third World non-democracies susceptible to being overthrown by revolutionary movements. However, despite this built-in susceptibility, full-scale revolutions are the exception rather than the rule since they involve considerable energy, anguish and human sacrifice. The incumbents' determination to remain in power at all costs also impedes the development of revolutions and instead harshens the already perilous political arena. Instead of revolutions, political instability, arising out of legitimacy crises and raw intra-elite political competition, has become endemic to non-democratic, developing polities. Palace coups and personality changes have become commonplace, while revolutions occur with striking rarity. Nevertheless, political cultures in non-democracies are indeed conducive to the development of revolutionary circumstances and the overthrow of existing political arrangements. The exact developments that bring about revolutions are products not only of political culture but of existing social arrangements, cultural dynamics and, of course, political forces. Combined with and occurring within political culture, these developments provide the appropriate contextual environment within which revolutions take place.

NOTES

1. See, for example, Stephen Chilton. 'Defining Political Culture'. *Western Political Quarterly.* vol. 41, no. 3 (September 1988), pp. 419–45; and Larry Diamond (ed.) *Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994). For my other writings on the subject, see Mehran Kamrava. 'Political Culture and a New Definition of the "Third World"'. *Third World Quarterly.* vol. 16, no. 4 (Fall 1995), pp. 679–89 and *Cultural Politics in the Third World.* (London: UCL Press, 1999).
2. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture.* (London: Sage, 1989), p. 13.
3. Ibid. p. 32.
4. Ibid. p. 25.
5. M. Margaret Conway. 'The Political Context of Political Behavior'. *Journal of Politics.* vol. 51, no. 1 (February 1989), p. 4.

6.   Denis Kavanagh. *Political Culture.* (London: Macmillan, 1972), p. 11.

7.   Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* (New York: Praeger, 1975), p. 8.

8.   Stephen Chilton. 'Defining Political Culture'. p. 427.

9.   Dennis Kavanagh. *Political Culture.* p. 12.

10. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 8.

11. Stephen Chilton. 'Defining Political Culture'. p. 422.

12. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 13.

13. Dennis Kavanagh. *Political Culture.* p. 33.

14. Ibid. p. 35.

15. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 17.

16. Dennis Kavanagh. *Political Culture.* p. 40.

17. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture', in Lucian Pye *et al. Crises and Sequences in Political Development.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 109.

18. See above, Chapter 1.

19. The paying of homage to Lenin's mausoleum by bridal couples and group marriages sponsored by the Communist Party in China are two of the more extreme examples of routinised efforts to instil officially sponsored political cultures.

20. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. pp. 111–12.

21. Harry Eckstein. 'A Culturalist Theory of Political Change'. *American Political Science Review.* vol. 82, no. 3 (September 1988), p. 798.

22. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 37.

23. Ibid. pp. 44–7.

24. Ibid. p. 41.

25. Stephen Chilton. 'Defining Political Culture'. p. 769.

26. Harry Eckstein. 'A Culturalist Theory of Political Change'. p. 799.

27. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 54.

28. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. p. 106.

29. Harry Eckstein. 'A Culturalist Theory of Political Change'. p. 797; see also below, Chapter 6.

30. Harry Eckstein. 'A Culturalist Theory of Politcal Change'. p. 797.

31. Ibid.

32. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 103.

33. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. p. 103.

34. Ibid.

35. See above, Chapter 4.

36. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 145.

37. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture.* pp. 17–19.

38. Ibid. p. 17.

39. Ibid. p. 18.

40. Ibid.

41. Ibid. p. 45.

42. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. p. 106.

43. Dennis Kavanagh. *Political Culture.* pp. 44–5.

44. Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture;* M. Margaret Conway. 'The Political Context of Political Behavior'; Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture;* Harry Eckstein. 'A Culturalist Theory of Political Change'; Stephen Chilton. 'Defining Political Culture'; Ronald Inglehart. 'The Renaissance of Political Culture'. *American Political Science Review.* vol. 82, no. 4 (December 1988), pp. 1203–30; Gabriel Almond and G. Bingham Powell. *Comparative Politics: Systems, Processes, and Policy.* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1978).

45. See, especially, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture.*

46. For more on political culture in Third World democracies, see below, Chapter 7.

47. Roger Scruton. *A Dictionary of Political Thought.* (London: Macmillan, 1982), p. 213.
48. Douglas Ashford. 'Attitudinal Change and Modernization'. p. 180.
49. A distinction needs to be made between the *official* state ideology and doctrines and beliefs independent of the political establishment.
50. Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran: Roots of Turmoil.* (London: Routledge, 1990), p. 117.
51. Howard Wiarda. 'Political Culture and the Attraction of Marxism–Leninism: National Inferiority Complex as an Explanatory Factor'. *World Affairs.* vol. 151, no. 3 (Winter 1988–9), p. 145.
52. Ibid. p. 148.
53. Frantz Fanon discusses this importance of ideology, but, addressing a black audience, argues for the blacks' discovery of 'Negrotude'. See Frantz Fanon. *Black Skin, White Mask.* Charles Lam Markmann, trans. (New York: Grove Press, 1967).
54. See below, Chapter 6.
55. Daniel Levine. 'Religion and Politics in Contemporary Historical Perspective'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 19, no. 1 (October 1986), p. 97.
56. Daniel Levine. 'Assessing the Impact of Liberation Theology in Latin America'. *Review of Politics.* vol. 50, no. 2 (Spring 1988), p. 246.
57. Daniel Levine. 'Religion and Politics in Contemporary Historical Perspective'. p. 100.
58. Ibid. p. 102.
59. Terence Ranger. 'Religion, Development, and African Christian Identity', in Kirsten H. Petersen (ed.) *Religion, Development, and African Identity.* (Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute for African Studies, 1987), p. 50.
60. Daniel Levine. 'Religion and Politics in Contemporary Historical Perspective'. p. 106.
61. For a study of Liberation Theology in Brazil, where the impact of the movement has been strongest, see Thomas Bruneau and W. E. Hewitt. 'Patterns of Church Influence in Brazil's Political Transition'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 22, no. 1 (October 1989), pp. 39–61.
62. Daniel Levine. 'Assessing the Impact of Liberation Theology in Latin America'. p. 245.
63. Ibid. p. 253.
64. Ibid. p. 249.
65. S. C. Dube. *Modernization and Development.* p. 89.
66. According to Professor Frank Mora, an expert on Latin American politics,

> An artist in Peru who does this with a very indigenous art is Nicario Jimenez Quispe, conveying quite a bit of his political sentiments concerning the plight of the poor in Peru and the violence associated with Shining Path. Jimenez's art is with 'retablos' – a kind indigenous sculpturing. Another important author is August Roa Bastos, from Paraguay, who wrote about the violence, exile and national tragedy associated with Paraguay's long tradition with ruthless dictators. These are just a few examples among many.
>   In the Latin American context, I would argue that because of a legacy of violence, exploitation, state repression, and social marginalization, this kind of art is prevalent.
>   (Private correspondence with the author, 27 February 1999)

67. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. p. 106.
68. Douglas Ashford. 'Attitudinal Change and Modernization'. p. 174.
69. Ronald Inglehart. 'The Renaissance of Political Culture'. p. 1209; as mentioned earlier, Inglehart discusses Western democracies rather than Third World political systems.

70. Ibid. p. 1207.
71. Richard Parker. 'Anti-American Attitudes in the Arab World'. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.* vol. 497 (May 1988), p. 53.
72. For two excellent treatments of this subject, see Fouad Ajami. *The Arab Predicament: Arab Political Thought and Practice since 1967.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981) and James Bill and Robert Springborg. *Politics in the Middle East.* (Boston, MA: Scott Foresman/Little, Brown, 1990), pp. 360–8.
73. Alvin Rubenstein and Donald Smith. 'Anti-Americanism in the Third World'. *The Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Sciences.* vol. 497 (May 1988), p. 39.
74. Riodan Roett. 'Anti-Americanism in the Southern Cone of Latin America'. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.* vol. 497 (May 1988), p. 71.
75. Richard Parker. 'Anti-American Attitudes in the Arab World'. p. 53. Parker has served as a US ambassador to various Middle Eastern countries.
76. Alvin Rubinstein and Donald Smith. 'Anti-Americanism in the Third World'. p. 35.
77. Examples of such overt interventions include the Soviet Union's military invasions into Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Afghanistan, and American-sponsored coups in Iran and Chile and its invasions of the Dominican Republic, Grenada and Panama.
78. J. E. Goldthrope. *The Sociology of the Third World.* p. 199.
79. This is not necessarily the case with all Third World leaders, especially those like Ferdinand Marcos in the Philippines, who wish to portray to the masses a certain style of life and do not mind being emulated by others.
80. Walter Rosenbaum. *Political Culture.* p. 79.
81. Indonesia, as a random example of a Third World country, has cabinet-level ministries for 'public welfare', 'education and culture', 'home affairs', 'information', 'religion', 'social affairs', 'role of women' and 'youth and sports'. In most Third World countries it is common to find separate cabinet portfolios for such departments as 'culture', 'religious affairs', 'youth development' and 'internal affairs'. See Central Intelligence Agency. *Chiefs of State and Cabinet Members of Foreign Governments.* (Washington, DC: CIA, 1998).
82. Dennis Kavanagh. *Political Culture.* p. 31.
83. Ibid. p. 35.
84. Keith Watson. 'Educational Neocolonialism – The Continued Legacy', in Keith Watson (ed.) *Education in the Third World.* (London: Croom Helm, 1982), p. 10. A similar argument is made by Phillip Foster. 'The Educational Policies of Postcolonial States', in Lascelles Anderson and Douglas Windham (eds) *Education and Development: Issues in the Analysis and Planning of Postcolonial Societies.* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1982), pp. 3–25.
85. Keith Watson. 'Educational Neocolonialism – The Continued Legacy'. p. 184.
86. Ibid. p. 193.
87. Ibid. p. 199.
88. See Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran.* chapter 3 for Iran; Immanuel Hsu. *The Rise of Modern China.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), chapter 40 on China; and Nazih Ayubi. 'The Politics of Militant Islamic Movements in the Middle East'. *Journal of International Affairs.* vol. 36, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 1982–3), pp. 271–87 for an examination of political activism by Egyptian students.
89. See, for example, J. Cotton. 'From Authoritarianism to Democracy in South Korea.' *Political Studies,* vol. 37 (June 1989), pp. 244–59 and S. J. Han. 'South Korea in 1988: Revolution in the Making'. *Asia Survey.* vol. 29 (January 1989), pp. 29–38.

90. Fredrick Gareau. 'Another Type of Third World Dependency: The Social Sciences'. *International Sociology.* vol. 3, no. 2 (June 1988), p. 173.

91. Ibid. pp. 172– 3.

92. Philip Altbach and S. Gopinathan. 'Textbooks in the Third World: Challenge and Response', in P. Altbach, A. Arboleda and S. Gopinathan (eds) *Publishing in the Third World: Knowledge and Development.* (London: Mansell, 1985), p. 15.

93. Philip Altbach, Amadio Arboleda and S. Gopinathan. 'Publishing in the Third World: Some Reflections', in P. Altbach, A. Arboleda and S. Gopinathan (eds) *Publishing in the Third World.* p. 2.

94. Ibid. p. 6.

95. J. P. Nettl. 'Ideas, Intellectuals, and Structures of Dissent', in Philip Rieff (ed.) *On Intellectuals.* (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1970), pp. 89–90.

96. Ibid. p. 90.

97. Edward Shils. 'The Intellectuals and Power: Some Perspectives for Comparative Analysis', in Philip Rieff (ed.) *On Intellectuals.* p. 30.

98. Jay Weinstein. 'The Third World and Developmentalism: Technology, Morality, and the Role of Intellectuals', in Raj Mayhan (ed.) *The Myth-makers: Intellectuals and the Intelligentsia in Perspective.* (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1987), p. 115.

99. Mehran Kamrava. 'Intellectuals and Democracy in the Third World'. *Journal of Social, Economic, and Political Studies.* vol. 14, no. 2 (Summer 1989), pp. 231–2.

100. Syed Hussein Alatas. *Modernization and Social Change.* (London: Angus & Robertson, 1977), pp. 49–50.

101. Ibid. p. 9.

102. Alejandro Portez. 'On the Sociology of National Development: Theories and Issues', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds) *Third World Urbanization.* p. 109.

103. Ronald Inglehart. 'The Renaissance of Political Culture'. p. 1207.

104. Ibid. pp. 1215–16.

105. Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. p. 111.

106. Identity crisis is indeed an impediment to political development and inhibits the growth of a sense of political community and nationhood. It is, however, an inevitable stage through which all developing polities must pass in order to overcome the force of parochial identities. See Lucian Pye. 'Identity and Political Culture'. p. 124.

107. Ibid. p. 112.

108. Ibid. p. 117.

109. Ibid. p. 118.

110. Nathan Keyfitz. 'Development and the Elimination of Poverty'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 651.

111. See above, Chapter 1.

112. See Terry Hoy. 'Octavio Paz: The Search for Mexican Identity'. *Review of Politics.* vol. 44, no. 3 (July 1982), pp. 370–85.

113. Octavio Paz. *The Labyrinth of Solitude: Life and Thought in Mexico.* Lysander Kemp, trans. (London: Evergreen, 1961), p. 10.

114. Terry Hoy. 'Octavio Paz: The Search for Mexican Identity'. p. 385.

115. See the case of Iran's Ali Shariati, in Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran.* pp. 73–6. Shariati repeatedly acknowledged his debt to Frantz Fanon for his concept of 'return to the self'.

6 Revolutions

The appearance of revolutions and revolutionary movements in developing countries is a result of political as well as social and cultural developments and dynamics. More specifically, as discussed in previous chapters, the particular characteristics of Third World states, the larger consequences of social change, and the features inherent in political cultures combine to give rise to conditions conducive to the outbreak of revolutions. Nevertheless, despite the widespread prevalence of such conditions throughout the developing world, revolutions are rather rare historical occurrences. Why, it is thus important to ask, have revolutions not taken place with greater frequency given the existence of their social and political preconditions? Moreover, exactly how and what social and political dynamics lead to revolutions and at which specific junctures?

Broadly, revolutions denote fundamental objective and subjective changes (i.e. both institutionally and culturally) in political arrangements and leaders, principles and orientations.[1] They entail the transformation of the very political fabric on which a government is based. Palace coups and changes in leadership and in personalities do not necessarily constitute a 'revolution' in the fullest sense, despite what the coups' protagonists often like to think. Nevertheless, it is quite conceivable that a coup may set in motion a chain of events which may lead to the outbreak of a revolutionary situation. Compared with military coups, revolutions entail much deeper and more profound changes. They turn the world of politics around, change the basic premises on which political culture is based and transform the larger implicit and explicit guidelines according to which political conduct is governed. In this respect revolutions are distinctively political episodes, although their precise occurrence is brought on by a coalescence of not only political but also social and cultural factors.[2] As past and recent experiences have demonstrated, to say that revolutions are 'political struggles of great intensity'[3] and that they invariably involve considerable violence[4] has become somewhat of a truism, although the decade of the 1980s did bear witness to the budding of 'negotiated revolutions' in some parts of Eastern Europe.[5] Yet, by and large, revolutions still remain mass-based affairs of great magnitude, brought on and carried through by the mobilisation

of masses of people against specific political targets. Even Hungary's largely 'negotiated revolution' was precipitated and in turn fuelled by frequent and noisy protests by thousands of Hungarians in Budapest and elsewhere.[6]

CAUSES OF REVOLUTIONS

It follows that any credible attempt to explain revolutions needs to consider the conditions under which mass mobilisation is achieved.[7] This includes an analysis of the prevailing *social* as well as *political* conditions that are conducive to the emergence of revolutionary mass mobilisation. Revolutions are *political* episodes to the extent that they denote the institutional crumbling of an old political order and its replacement by new political objects, arrangements and structures. Exactly how this collapse and the subsequent replacement are brought about is a manifestation of not only political dynamics but also of all those other factors – social and cultural – which also influence mass mobilisation and political activism. Thus, to view revolutions only as political events is to see only half of the picture. Political dynamics need to be considered in conjunction with social and cultural developments.

It is within this multi-disciplinary framework that theories of revolutionary causation have generally been constructed and put forth. Ancient and contemporary scholarship bears witness to ceaseless and at times highly impressive efforts to examine the root causes of revolutions and to grasp the full extent of the social and political dynamics which result in revolutionary episodes.[8] Some of these theories have had greater explanatory success than others. Nevertheless, most theoretical explanations suffer from a number of highly significant analytical deficiencies.[9] To begin with, most existing theories ignore the inherently varied nature of revolutions and attempt to explain these diverse phenomena through one all-embracing framework. What result are theories which in their attempt to find applicability to *all* revolutions become at best too generalised.[10] There is a need for both historical and contextual specificity. Revolutions vary from one another according to the different historical contexts within which they occur.[11] Thus a theoretical framework which explains the causes of, say, the French revolution may not necessarily apply to more contemporary examples such as the Vietnamese and Chinese revolutions.

Equal attention must be paid to the significant role played by human agency in revolutions, which is by nature reflexive and changeable. A theory of revolution needs to consider the intrinsic changeableness that is imparted to revolutions because of human initiative.[12] More than anything else, the success or failure of revolutions depends on the specific actions taken by revolutionary participants, actions that are inherently varied according to the context, the timing and the manner of their execution.[13] The decisions that revolutionary leaders make, the manner in which those decisions are implemented and pursued, and the specific

consequences that may arise from them differ from one case to another. It is precisely these vital details that make each revolution different from another one. Even in cases where deliberate attempts are made to emulate previous models, as, for example, Che Guevara tried in Bolivia, there are striking differences in the detailed mechanisms with which revolutions are carried forward. It is precisely this lack of attention to contextual specificity, at the heart of which is the variable nature of human conduct and initiative, that has led to the demise of so many emulative revolutionary movements around the world.[14]

In addition to their overly ambitious and thus highly generalised nature, most theories of revolution put too much emphasis on one aspect of revolutionary eruption at the expense of other, equally significant ones. Among the theories of revolution which in recent years have gained widespread respect and currency within the academic community, emphasis has been placed either on the 'dissynchronisation' of value systems and the ensuing 'disequilibrium' of pre-revolutionary societies;[15] on the inability of social actors to fulfil their goals and aspirations;[16] on the regime's incapacity to absorb emerging groups into itself,[17] or to mobilise them for its own benefit;[18] or on the state's inability to withstand the pressures brought on it by structural weaknesses and by class-based revolts.[19] In virtually all of these approaches overwhelming emphasis is placed on one facet of social and/or political developments while the simultaneous contribution of other dynamics to revolutions are underestimated or even completely ignored.[20] In a few instances emerging developments have forced a revision of earlier, one-dimensional theories.[21] But the tendency to give primacy to one aspect of analytical examination while underestimating the importance of others still pervades current scholarship on revolutions.

The study of revolutions, whether classic or contemporary, requires a multi-disciplinary, multidimensional approach. The dynamics that result in the appearance of revolutionary circumstances are political as well as social. Politically, the outbreak of revolutions requires a significant weakening of the powers of political incumbents and their growing incapacity to hold on to the state's institutions and its various other resources. This includes loss of control of the means of economic hegemony over the general population; loss of control over the coercive organs of the state, such as the army and the police, and the state's propaganda networks, such as the electronic and the printed media; and a steady loss of privileged access to socially valued goods and institutions. In general the primary precondition of revolutions is the loss of previously held powers and privileges on the part of the elite. This reduction in the elite's powers may be caused by any number of domestic or international developments that could adversely affect the powers of the state. Internationally, such a weakening could occur through inter-state disputes and military conflicts, excessive diplomatic pressures or what may be termed as 'conditional relations'.[22] Internally, the elite's hold on power may be weakened by

such events as the death of a central, authoritarian personality or excessive and naked competition over power resources. Concurrently, however, the political exigencies thus created need to be exploited by the efforts of groups who initiate specific acts in order to bring about the state's ultimate collapse. Unless and until such groups exist, and acquire powers sufficient to overwhelm those of the dying state, a revolution will not occur. In essence revolutions are raw power struggles of the highest order: on the one hand exist the political elite, in control of the state, their powers and privileges steadily declining owing to a variety of internal and/or international developments; on the other hand, there are revolutionaries, increasingly belligerent and with more specific demands, gradually achieving enough size and strength to overpower and replace the elite.

These political dynamics cannot occur in a social vacuum. The growing momentum of the contenders for power, who are gradually seen as – and who come to see themselves as – revolutionaries, and the withering of the state both take place within and are precipitated by social and cultural dynamics. Social developments help in the structural weakening of the state in a number of ways. Most fundamentally, social change and industrial development lead to the creation of various social classes and values which the existing system cannot absorb into itself.[23] Thus, especially in modernising societies, where new classes are continually emerging and where old and new values are in constant flux, the state assumes an essentially conflictual relationship with emerging social groups and seeks constantly to sever their access to sources of political power. Regardless of the eventual outcome of this state-society conflict, even if society has been subdued and subjected to the state's full control, the very existence of such an adversarial nexus weakens the basic foundations of the state and increases the likelihood of its collapse.

A more important contribution that social dynamics make to revolutionary outbreaks is in influencing the extent of popular support enjoyed by revolutionaries among the general population. By their attempts to communicate with the masses and to get their increasingly revolutionary message across, emerging revolutionary groups employ various social mediums, some of which they may not even be aware of. The existence of a number of social and cultural factors can significantly enhance or curtail the legitimacy of revolutionary actors. Depending on the specific conditions within a given society, apathy and conservatism may drown a revolutionary group into oblivion, with its cries of injustice and calls to revolt falling on ears deafened by passivity and content. By the same token, social conditions may invoke in people senses of injustice, deprivation and nationalist and religious sentiments which make them highly amenable to revolutionary mobilisation. The prevalence of specific social conditions that encourage revolutionary action, and the exact nature of the link between the existing conditions and the types of response evoked, are context-specific and vary from society to society. None the less, in all revolutions social conditions influence the direction and nature of unfolding events, to the same extent as, if not more than, political factors.

As the above summary suggests, the causes, course and outcome of revolutions in the developing world can be best analysed through the adoption of a multi-disciplinary approach that takes into account both social and political forces. In contrast to the West, throughout the non-democracies of the developing world, social and political forces confront each other nakedly, in their most brutal form, seeking aggressively to implant themselves and to supplant others.[24] This polarisation is further accentuated by the fragility of norms that govern political conduct, underwrite social relationships, and support existing institutions.[25] Within this context, while state–society links in non-democracies are more tenuous, their relationship with each other is a much more consequential one. In the developing world, changes occurring in the state can far more dramatically affect society than is the case in the West. Adversely, changes taking place in developing societies can have far more dramatic political ramifications than they would in Western countries. Examining revolutions in the developing world thus requires detailed analysis of political dynamics that lead to the state's weakness and to the emergence of revolutionary groups, in addition to the development of social and cultural conditions conducive to popular revolutionary mobilisation. State breakdown is only one facet of revolutionary episodes.

STATE BREAKDOWN

Revolutions are brought about through a confluence of political developments and social dynamics which weaken the powers of governing incumbents and, at the same time, enhance the capabilities of those aspiring to replace them. The political dynamics at work involve the incumbents' loss of legitimacy, the growing weakness and vulnerability of the structures and the institutions they have at their disposal and the concurrent activities of revolutionary groups aimed at exploiting these emerging exigencies and the resulting mobilisation of masses towards revolutionary goals. Equally significant are the prevailing social and cultural conditions that are conducive to revolutionary mobilisation, be they a general sense of deprivation among various social strata or disenchantment over prevailing cultural values. Also important are the means of access which revolutionary groups have to the general population, determined by either existing social organisations or by means of alternative nexuses that are specifically forged for this purpose.

It is only through a concurrent appearance of all of these dynamics, from legitimacy crisis and structural breakdown to revolutionary activism and mass mobilisation, that a revolution in the fullest sense takes place. Otherwise, in instances where emerging political weaknesses and vulnerabilities are not exploited by revolutionary groups, or when self-proclaimed revolutionaries operate in a social vacuum and seek to overthrow a strong and viable state, what occurs is merely political instability and upheaval, but not revolution. It is important also to distinguish between a revolution and a palace coup, the latter resulting merely in a change of personalities

while the former denotes an all-encompassing change in political arrangements, institutions and practices. Coup leaders all too often proclaim themselves as revolutionaries and declare their reign to be the start of a revolutionary era. It was indeed a military coup that brought the Ethiopian revolution to a head and caused the dawn of the post-Haile Selassie era.[26] However, the Ethiopian example has not been widely repeated, and the vast majority of military coups, especially in Latin America and Africa, result in a change of political personalities rather than principles. Politicians are only actors in the political drama. Their replacement by other actors does not necessarily affect the outcome of the play. It is the institutions they create and occupy, and the ideologies and principles they espouse, that constitute the political drama itself and affect society at large. Revolutions involve changing not only political actors but the entire scenario on which the drama of politics is based.

With this in mind, it is important to remember that the key to all successful revolutions, the catalyst that sets into motion all the other dynamics which produce revolutionary circumstances, is the political incapacitation of the ruling elite. Revolutions are in the first order developments that result from the political crises that engulf those in power. This centrality of state power arises out of the state's control of the various prized resources in society. Especially in the remaining non-democracies of the developing world, the state not only has power over the army, the police and the bureaucracy, but it also controls, directly or indirectly, various aspects of economic life, including resources, services, and general economic activity. In short, the state controls most if not all of the essential tools and resources that are necessary for running the country. Unless and until this control is somehow weakened and is transferred to power centres outside of the state, then aspiring revolutionaries will not find sufficient resources with which to mount and to maintain a political takeover.

The political weakening of pre-revolutionary states can be caused by the appearance of three broad categories of developments. Most directly consequential in bringing about revolutionary situations, and by far the most common developments weakening state power, are those with direct negative bearings on the state's cohesion and organisational viability. These are developments that lead directly to the structural collapse of state organisations and institutions. Developments as diverse as wars, economic bankruptcy, or the death of a central figure in a personalised system are among the category of events which can dramatically reduce the state's continued ability to control the resources needed to stay in power. Similar consequences may arise from partial and incomplete processes of political modernisation, thus leading to overstretched bureaucracies incapable of dealing with evolving circumstances, unfulfilled demands for increased political participation and a general absence of society-wide political entrepreneurship. Lastly, there is the development of a situation best described as a 'crisis of legitimacy'.

These developments are not mutually exclusive and often occur in connection with one another. The relationship between crises of legitimacy and structural

collapse is an especially strong one, with these two developments naturally interrelating and reinforcing one another. This relationship of mutual reinforcement assumes particular importance in developing countries, where the very process of development can trigger crises of legitimacy for political incumbents. Questioning the legitimacy of political leaders is an inevitable consequence of the intertwined processes of industrial growth, social change and political development. The 'development syndrome' results in a widening of perceptions on the part of ever greater numbers of people and, therefore, an increase in sensitivities about possible alternative ways of doing things in most aspects of life.[27] What occurs is a 'dissynchronisation' between the values that state leaders hold on the one hand and those of the general population on the other.[28] More specifically, crises of political legitimacy arise when the claims of current leaders to power are based on socially unacceptable historical or ideological interpretations, when the degree of political socialisation has not been sufficient to convince the people of the legitimacy of existing political arrangements and when there is excessive and uninstitutionalised competition for power.[29] In essence legitimacy crisis arises out of inadequate and incomplete political institutionalisation and consolidation, itself an inherent feature of non-democratic political systems.[30] Thus, a structural analysis of the collapse of pre-revolutionary states must necessarily examine the legitimacy crises that concurrently accompany them.

A legitimacy crisis is basically a crisis of authority. It signifies the inability of political leaders to justify their continued hold on power.[31] As mentioned earlier, legitimacy crisis is inherent in the process of development. However, a number of specific dynamics exacerbate the withdrawal of the proverbial 'mandate of heaven' and heighten a regime's sense of illegitimacy among the population at certain historical junctures. The problem is one of inability to deliver the goods promised or in demand, be they economic, political or emotional.[32] Lack of dynamic leadership and political acumen, continued and persistent demands for greater political participation or increased economic gratification, or a neglect or abuse of sources with symbolic importance, such as religion and nationalism, can all significantly accentuate popular perceptions about a state's illegitimate claims to power and unfitness to govern. Structural weaknesses in turn sharpen the potency of legitimacy crises by compounding the difficulties faced by supposedly incompetent leaders and by giving added purchase to people's negative feelings towards the state. Moreover, when prevailing circumstances allow, the sense of illegitimacy that prompts people to demonstrate their displeasure with state leaders has important consequences for mass mobilisation. Here, again, the relationship between structural variables and legitimacy crisis is crucial in pushing forward the eruption of revolutions.

Within the plethora of social and political developments that brings to a head the eruption of legitimacy crisis, the role of state leadership is central. This centrality arises from the fact that it is the legitimacy of state leaders that is at the very heart

of legitimacy crisis. This propensity towards a sense of leadership illegitimacy is even stronger in non-democratic countries subject to intense social change, where, through diffusion or imitation, the populace is constantly striving to attain the political liberties prevalent in democratic polities. With varying degrees, non-democratic leaders need constantly to react to or at least justify not abiding by the standards which underlie democracies.[33] It is no accident that revolutions have historically taken place in decidedly anti-democratic, authoritarian states.[34] Within the specific context of the developing world exclusionary regimes, which do not bother to mobilise popular support in order to justify their narrowly based sources of authority, are seen as particularly illegitimate and are most vulnerable to the outbreak of revolutions.[35] Such regimes are often based on the rule of a single, all-powerful political figure and have an increasingly narrow base of support.[36] The blatant elite corruption that is frequently endemic to these states, their tight control over education and the press, the control of the economy by a few families and their frequent neglect of national interests in preference for the interests of the superpowers all combine to increase significantly the likelihood that such polities encounter crises of legitimacy.[37] Nevertheless, even these vulnerable political systems can stave off revolutions if they acquire the patronage of a sufficiently strong sector of the population, especially the middle classes.[38]

The relationship between state leaders and legitimacy crisis extends to more than the mere maintenance of popularly acceptable political practices and interpretations. State leaders can significantly enhance or harm their popular legitimacy depending on how they treat the various symbols that are held in high value by important social classes. Most notably, the state leaders' neglect or offensive treatment of nationalist values and sentiments, historical traditions, cherished cultural values and religious beliefs and symbols can dramatically reduce their legitimacy. In order to bring prevailing social and cultural principles in concert with their political doctrines and ideologies political leaders often interpret socially pervasive symbols in a manner that would fit their narrow purposes, regardless of how twisted or even offensive those interpretations may be. Interpretations ascribed to specific historical episodes and to religious values are particularly used extensively in augmenting the legitimacy of existing political institutions and practices.[39]

Manifestations of nationalism tend to be even more influential in accentuating the popular sense of illegitimacy ascribed to state leaders in many non-democracies.[40] Colonial or neo-colonial relations generate the strongest sense of popular nationalism and are most conducive to legitimacy crises for colonial powers or their local proxies. Other forms of less dependent relationships are also instrumental in bringing into question the legitimacy of existing elites by heightening a perception of their subservience to foreign powers.[41] Nevertheless, the linkage between legitimacy crisis and nationalism is more than one of political sensitivity. Nationalist sentiments can be offended through the appearance of economic and industrial subservience

to a foreign country. State elites may effectively cultivate a sense of political nationalism and exploit it to their benefit. However, the economic policies that they pursue, especially if their strategy of economic development is one of import-substitution industrialisation,[42] can give rise to sentiments of economic nationalism and discredit their legitimacy as genuinely national leaders. Intense propagation of Western values and norms and ensuing backlashes among social classes can have similar effects.

In addition to demands for greater political participation and the upholding of values with symbolic importance, crises of legitimacy can arise out of a government's inability to meet evolving economic demands and expectations. The inability to 'deliver the goods', politically and emotionally, represents only one of the shortcomings that lead to legitimacy crisis. A state's inability to deliver more tangible goods, those which directly affect the economic well-being of the population, can have even more direct bearing on its perception as legitimate or illegitimate. Similar to anti-democratic, authoritarian states, those countries that are in a comparatively disadvantageous economic position are more prone to revolutions.[43] Similar to growing demands for greater political participation, often arising out of diffusion with or exposure to Western political practices, the transitional nature of economic development breeds rising expectations, thus accentuating the legitimacy crisis of those regimes unable to meet such expectations.[44] In instances where 'there is the continued, unimpeded opportunity to satisfy new needs, new hopes, new expectations', the legitimacy of political leaders is greatly enhanced and the probability of a revolutionary outbreak is reduced to a minimum.[45] When there is widespread economic deprivation, however, whether actual or perceived, real or relative, the likelihood of opposition to a state is significantly increased, especially when that state is seen as an obstacle to continued economic mobility.[46]

Lastly, the sources and the means through which a sense of the illegitimacy of political leaders is instilled and popularised among the people are important. A general feeling of unacceptability regarding the political and ideological justifications of political incumbents may already exist among a population. But how are these negative sentiments given sufficient potency and direction to be usefully channelled into revolutionary agitation? The issue is not merely one of overt revolutionary mobilisation. Before large-scale mass mobilisation towards avowedly revolutionary goals can be achieved, and even before the social and cultural conditions conducive to mass mobilisation can appear in a society, there must be voices of dissent, no matter how faint, bringing to light the illegitimate premises on which the current leaders' rule is based. Legitimacy crisis is based on the perception that current political values and practices are not legitimate while certain alternative ones are. It is more than coincidental that almost all legitimacy crises that precede revolutions occur along with a general 'intellectual rebelliousness', a 'foment of ideas' which sharply criticises the status quo and proposes ideological and valuative alternatives.

The proliferation of intellectual activities that occurred before the revolutions in France,[47] Russia,[48] Cuba,[49] Iran[50] and Hungary,[51] to mention a few, all had the effect of heightening popular perceptions of illegitimacy attributed to incumbent states. All too often, these sudden outbursts of intellectual activism are scattered, unorganised and uncoordinated, without a coherent doctrine or theoretical framework emerging until some time later. In France, for example, there was little agreement before 1789 between the many *philosophes* and *physiocrats* who were theorising about such concepts as liberty, political accountability and egalitarianism.[52] Russia's pre-revolutionary 'foment of ideas' was expressed mostly through a highly amorphous literary movement. In Cuba, what occurred was not a coordinated attempt to formulate a new theory, but essentially 'a guerrilla war of concepts, objectives, and abstractions'.[53] And in Iran the evolution of 'political Islam' as an alternative frame of ideological reference was only piecemeal and gradual.[54] What is important is the cumulative effect of these alternative values and conceptual frameworks in undermining the legitimacy of political incumbents.

Precisely why the flourishing of intellectual activity, which is part of the process of legitimacy crisis, occurs before revolutions is related both to social and to political dynamics. On the one hand, the characteristics that are inherent in political cultures in non-democracies, coupled with the intense social changes underway there, breed an environment which is conducive to the appearance of intellectuals propagating comparatively revolutionary ideas and concepts. In societies where merely speaking one's mind or even satirical writings are considered 'revolutionary' and subversive, any meaningful steps towards commentary and analytical writings can have a magnified social and political effect. At the same time, on the other hand, the structural weaknesses that engulf pre-revolutionary states add a special significance to the works of intellectuals and other men of letters. Even if purely artistic in value, works done by intellectuals in such an atmosphere add to the overall sense of scepticism regarding the legitimacy of the current order in general and that of the political establishment in particular.

The growing sense of unease with the legitimacy of the body politic is further compounded by the structural breakdown of the political system itself. A group of politicians that is unable to deliver the political, social and emotional goods that are in demand is considered even less justified in its rule when the very organisations through which it governs start to break apart. Again, the contextual relationship between legitimacy crises and structural weaknesses assumes crucial importance. Revolutions, as mentioned earlier, are in large part a product of the break-up of the political establishment. Only after the state has already lost a substantial part of its coercive abilities due to various debilitating developments, such as military defeats or bureaucratic collapse, have revolutionary groups found an opportunity to carry forward their agendas and gain widespread popular support.[55] Reinforcing and expediting this break-up is the popular perception of political elites as unfit to rule and unjust in holding on to the reins of power.

In analysing the structural break-up of pre-revolutionary states, equal attention needs to be paid to international as well as to domestic factors. With the growing complexity of evolving national agendas and international circumstances, economic and even political interdependence between modern nation-states has become an inseparable part of contemporary comparative politics. 'Every modern state,' it should be remembered, 'if it is to be understood accurately, must be seen just as fundamentally as a unit in an international system of other states as it must as a key factor in the production of social and economic power within its own territorial purlieus.'[56] Consequently, the types of developments and relations necessary to analyse within pre-revolutionary states are not merely those between the pre-revolutionary state and society but those between the state itself and other states.[57] Specifically, it is important to see what negative ramifications arise from a state's inability to meet the challenges of evolving international circumstances, as, for example, the French, Russian, Chinese, Iranian and, more recently, the governments of Eastern European countries experienced.[58]

Various types of domestic development have the potential of causing the paralysis of pre-revolutionary states and subsequently expediting the appearance of revolutionary movements. Such developments occur especially in relation to the state's organisations and its structures. Non-democratic countries include states that have variously been called 'bureaucratic authoritarian', 'praetorian', 'neo-patrimonial' or 'Sultanistic'.[59] For reasons discussed below, the structures supporting these states are particularly fragile and unreformable, and are, therefore, prone to being subsumed by revolutionary movements. Such states are inherently weak, for they cannot substantially penetrate their respective societies regardless of their massive bureaucracies or the fear and awe they instil in their populations through their armies and secret police. The fragile and often compulsory bonds that link the state to society are easily broken when the very seams that hold the state together begin to disintegrate, and the social energy released through this breakage often has devastating revolutionary consequences. It is not widespread poverty and misery but rather this endemic fragility of state institutions, and in turn their inability to control and to penetrate society, that is the most prevalent cause of revolutions in the developing world.[60]

Non-democratic states are particularly susceptible to revolutions because they tend to foster an atmosphere that politicises grievances that may otherwise be completely non-political. Those who are excluded from the political process and are not recipients of its patronage are especially likely to blame the political system for shortcomings that may or may not be politically related, such as economic difficulties or sudden social and cultural changes that cause widespread disillusionment and resentment. Particularly in closed, authoritarian systems, state leaders are seen as the primary protectors of the social and economic good, the all-embracing force from whom all power emanates. Eager to ascribe to themselves all benefits accrued

through their rule, they are similarly blamed through popular eyes for discomforts that may not necessarily be of their doing. Precisely because of this overwhelming role played in all affairs of the country, or at least due to popular perceptions of such a dominant role, these elites represent highly visible and resented symbols of authority, targets that not only are easily identifiable but also serve to unify protesters with different grievances and different agendas.[61] Also important is the tendency of such states to valorise political opposition and, by virtue of their repressive characters, to turn even moderate opposition into radical revolutionism.

Unlike personalised political systems, military dictatorships and bureaucratic-authoritarian states are not as easily susceptible to revolutions, although they are inherently just as unstable politically. The accentuated instability of personalised systems as opposed to bureaucratic or military dictatorships arises from structural characteristics as well as the functional attributes of the different systems. Structurally, the varying roles of the armed forces and the police in different systems are central to the extent of their political survivability. In literally all non-democratic political systems, repressive organs such as the military and the police play pervasive roles in maintaining the status quo. Coercive organisations in such systems tend to be the most sophisticated and organisationally viable of the institutions.[62] Nevertheless, the police and the army are often more capable of supporting the political order in times of crisis and turmoil in military dictatorships and authoritarian bureaucracies than they are in personalised systems. This discrepancy in the effectiveness of coercive organisations in maintaining the status quo arises out of the different structural relationships that they have with the various governing bodies. In bureaucratic and military dictatorships, the army and the police are often the very organisations that occupy the seat of power and themselves form the governing elite. Even if not directly part of the establishment themselves, the relationship between these organisations and the ruling elite is at a much more intimate level than is the case in personalised systems. There is thus a lot more at stake for them in ensuring the survival of the political order than might be the case in a different circumstance. Moreover, dictators in personalised systems often govern through creating and then manipulating cleavages between various organisations, even within various factions of the army, and are highly dependent on the loyalties they forge through patronage and manipulations.[63] They are thus constantly on guard against possible conspiracies or at least a waning of loyalties, loyalties that frequently wear thinner as crises set in.

Domestic developments are, nevertheless, only one category of events that bring about the structural collapse of an existing state. International factors can be equally influential determinants of the viability of domestic state structures and institutions. The prevalence of unequal economic and political relationships between Third World governments and the more powerful Western countries only heightens the sensitivities of domestic Third World political institutions to changes in the

international environment. The extent of domestic structural responsiveness to international fluctuations varies according to the degree of economic and political dependence. In overtly dependent developing countries several factors make the domestic power structure particularly weak and exposed to revolutionary situations. To begin with, the over-identification of the elite with one or more foreign powers substantially increases their perceptions of illegitimacy in the public eye and makes it difficult for them to justify their rule on historical and nationalist grounds. More specifically, dependence on a foreign power reduces the political manoeuvrability of incumbent elites and circumscribes the range of their potential responses in times of crisis.[64] For the elite, the conduct of domestic politics becomes diplomatically conditional: domestic responses rely heavily on the diplomatic nuances of the more powerful state.[65] Thus, pre-revolutionary states in Iran, the Philippines and Hungary felt compelled, for one reason or another, to pursue domestic policies that were being explicitly or implicitly advocated by their much stronger patrons.[66] Whether actual or perceived, these states felt constrained from pursuing policies which might have otherwise helped them remain in power.

In instances of outright colonial domination, ruling colonial structures are not necessarily any less prone to revolutions than those of weaker, dependent states. Like personalised and bureaucratic-authoritarian states, direct colonial rule often dispenses economic and political privileges to very few elite groups, often to settlers, and thus generates considerable anger and resentment, especially among the middle and upper classes.[67] As if the granting of special privileges to visible minorities is not a sufficient precondition for widespread animosity towards the colonial establishment, nationalist sentiments and demands for political self-government further fan the flames of anti-colonial revolutions.[68] Moreover, similar to personalised states, colonial administrations inadvertently facilitate revolutionary mobilisation in two important ways: first, they serve as highly visible targets for grievances that are economic and socio-cultural as well as political; second, they often function as unifying elements that draw together groups with diverse social, economic and ethnic backgrounds whose unity might not have been as easily achieved otherwise.[69]

The external relations that can potentially lead to revolutions need not necessarily be of the type found between patron and client states. The outbreak of revolutionary circumstances in one country may lead to similar developments in another through imitation, instigation or even contagion.[70] Insecure about the extent of their newly acquired powers and paranoid about the conspiratorial designs of outside forces, revolutionary states often try to foment revolutions in neighbouring countries in order to enhance their own legitimacy and power-base both at home and abroad. Similarly, domestic revolutionaries, for lack of indigenous role models or an ideology of their own, often idolise revolutionary heroes in other countries and try to follow their teachings and replicate their actions. Fuelled by such revolutionary myths as Latin American continentalism, Arab unity and pan-Africanism, the 'echo effect' of

revolutions is amplified by the intense propaganda and repeated slogans of what is usually no more than a handful of guerrillas.[71] Also prevalent are the contagious effects of revolution in one country on events occurring in another, a development further fuelled by the unrelenting propaganda of most revolutionary states and the tendency to imitate foreign revolutionaries. As the changes in the former Soviet Union in the late 1980s and their reverberations in the rest of Eastern Europe demonstrated, also important are the cumulative effects of gradual changes in world-historical contexts. These accumulated developments often give rise to 'slow, secular trends in demography, technology, economics, religion, and worldly beliefs that set the stage for the rise and decline of core hegemonic orders, which in turn create opportunities for peripheral and small groups to gather situational advantage and revolt'.[72]

In so far as internationally dependent states are concerned, relations with a more powerful foreign patron can have either negative consequences for the viability of domestic structures or, as the case might be, a reinforcing, positive effect. For decades, for example, the overwhelming diplomatic force of the Soviet Union, backed up with military might under the Brezhnev Doctrine, kept together the seams of Eastern European regimes and repeatedly suppressed emerging revolutions such as those in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. In the 1960s, the Kennedy administration's policy of 'Alliance for Progress' was similarly designed to contain the emergence of revolutionary circumstances in South and Central America.[73] This policy of containment was once again pursued with great zeal in the 1980s under the auspices of what came to be known as the 'Reagan Doctrine'. In speech after speech President Reagan warned of 'a mounting danger in Central America that threatens the security of the United States' and spoke of the necessity to contain it.[74] 'Using Nicaragua as a base', he declared,

> the Soviets and Cubans can become the dominant power in the crucial corridor between North and South America. Established there, they will be in a position to threaten the Panama Canal, interdict our vital Caribbean sealanes and ultimately move against Mexico.[75]

The pursuit of a foreign policy thus shaped in turn resulted in heightened American economic, diplomatic and even military presence throughout Latin America, from Mexico down to Grenada, El Salvador, Honduras, Panama, Colombia, Chile, Brazil and Argentina. In one way or another, whether militarily or through economic aid, American efforts in Latin America were designed to strengthen incumbent states and to stem the tide of revolutions threatening the anti-communist governments of the region.[76]

In addition to crises of legitimacy and to domestic and international sources of structural weakness, states can lose a substantial degree of their cohesion and organisational viability owing to incomplete and partial processes of political

modernisation. Thorough and complete political modernisation involves the progressive rationalisation and secularisation of authority, the growing differentiation of new political functions and specialised structures, and increased participation in the political process.[77] Non-democracies, however, are reluctant to open the system to unsolicited and undirected political participation and to reform other existing centres of power.[78] The negative consequences of skewed political modernisation thus figure particularly prominently in non-democratic polities, where centralised political structures strive to pursue parallel but contradictory goals of increased consolidation and accommodative participation. Political modernisation is politically inherently destabilising as it undermines loyalty to traditional authority, creates a need for new loyalties and identifications, and increases the public's desire for wider participation in the political process.[79] When demands for greater participation are not met, the accentuation of unfulfilled aspirations substantially increases the likelihood of political instability.[80] The absence of any meaningful means and institutions through which political objectives and demands for participation could be channelled only aggravates the inherent fragility of the system.[81] Even those groups which gain entry into politics do so without becoming identified with established political institutions or acquiescing in existing political procedures.[82] Under repressive states, where political demands cannot be comprehensively formulated, much less expressed, the result is a further polarisation of the inherently antagonistic relationship that in such countries exists between the state and society.[83] Moreover, partial political modernisation further hampers the cohesion of the political system and impedes the growth of political entrepreneurship and national integration.[84] The political context remains hopelessly unevolved, exacerbating the rawness and nakedness with which political forces and dynamics confront each other. Such a persistent absence of 'normative regulations of the means of competition', as one observer has put it, results in heightened political instability and a growing proclivity towards revolutionary eruption.[85]

In addition to structural attributes, functional characteristics are equally important in determining the longevity of various political systems. Personalised systems comprise highly visible, widely feared and resented, manipulative political figures whose longevity is determined by their vigilance, political will and sheer wiliness. Patrimonialism pervades and there is a predominance of intra-elite and inter-organisational rivalries manipulated by the person of the ruler.[86] However, bureaucratic and military dictatorships, along with other types of 'corporatist' states,[87] are more likely to extend patronage to the various social groups and try to incorporate them into the system.[88] The vulnerability of such states to widespread, mass-based revolts is thus reduced, at least while the extension of patronage continues uninterrupted and the popular goods in demand – political and otherwise – are delivered.

REVOLUTIONARY MASS MOBILISATION

The political dynamics that bring about revolutionary circumstances are by no means limited to the structural breakdown of pre-revolutionary states. Equally important are the deliberate efforts of avowed revolutionaries in overthrowing the political order, as too are the situational possibilities that enable them to achieve the widespread support and mobilisation of the masses. Revolutions, it must be remembered, are as much products of human initiative as they are the result of the political and structural collapse of state institutions and the elite that rules through them.[89] The existence of oppositional groups who specifically seek to exploit the state's mounting difficulties is an integral part of every full-blown revolution.[90] What varies from one historical example to another is the exact timing of the formation of such groups. Some revolutionaries predate the start of the state's structural difficulties, while others begin to collect into cohesive organisations *after* the state's atrophy has begun.[91] The crucial difference, especially in so far as the starting point and the nature of revolutionary activism are concerned, is that some revolutions are *planned,* signified by the premeditated actions of revolutionaries based on previous calculations, whereas others are more *spontaneous.* Planned revolutions are typically formulated and carried out by revolutionary organisations which, due to the force of circumstances, rely on guerrilla warfare to overthrow existing states. Thus the revolutions in Vietnam, China, Cuba, Algeria and Nicaragua were all planned.[92] Spontaneous revolutions, on the other hand, acquire their leaders only *after* the revolutions are well under way. The revolutions in France, Russia, Iran and those that swept across Eastern Europe in the late 1980s were all of the spontaneous variety. In all instances, nevertheless, the active initiatives of groups aiming to compound and to exploit the political difficulties of states are essential in bringing revolutions to fruition. Otherwise, what results are weakened states, lingering and in disarray, but unopposed and unchallenged.

Spontaneous and planned revolutions differ most significantly in the manner in which the revolutionary mobilisation of the masses is achieved and in the role of the revolution's leadership cadre. In both types of revolution, the paramount weakness and vulnerability of existing political institutions are necessary preconditions. In planned revolutions, however, a clear, identifiable cadre of revolutionary leaders exists which seeks to expedite the state's collapse through its activities. In the process, they hope, their stature and legitimacy among the public will increase, enabling them to augment their popular support and following. Such groups are actively revolutionary, both in name and in their goals, and seek specifically to bring about revolutionary circumstances. They proclaim themselves to be 'revolutionaries' long before actual revolutionary circumstances set in. In spontaneous revolutions, on the other hand, leaders of revolution ascend to that position gradually and only through the progression of revolutionary circumstances.

In planned revolutions the role and initiatives of professional revolutionaries are highly important. These revolutionaries do not by themselves necessarily 'make' revolutions, but are instrumental in mobilising, organising and arming supporters and sympathisers, who eventually become revolutionary masses.[93] Their specific purpose is to compound the structural deficiencies of the state by turning the political frustrations of the masses into organised revolutionary action.[94] In their efforts, self-proclaimed revolutionary leaders recruit an army of their own and wage a war aimed at overwhelming the state. They have two pressing concerns: the formation of an army that would at least be comparable in strength to that of the state; and the strategic and tactical manoeuvres of this revolutionary army aimed at bringing about the state's military defeat. It is only through a successful combination of these two tasks that a revolutionary organisation can succeed in overthrowing the state.[95] For reasons discussed below, the leadership cadre of this revolutionary army is frequently drawn from the ranks of the urban middle class, while the rank-and-file foot-soldiers, the majority of the troops, are made up of rural inhabitants and peasants.

Primarily, the efforts of revolutionary leaders aimed at mobilising and directing peasant activism require a solid and viable organisational apparatus. In addition to an aroused and mobilisable peasantry, guerrilla revolutions require a disciplined army and a party organisation that can provide the coordination and tactical vision necessary for peasant unity and, ultimately, control of national power.[96] Peasant-based revolutions depend directly upon the mobilisation of peasants by revolutionary organisations, making the sheer availability and effectiveness of such groups a necessary precondition of revolutionary situations.[97] Frequently, spontaneous political acts by peasants have forced a scramble for the mobilisation and formation of its would-be leadership.[98] The degree of interaction between peasants and the leadership, and the extent to which leaders can absorb the peasantry into their organisation and expand their power-base, determines the viability and success of the revolutionary movement. Absence of firm links between revolutionary leaders and followers, especially in guerrilla revolutions where planned revolutionary initiatives play an extremely important role, can substantially reduce a movement's chances of Success.[99] Moreover, for guerrilla organisations to succeed in achieving their revolutionary goals, they need to have a sustained ability to recruit new members, to evolve and develop structurally and organisationally, and to endure the adversities of military confrontation with the state.[100]

In contrast to the rank and file, the social composition of the leadership of planned revolutionary movements is often decidedly non-rural. It is frequently the disaffected members of the middle classes, most notably urban-educated students and intellectuals, who occupy most of the leadership positions in guerrilla organisations. Disjointed processes of social, political and economic development turn the middle classes into inherently revolutionary groups whose oppositional

inclinations are likely to rise along with their level of education and social awareness. Given their greater sensitivity to their surrounding environment, most revolutionary leaders in the developing world come from middle-class, intellectual backgrounds, especially from the ranks of students.[101] These are dissatisfied literati elites who have turned into professional revolutionaries. They have entrusted themselves with the task of establishing solid revolutionary coalitions and alliances which not only are able to overcome social, ethnic and economic divides but are capable of eventually replacing the current regime.[102] In search of an audience willing to follow and obey them, they most frequently find the peasantry.

The preponderant role of the peasantry in guerrilla organisations arises out of a combination of rural conditions that are conducive to oppositional mobilisation and political and ideological inclinations of revolutionary leaders. To begin with, urban-based political activists are drawn to the peasantry by a number of practical political considerations. A lack of political penetration by the government machinery into distant towns and villages has in many countries resulted in the alienation of the countryside from the rest of society. Despite detailed and large-scale control over various aspects of urban life, most Third World governments at best pay scant attention to the countryside and, for the most part, neglect not only the economic development but the political pacification of rural areas. Even in instances where concerted efforts aimed at the political mobilisation of rural inhabitants have been launched, large numbers of peasants continue to remain outside the influence of what often turn out to be only half-hearted campaigns. The political vacuum thus created offers potential guerrilla leaders ample opportunity for recruitment and mobilisation. In an environment of little or no official political presence of any kind guerrilla leaders not only recruit followers with relative ease but also conduct 'revolutionary acts' which, even if only symbolically important, may have a magnified effect. For guerrilla organisations, mere survival can be politically as important as wining battles. In the eminently political types of war they wage survival for the guerrillas is a victory in itself.[103]

Another reason for the attraction of revolutionary leaders to the peasantry is the supposed 'ideological purity' of peasants, brought on by their geographic and political distance from centres of power. Alienation from the world of state politics also entails ideological and valuative estrangement from the political establishment. Mao, who was perhaps the most astute observer of the peasantry's revolutionary potential, went so far as to label peasants (not the Communist Party) 'the vanguards of revolution', 'blank masses' uncorrupted by the bourgeois ideologies of the city.[104] Moreover, not only is the peasantry ideologically unassimilated into the political establishment, its predicaments and objective conditions often closely match the revolutionaries' ideologies. Most revolutionaries declare their aims to be the alleviation of misery and injustice, poverty and exploitation, the very conditions which in one way or another pervade Third World rural areas. Coupled with greater

possibilities for recruitment and mobilisation, ideological compatibility with objective conditions draws most leaders of planned revolutions to remote rural regions and areas. There is thus a strong connection between the revolutionaries' ideology and dogma and circumstances prevailing in the countryside.

The development of the links that bond revolutionary leaders and guerrilla organisations to the mass of peasants is important in determining the extent and effectiveness of revolutionary mobilisation. The establishment of such nexuses and the resultant mobilisation are dependent upon several variables, some indigenous to local conditions and others dependent on the characteristics of the guerrilla leaders themselves. Chief among these determining factors are the degree of hegemony of the local ruling classes, the nature and extent of rural coalitions and alliances and the ability of guerrilla leaders to deliver the goods and services which others cannot. In most rural areas in the developing world, pre-capitalist, peasant smallholders, sharecroppers and tenants are likely to enjoy cultural and social (as well as organisational) autonomy from ruling elites, despite their tendency towards localism and traditionalism.[105] This relative, built-in resistance to elite hegemony and consequent receptivity to ideological and organisational alternatives arises out of a sense of economic security and independence, inflated though it may be at times, vis-à-vis the more dominant rural classes such as big landlords and estate owners. The spread of capitalism and the subsequent commercialisation of agrarian society are also important in bringing about peasant rebelliousness.[106] This increasing propensity towards revolutionism is not necessarily because of the increased exploitation of peasants, but, rather, it is derived from a general breakdown of 'prior social commitments' to kin and neighbours and thus greater flexibility and independence to act as desired.[107] Even more important, however, is the extent of direct government control over a region, or indirectly through landed proprietors acting as government proxies. Favourable political circumstances, most important of which is the existence of weak states, are crucial in determining the feasibility of revolutionary activism and possibilities for peasant mobilisation.[108]

Another significant factor that can directly influence the success of guerrilla leaders in mobilising peasants is the guerrillas' ability to deliver goods and services, both actual and perceived. People will join or abstain from opposition groups based on the rewards they receive, both individually or as a collective, rewards that may be emotional as well as material.[109] In specific relation to rural areas revolutionary movements have won broad support when they have been willing and able to provide state-like goods and services to their targeted constituents. The establishment of 'liberated areas' secure from government attacks, the provision of services such as healthcare, law and order and public education, and the initiation of economic reforms in the form of land redistribution or tax reductions are particularly effective measures in drawing peasants closer to guerrilla leaders.[110] The success of revolutionary groups in peasant mobilisation becomes even more tangible when

they provide local goods and services with immediate payoffs before attempting to mobilise the population for the more difficult task of overthrowing the government.[111]

The provision of goods and services may not necessarily be material. For most peasants and rural inhabitants, participation in an army-like guerrilla organisation offers a way of escaping from disillusioning surroundings and finding purpose and meaning in a greater cause. Membership in an organisation becomes an end in itself, a means to fulfil desires of assertiveness and beliefs in higher goals and principles. To command and in turn to be commanded, to hold a gun in hand and to aspire to dreams and lofty ideals are often mechanisms through which peasant revolutionaries, especially younger ones, try to shatter their socially ascribed, second-class image, and, in their own world, attempt to 'become somebody'.

While planned revolutions frequently take the form of organised, peasant-based guerrilla attacks on specific targets, spontaneous revolutions are more elusive in their start and objectives, especially in their earlier stages, and tend to be centred more in urban rather than rural areas. Spontaneous revolutions typically begin with a drastic decline in the coercive powers of the state, followed in turn by a simplification of the political process and the subsequent growth of polarisation among various sectors of society.[112] Political simplification and polarisation are interrelated: the growing division of society into two crude and simplified camps of political 'supporters' and 'opponents' polarises the political environment and leads to the politicisation of traditionally non-political groups.[113] Crisis-initiating events, exacerbating responses by the state, and the increasing weakness of the elite in the face of the revolutionaries' growing momentum combine to bring about a revolution.[114] In this sequence of events political mobilisation takes place outside the state's purview and occurs precisely because the state itself was unwilling or unable to sanction popular political participation. Precipitating events force the hands of those claiming the revolution's leadership mantle, prompting them to be more reactive than proactive in their manoeuvres, exploiting rather than creating the situational opportunities that arise as the revolution progresses.

The role and importance of revolutionary leaders and their actions in spontaneous revolutions cannot be overemphasised. The significance of leaders in spontaneous revolutions increases as the course of events progresses and as the revolution's features and goals become clearer. Leaders of spontaneous revolutions call the shots, but only *after* it becomes clear that they are indeed the ones commanding the adherence of the masses already protesting in the streets. How these leaders achieve their exalted position vis-à-vis the protesting masses depends on a number of developments. Most notably, they include a coalescence of their organisational and verbal skills, the cultural communicability of their revolutionary message and ideology and their effectiveness in exploiting the opportunities presented to them by the state's collapse. Also important are the viability of the social and/or political organisations through which they establish their links with the larger society and relay their beliefs and propaganda to their growing mass of followers.

It is here that the crucial role of social organisations in spontaneous revolutions becomes evident. Focus must be on the groups and classes that comprise a society's strata, the various groups that seek to overthrow the state by mobilising popular support and the connections that are forged or which already exist between the social classes on the one hand and the opposition groups on the other. In planned revolutions the links between revolutionary leaders and the masses are established through the political parties that have been established for this very purpose. The ideology, structure and initiatives of these parties are designed in a manner not only to capture political power but also to acquire popular support as a necessary starting point. In contrast, in spontaneous revolutions, avowedly revolutionary organisations initially play only a marginal role and operate on fringes of the larger social and political setting. As exemplified in one historical case after another, the revolutionary organisations that evolve under the eventual leaders of spontaneous revolutions are initially highly amorphous and rather unstructured[115] and it is through existing social organisations that the necessary links between revolutionary leaders and the masses are established. Before having even acquired the support and sympathy of the population, the revolution's leaders are determined by virtue of their dominant position within society and by the strength of the social institutions they have at their disposal.

Whereas the success of planned revolutions greatly depends on the viability of the political parties and organisations involved, it is mostly through highly fluid, non-formal and society-wide institutions and means of communication that the leaders of spontaneous revolutions communicate with their emerging followers and push the revolution forward. Gatherings in churches and mosques, tea-houses and community meeting places, and social or ritualistic ceremonies and other occasions in which intense interpersonal interactions at the local level are conducted can all serve as instruments through which messages and instructions might flow from revolutionary organisers to street protesters. The accessibility of various revolutionary groups to these instruments of communication and mobilisation determines which ones can call on the most followers more effectively, enabling them eventually to assume the leadership of a mounting revolutionary movement.

Other factors significant in the nexus between the leaders and followers thus established include, among others, the depth and social salience of the informal and society-wide institutions involved, the sheer numeric size and popular availability of these organisations and their degree of immunity from government reprisals. Equally important is the ideological and strategic compatibility of these social organisations with the opposition groups. While priests and religious activists may fully exploit the advantages of churches and other religious institutions to communicate with the masses, for instance, communist activists, most of whom reject religious aesthetics on doctrinal grounds, are likely to shun their use and thus circumscribe the scope of their mobilisational efforts.

It is this differing role of social organisations as opposed to revolutionary parties that has led to a historical paucity of spontaneous revolutions in developing countries. Examples of planned revolutions spearheaded by guerrilla organisations, or at least intended revolutions, abound in the developing world, especially in Latin America and Africa.[116] Planned revolutions occur most frequently where relatively strong (often military-based) states coexist side by side with bifurcated societies plagued by social, cultural, economic and ethnic divisions. In such settings revolutions could not possibly take place without the deliberate efforts of revolutionary organisations. Spontaneous revolutions, however, require strong social organisations and comparatively homogeneous societies, characteristics that are not readily found in many developing countries. As it happens, throughout the developing world, the most viable social organisations that have not been fully absorbed into the state are religious institutions, especially those with a history of political independence. It is primarily due to this reason that in countries where spontaneous revolutions have recently taken place, as in Iran and the Eastern European states, religious institutions have played a highly important role in the revolutionary movement.[117] Politically independent social organisations, of which religious institutions have been prime historical examples, have afforded emerging leaders of revolutions access to the popular classes, in terms both of communication and organisation, and have enabled them to popularise their beliefs and propagate their revolutionary actions among the population at large.

A final feature that separates spontaneous and planned revolutions is the role of ideology. Ideology plays a much greater role in planned revolutions than it does in spontaneous ones. By nature, planned revolutions are far more dependent on the deliberate revolutionary mobilisation of the masses than are spontaneous revolutions, in which state breakdown and mass oppositional activity largely occur spontaneously and with little encouragement from designated leaders. Planned revolutions, brought on by the efforts of organised guerrilla organisations, are often guided by strict interpretations of specific ideologies. They are, in essence, as much *ideological* movements as they are *revolutionary*. Spontaneous revolutions, however, initially lack ideological specificity, especially in their embryonic stages when revolutionary leaders have not yet been fully determined. Leaders of planned revolutions know exactly what they want, to wrest political power, and have clear targets and objectives. In their pursuit they develop or adopt an ideology most suited to their ends. In furthering their cause and their efforts the adoption of an ideology by guerrilla leaders is particularly important in representing an alternative frame of reference to that of the regime. Since they do not hold power, revolutionary leaders must convince their audience that what they believe in holds greater promise than what the state has done. A revolutionary ideology is needed, therefore, to further the legitimacy of the revolutionaries and to delegitimise the views and beliefs of those in power.[118] In spontaneous revolutions, on the other

hand, the ideology of the revolution becomes clear only with the emergence of its cadre of leaders. Most spontaneous revolutions are free of any specific ideological character until well after the ultimate winners of the revolution have become clear and have established their reign over the country. During the course of the revolution itself, differing ideologies are as much in competition with each other as are various opposition groups who find themselves at the helm of a brewing revolution. For protesting crowds, and for the emerging leaders of the revolution themselves, an ideological understanding of the revolutionary movement is summed up in dogmatic slogans promising vague ideals and rejecting the present. Specific doctrines with detailed outlines for future courses of action are conspicuously absent, at least until after one revolutionary group has completely dominated the movement. Even then, the ideological character of many post-revolutionary states does not become clear until well after their initial establishment. Post-revolutionary ideological orientations often emerge out of strategic, diplomatic and organisational considerations that may not necessarily be the original ones the revolutionaries held.[119]

Considering that spontaneous revolutions begin as largely non-ideological movements, the existence of precise factors and conditions that specifically facilitate mass mobilisation assumes particular importance. A state's popular social base among those it governs, its ability and willingness to use coercion to quell the expression of anti-state sentiments and the degree to which the popular classes are allied together against the governing elite all determine the extent and depth to which a population is spontaneously mobilised against a political order. A most important factor is the extent to which various social classes have been co-opted into the state and identify with it both politically and valuatively. It is precisely those groups unincorporated into the system, often unidentified and alien from it, that are most amenable to anti-state persuasions.[120] They have very little or nothing at stake in the prevailing political arrangements, and indeed frequently view them as a source of misery and grief. Given the existence of favourable social and political circumstances, such as a permissible political environment and a general willingness to revolt, these groups waste little time in showing their displeasure over the state of affairs. Expressions of anti-state sentiments by one group are greatly strengthened when joined by those of other groups, enhancing the size and forcefulness of an emerging alliance united in its dislike of the prevailing polity. An alliance of the middle classes, who in the developing world are most prone to political opposition, and other, less well-placed social groups like the peasantry or the lumpen proletariat, is particularly threatening to the political order.[121] Such a coalition not only enjoys the raw social and economic powers that stem from middle-class participation, but has the numerical strength and size of the lower classes, who, not having much to lose anyway, are more prone to taking risks and indulging in acts of political violence.

Also influential in shaping the depth and the nature of anti-state mobilisation are a number of otherwise politically unimportant logistical factors. Variables that in

one way or another affect popular conduct, such as the weather, availability of recreational facilities, transportation routes and opportunities for face-to-face communication all influence the extent of mobilisation, the manner in which it comes about and is conducted.[122] Expressly political factors are equally important. The mere existence of anti-state grievances and sentiments is not sufficient to result in mass mobilisation.[123] The political space provided by the state and by the efforts of existing or emerging revolutionaries is equally important. The extent to which the state is willing and capable of using coercion to maintain itself in power contributes most directly to the nature of oppositional mobilisation. Pre-revolutionary states frequently lack the strong willpower necessary to withstand the onslaught of an evolving revolution, wavering between alternative options to adopt and unwilling to bear the costs of heavy-handed repression. In other instances, where expressions of opposition are met by determined responses, only sympathisers are intimidated into silence and become passively obedient. For the most part, activists are not discouraged but are rather radicalised, and the political atmosphere is more polarised than stabilised.[124]

The breadth of mass mobilisation is, in turn, determined by the existence of specific, society-wide conditions which are conducive to revolutionary developments. Several developments, not all of which are specifically political in origin and context, arising within the larger society make various social strata prone to revolutionary mobilisation and, concurrently, have the potential of further exacerbating the state's political difficulties. In a broad sense these developments provide the contextual background within which the widespread mobilisation of emerging revolutionaries is made feasible and takes place. More importantly, the consequences of these developments – or, at times, their mere existence – often serve as the main impetus for popular opposition against ruling elites, made possible by permissive political circumstances. People will not revolt against a state unless there is a compelling reason for them to do so.[125] Political incapacitation by incumbent regimes simply provides the space and the breathing room necessary for the articulation and expression of political antagonisms. It is not, however, by itself a sufficient *cause* for the coordinated expression of anti-establishment sentiments by a reasonably large sector of the population. The specific sentiments and grievances that prompt populations into political activism may be political, but they may just as likely be non-political, at least in genesis if not in the actual form of expression. What is needed is a thorough examination and understanding of the underpinning characteristics and features, both political and otherwise, of societies in which revolutionary mobilisation takes place. Then an identification can be made of those factors and dynamics which, individually or in conjunction with one another, invite an otherwise inert mass of people to demonstrate their collective displeasure when political circumstances allow.

Three specific sets of developments in any society have the potential of leading to the mobilisation of large numbers of people. They are, broadly, those developments

that give rise to economically based grievances, to social and cultural grievances and to political grievances. In their own way each of these developments produces feelings of resentment and opposition against those who are popularly perceived as responsible for society's ills. Feelings of economic unease and grievance can potentially arise out of the many consequences of industrial development and technological modernisation, such as scarcity of essential goods resulting from demographic growth, feelings of deprivation and inequality vis-à-vis others, and class structures conducive to antagonistic behaviour. Social and cultural grievances, meanwhile, become most acutely pronounced during periods of intense social change, particularly when prevailing social values become disjointed and clash with one another. Lastly, political grievances, which are both frequent and form an integral part of almost all revolutionary movements, arise out of such developments as alienation and desires for wider participation in the political process, nationalism and growth of alternative ideologies.

In one way or another, various facets of economic development substantially increase the potential for widespread protests among the different social classes. The precise causal connections between economic development and political instability and violence are blurred and varied at best.[126] Nevertheless, under specific circumstances the consequences of economic and industrial development may potentially be politically threatening to the state. On the most elementary level industrialisation expands the numerical size of some economic classes at the expense of others: rural inhabitants, most notably the peasants, find their numbers increasingly dwindling while the industrial and the middle classes often rise steadily. Unpropertied and unemployed villagers mushroom into lumpen proletariat, and domestic migration becomes an uncontrolled, integral part of the development process.[127] Depending on specific economic policies, traditionally based elites and upper classes are also often weakened, both politically and economically, and replaced by newly emerging elite groups. In most developing countries it is thus not uncommon to find long-established landed or commercial elites and other aristocratic families who gradually fade into political oblivion and give way to new groups. These new social classes owe their status to modern economic relations such as banking, international trade and modern industries. How these consequences of industrial development and economic growth on class composition affect the stability of political elites varies from one specific instant to another. Nevertheless, shifting class structures can, and often do, influence the viability of a political system, particularly in cases where the state is dependent on and, in turn, patronises a specific class. The close political and economic affinity of numerous Third World states with one or more of the elite classes has frequently been one of the main sources of dissent and grievance by both the public at large and emerging or existing revolutionary groups.

Another potential source of economic grievance that can increase the public's propensity towards revolutionary action is a feeling of deprivation from desired

economic objectives. This syndrome is not unrelated to the development process and is most accentuated in countries undergoing rapid economic growth and modernisation, which brings with it new needs, outlooks and desires. It engenders new hopes and fosters rising expectations. Those who experience continued increase in well-being develop expectations about continued improvement.[128] In the promotion of society-wide economic grievances,

> the crucial factor is the vague or specific fear that ground gained over a long period of time will be quickly lost. This fear does not generate if there is continued opportunity to satisfy continually emerging needs; it generates when the existing government suppresses or is blamed for suppressing such opportunity.[129]

What occurs is a sense of economic deprivation, one that is relative to one's past or to future aspirations, or is a result of lesser current capabilities than before but higher aspiration for the future.[130] People who feel deprived and are frustrated in their goals and aspirations have an 'innate disposition to do violence to its source', which, especially in the developing world, is perceived to be the state.[131] In instances when the sources of deprivation are obscure and cannot be attributed to specific political targets alternative doctrines and ideologies which justify violence gain increasing currency and appear as more and more plausible to ever-growing segments of the population.[132]

Also related to the general process of development and more specifically to feelings of deprivation are growing rates of inequality among various classes. Economic inequality by itself does not necessarily lead to political violence and the relationship between the two developments is context-specific.[133] In accented forms, however, inequality, whatever its causes, leads to a reduction of identification between the rulers and the ruled. In the face of continued immiseration and little or no identification between the body politic and the rest of society, widespread expressions of political discontent become highly likely.[134] In countries entangled in the complicated and multifaceted web of industrial development a variety of factors can potentially heighten existing economic inequalities and create new ones. Unequal access to economically valuable goods due to social or political influence, especially those goods whose value rises with the pace of industrialisation, exacerbates differences in class standing, power and prestige. The spread of commercialism across social and class lines polarises competition over valued goods, especially those that are often in scarce supply, such as arable land and water. In instances where institutional means of competition are lacking and there are permissive class structures and political circumstances the potential for political violence is greatly magnified.

Economic inequality can also arise from demographic growth, albeit indirectly, which similarly increases the scarcity of prized resources in rural and especially urban areas. Although the connection between the two developments is not

universal, under certain circumstances population growth severely strains a state's capabilities and can bring it to the brink of collapse, as was the case immediately prior to the English revolution.[135] Reduction of state revenues and irregularities in finances, elite competition and turnover, and other difficulties associated with population growth may in one way or another propel a weakened state towards breakdown.[136] The connection between population growth, inequality and revolutionary action is even more direct. As one observer claims, 'given a finite set of resources, a bifurcation process takes place in which many persons have very little and a few persons have much. This process has been shown to occur in instances of mass revolution.'[137] Those revolutions that have involved the extensive mobilisation of peasants have taken place in countries where there has been a scarcity of land and its concentration in strikingly few hands.[138]

The last category of economic grievances that can potentially lead to revolutionary mobilisation stems from the predominance of particular class structures. These class-based dynamics may or may not be exacerbated by the industrialisation process. The prevalence of specific structures and patterns of intra- and inter-relations within each class can significantly determine its potential for revolutionary mobilisation. The middle and the lower classes, including the peasantry, are most directly amenable to grievances arising out of class structures and relations. As earlier discussed, the primary source of grievance among the middle classes in the developing world is the frustration of their aspirations and feelings of relative deprivation. In so far as peasants and other rural inhabitants are concerned, their revolutionary mobilisation is most feasible when the peasant community as a whole is strong and they enjoy some degree of economic and political autonomy, and when landlords or proxies of the establishment lack direct economic and political control at the local level.[139] Peasants with smallholdings are normally conservative and quiescent, reluctant to risk losing their paltry goods and heavily dependent on wealthier peasants and landed upper classes.[140] Sharecroppers and property-less labourers, who have little to lose and much to gain by risking the adversities of violent action, along with middle-income peasants frustrated by their inability to break into the ranks of large estate proprietors, are most apt to partake in revolutionary action. An equally inert conservatism similarly pervades the upper echelons of the industrial working class, especially among highly skilled technical workers who form the 'labour aristocracy'.[141] Having finally secured stable and relatively comfortable positions, skilled industrial labourers are less willing to engage in the risky and often violent political activities in which the lumpen proletariat readily participate.

Despite their important role, economic grievances are not the only category of dynamics that is conducive to mass mobilisation. Society-wide grievances with deep roots among the population can arise out of the appearance of certain social and cultural factors as well. The many and varied ramifications of social change are

examples of the developments that can propel an otherwise quiescent group of people into revolutionary mobilisation. Socially aroused political opposition is often attributed to an absence of 'harmony' between a 'society's values and the realities with which it must deal'.[142] Disparities between the way people feel and behave and their surrounding environment may indeed lead to their disillusionment and the subsequent focusing of their anger on political targets. But, at least in so far as developing countries are concerned, social antagonisms are more likely to arise out of an incoherence in the very values that people hold and cherish. Specifically, deeply felt feelings of trauma and anguish are likely to occur when the prevailing values of society themselves are sharply divided, incoherent and at times outright contradictory. Social and cultural homogeneity is hardly evident in any contemporary modern society. In some societies, however, especially those undergoing rapid modernisation and development, values are so disjointed and contradictory that valuative heterogeneity turns into what are almost completely separate and unrelated clusters of different cultures. When sufficient numbers of people subscribe to these differing value systems, and they all demand equal shares of the available cultural and political resources, then there is potential for violent action, especially if institutional, agreed-upon means of political competition do not exist.

The mutual incompatibility of desired and cherished values may not even transcend social and class lines. People who are constantly bombarded with ever-changing norms and values, especially in developing countries, can become culturally disillusioned and may, under the right circumstances, turn their anger on political objects. They become torn between the values that they have traditionally come to adopt and those contradictory ones which they either feel compelled to adopt or willingly desire.[143] The greater the intensity of the conflict among prevailing social values, the greater is the extent of individual and collective disillusionment and thus the higher is the probability of politically threatening behaviour. Similarly, the more acutely aware of the conflict between the values to be adopted, the higher is the people's disillusionment and thus the likelihood of their political activism. This is primarily why in the developing world students and intellectuals, whose job it is to reflect critically on prevailing social values, are more prone to political opposition than are other groups.[144]

Lastly, a series of developments can give rise to politically originated grievances. Because those grievances that are derived from social and economic developments are expressed in political terms, it is frequently difficult to distinguish between singularly political dynamics which prompt mass protests and those with social or economic roots. Nevertheless, there are several explicitly political developments that are, by themselves, sufficient causes for widespread political mobilisation. In fact, they are for the most part the same set of dynamics that bring about crises of legitimacy for incumbent elites and nullify their justifications for continued hold on power. The same factors that lead to a state's growing political weakness have the

potential for bringing about mass mobilisation. They include, among others, growing demands for greater political participation, increasing awareness of nationalist sentiments and the widespread acceptance of ideologies other than that of the state. There is, none the less, a fine and subtle difference between legitimacy crisis as such and politically induced mass mobilisation. Legitimacy crisis is one of the conditions through which states are weakened and are pushed to the brink of collapse. It is only then, well after a permissive political environment has appeared, that the same set of factors that had led to legitimacy crisis results in mass-based revolutionary mobilisation.

The depth and preponderance of one particular form of grievance throughout society are so important that they can directly influence the composition of the revolution's leaders and their followers. More than anything else, the leaders and followers of a revolutionary movement are determined by virtue of their relationship with the various sources of grievance that exist throughout society. Those who can most aptly discern the sources that aggrieve people, who are ideologically and organisationally capable of exploiting this aggrievement, and who offer remedies or promises for their alleviation rapidly ascend to the leadership of the revolution. At the same time those masses who are most acutely afflicted by a certain form of actual or perceived misfortune, who are organisationally and situationally most accessible to groups promising to alleviate those misfortunes and who are emotionally and valuatively receptive to the appeals and cries of revolutionary leaders form the bulk of mobilised protesters. In short, the very dynamics that set into motion the onslaught of revolutions to a great extent determine the character and nature of their leaders and followers.

It is precisely for this reason that the overwhelming participants in revolutions in the developing world are displaced and dispossessed peasants, disillusioned and unassimilated rural migrants and the aspiring but frustrated sectors of the middle classes. Given the right political circumstances, increased inequality and bifurcation due to a growing scarcity of goods or skewed commercialisation can promote an appropriate environment within which peasants become politically active and mobilised. The discovery by self-proclaimed revolutionaries of the merits of peasant-based revolutions, derived either from practical realism or from doctrinal idealism, provides a nexus between the two groups that has been a recurrent feature of many Third World revolutions. The less-than-successful peasant-based revolutionary movements that once flourished throughout Latin America attest to the centrality of bonds between peasants and guerrilla activists. The successful revolutions that occurred in China, Cuba, Vietnam and for a time in Nicaragua all entailed considerable peasant participation.[145] At the same time, the cultural disillusionment, economic frustration and political alienation of ever-growing lumpen proletariats can also turn them into readily mobilisable foot-soldiers for various revolutionary causes, the full meanings of which they may not necessarily grasp or even endorse. Their

participation in revolutionary movements is not so much a result of deep understanding of and adherence to specific revolutionary ideals but more due to their readiness and availability, both emotionally and organisationally, to indulge in politically oppositional activities. Those who do hold revolutionary hopes and aspirations and who do not hesitate to voice them are mostly drawn from among the ranks of the middle classes. By virtue of their social and economic positions, education, background and political aspirations, the middle classes are much better positioned to assume the mantle of a revolutionary movement, and when revolutions do occur, it is indeed the middle classes who are frequently in the forefront and are their most vociferous leaders. The politics of exactly what groups become mobilised and by whom are in turn determined by the prevailing social and cultural dynamics that bond the various social strata together.

CONCLUSION

Revolutions are clearly multifaceted phenomena arising out of the interplay of an array of diverse political, economic and social developments. They are, in the first place, products of skewed political development, of inherently unstable processes through which the body politic passes, voluntarily or involuntarily, on its way towards becoming a modern polity. Revolutions are, in essence, violent struggles aimed at achieving a fuller and more developed political establishment that is supposedly more capable than the incumbent state of delivering popularly desired goods and services. This struggle is an eminently political one, with its genesis, direction, scope and magnitude all dependent on the specific political configurations that happen to prevail at the time. However, the contextual environment within which the wilful leaders and the receptive audience of this struggle emerge is heavily influenced by dynamics which may be fundamentally apolitical, particularly those that are social and cultural or economic in nature. The polarising effects of this contextual environment are all the more accented in the developing world, where industrial development, rapid urbanisation and intense social change simultaneously take place at dizzying pace and breed an atmosphere that is highly conducive to the eruption of full-blown revolutions or at least to the appearance of revolutionary movements.

Where revolutions lead is a question largely dependent on whether they are more planned in genesis and execution or involve greater spontaneity. Planned revolutions are based largely on premeditated programmes devised by wilful revolutionaries who know precisely what they want and have a clear idea of the ways and means to achieve their goals. Their efforts are undertaken with clear goals in mind and, if successful, there is often little disparity between their previously proclaimed goals – apart, of course, from their boisterous and at times manipulative and false promises – and newly initiated policies. Spontaneous revolutions, on the

other hand, are more often the outcome of developments that at first look hardly revolutionary. They involve neither formulated programmes nor planned initiatives. Their leaders emerge relatively late, and the ultimate goals of those leaders are formed and pronounced even later. The revolution's goals and ideals are initially elusive at best, summed up in dogmatic slogans and vague promises. Each cadre of leaders promises such appealing alternatives as democracy and equality, principles that are left open to differing interpretations once it is time for their implementation. In these instances the ideals and purposes of revolutions often appear vastly contradictory to their eventual outcomes, a contradiction which is more the result of the inherent looseness of the revolutionary process itself than the sinister manipulation of revolutionary turn-faces.

Nevertheless, with remarkable uniformity and regardless of whether spontaneous or planned, revolutions give rise to populist, inclusionary regimes. By nature, revolutions involve the patronage of masses of people. The relationship between revolutionary leaders and followers is essentially one of patrons and clients, with the group most capable of catering to the needs and wishes of the widest spectrum of people emerging as their leader in opposing the establishment. Once the revolution has succeeded and formerly oppositional leaders become newly seated elites, their reliance on the patronage of the masses does not wither and is in most instances accentuated. Their mandate is no longer to oppose the regime but to make good on the numerous promises they gave before the revolution's success. The viability of the fledgling post-revolutionary order depends on a continuation of the mass patronage that the revolutionaries acquired before they attained formal political power. To sustain power, they now need to deliver the goods which they promised, or at least to divert attention from them by fomenting popular anger against enemies of the new order, real or imagined. Diverting attention they indeed do, as the many instances of politically sanctioned post-revolutionary violence, wars and other international disputes and purges and the elimination of 'counter-revolutionaries' demonstrate. But even if only symbolic, a token delivery of the goods promised is necessary to maintain the viability of the new system. The result is populist and politically inclusionary states that in one way or another allow greater participation in the body politic if not in the decision-making process itself.

It is here in these inclusionary, post-revolutionary states that revolutions meet an embryonic death. Various means of patronage, such as economic reforms, programmes for public welfare and greater political participation, no matter how farcical and marginal, heighten the new regime's sense of legitimacy among the population and, at least so long as that legitimacy lasts, make it immune from another revolution. Moreover, post-revolutionary states, which in any event owe their very genesis to violence, feel less inhibited to use coercion in order to preserve their newly acquired powers than would otherwise be the case. The constant identification of 'counter-revolutionary' elements as the prime public enemy, the

perpetual sense of besiegement and threat from outside forces and the unending rhetoric of denouncing the morbid past all make post-revolutionary states more prone to using violence against actual or perceived sources of opposition. Crushing those who oppose the new order is indeed one of the very sources upon which its legitimacy is based. In the many instances where generally accepted means of political competition are absent, the tendency towards violence and revolutions remains an endemic probability. Whether the new wave of emerging democracies in the developing world proves capable of stemming the tide of engendered instability remains to be seen. What is likely is the eruption of further revolutions in narrowly based, delegitimised states promoting rapid social change and industrial development in the face of non-responsive and unchangeable political structures.

NOTES

1. For an examination of the concept of revolution see, James Farr. 'Historical Concepts in Political Science: The Case of "Revolution"'. *American Journal of Political Science.* vol. 26, no. 4 (November 1982), pp. 688–708, and John Dunn. 'Revolution', in T. Ball, J. Farr and R. Hanson (eds) *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), pp. 133–56.
2. John Dunn. *Modern Revolutions: An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon.* 2nd edn. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), p. xvi.
3. Ibid.
4. Peter Calvert. *Politics, Power, and Revolution: An Introduction to Comparative Politics.* (London: Wheatsheaf, 1983), p. 163.
5. See, for example, Laszlo Bruszt. '1989: The Negotiated Revolution in Hungary'. *Social Research.* vol. 57, no. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 365–87.
6. Ibid. p. 386.
7. Mehran Kamrava. 'Causes and Leaders of Revolution'. *Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies.* vol. 15, no. 1 (Spring 1990), p. 84.
8. A few examples of works on revolutions include: Michael Freeman. 'Review Article: Theories of Revolution'. *British Journal of Political Science.* vol. 2 (1972), pp. 339–59; Rod Aya. 'Theories of Revolution: Contrasting Models of Collective Violence'. *Theory and Society.* vol. 8, no. 1 (July 1979), pp. 39–99; Perez Zagorin. 'Theories of Revolution in Contemporary Historiography'. *Political Science Quarterly.* vol. 88, no. 1 (March 1973), pp. 23–52; Theda Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), chapter 1; Issac Kromnick. 'Reflections on Revolution: Definition and Explanation in Recent Scholarship'. *History and Theory.* vol. Xl, no. 1 (1972), pp. 22–63; J. M. Maravall. 'Subjective Conditions and Revolutionary Conflicts: Some Remarks'. *British Journal of Sociology.* vol. 27, no. 1 (March 1976), pp. 21–34; and L. Stone. 'Theories of Revolution'. *World Politics.* vol. 18 (1966), pp. 159–76.
9. For a look at the merits of some of the more dominant theories of revolutions, see, especially, Barbara Salert. *Revolutions and Revolutionaries.* (New York: Elsevier, 1976); Rod Aya. 'Theories of Revolution: Contrasting Models of Collective Violence'; Farrokh Moshiri. 'Revolutionary Conflict Theory in an Evolutionary Perspective', in Jack Goldstone, Ted Robert Gurr and Farrokh Moshiri (eds) *Revolutions of the Late Twentieth Century.* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991), pp. 4–36.
10. James Farr. 'Historical Concepts in Political Science: The Case of "Revolution"'. p. 706.
11. Ibid.

12. John Dunn. *Rethinking Modern Political Theory.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), p. 77.
13. Mehran Kamrava. 'Causes and Leaders of Revolutions'. p. 84.
14. The Third World is full of examples of movements which embrace foreign ideologies and import them with little alteration to fit local conditions. 'Maoist' groups across the Middle East and Latin America, especially the Shining Path in Peru, are prime examples.
15. Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.*
16. James Davies. 'Toward a Theory of Revolution'. *American Sociological Review.* vol. 27, no. 1 (February 1962), pp. 7–19; and Ted Gurr. *Why Men Rebel?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970).
17. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.*
18. Jerrold Green. 'Countermobilization as a Revolutionary Form'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 16, no. 2 (January 1984), pp. 153–69.
19. Theda Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions.*
20. Mehran Kamrava. 'Causes and Leaders of Revolutions'. pp. 80–1.
21. See, for example, Theda Skocpol. 'Rentier State and Shi'a Islam in the Iranian Revolution'. *Theory and Society.* vol. 11, no. 3 (May 1982), pp. 265–83.
22. Diplomatic pressures and conditional relations with the United States were highly instrumental in the direction and success of revolutions in Iran and the Philippines, as were relations between the Soviet Union and those governments which fell to revolutions in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s.
23. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* pp. 4–5.
24. Huntington calls these states 'praetorian'. See ibid. p. 168; also see above, Chapter 1.
25. See above, Chapter 4.
26. Edmond Keller. 'Revolution and the Collapse of Traditional Monarchies: Ethiopia', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds) *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990), p. 87.
27. Lucian Pye. 'Legitimacy Crisis', in Lucian Pye *et al. Crises and Sequences in Political Development.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971), p. 183.
28. Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.* p. 65.
29. Lucian Pye. 'Legitimacy Crisis'. p. 138.
30. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* p. 31.
31. Lucian Pye. 'Legitimacy Crisis'. p. 141.
32. Barry Schutz and Robert Slater. 'A Framework for Analysis', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds) *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* p. 5.
33. Lucian Pye. 'Legitimacy Crisis'. p. 150.
34. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* p. 275.
35. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. *Politics and Society.* vol. 17, no. 4 (December 1989), p. 498.
36. See above, Chapter 1.
37. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. pp. 498–9.
38. Ibid. p. 500.
39. See above, Chapter 1.
40. Barry Schutz and Robert Slater. 'A Framework for Analysis'. p. 7.
41. Barry Schutz and Robert Slater. 'Patterns of Legitimacy and Future Revolutions in the Third World', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds) *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* p. 248.
42. See above, Chapter 2.
43. Theda Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions.* p. 286.
44. Barry Schutz and Robert Slater. 'A Framework for Analysis'. p. 5.
45. James Davies. 'Toward a Theory of Revolution'. p. 17.
46. Ted Gurr. *Why Men Rebel?* pp. 121–2.
47. R. Ben Jones. *The French Revolution.* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967), p. 16.

48. Richard Charques. *The Twilight of the Russian Empire.* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965), p. 204.
49. Pedro Perez Sarduy. 'Culture and the Cuban Revolution'. *The Black Scholar.* vol. 20, nos 5–6 (Winter 1989), p. 18.
50. Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran.*
51. Laszo Bruszt. '1989: The Negotiated Revolution in Hungary'. p. 386.
52. R. Ben Jones. *The French Revolution.* p. 15.
53. Pedro Perez Sarduy. 'Culture and the Cuban Revolution'. p. 19.
54. Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran.* p. 66.
55. Theda Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions.* p. 17.
56. John Dunn. *Modern Revolutions.* p. xxi.
57. Theda Skocpol. *States and Social Revolutions.* p. 31.
58. Ibid. p. 47.
59. See, especially, Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* chapter 4, and Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. pp. 498–9.
60. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 504.
61. Ibid. p. 496.
62. T. David Mason. 'Indigenous Factors', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds) *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* p. 40.
63. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 500.
64. David Mason. 'Indigenous Factors'. p. 33.
65. Mehran Kamrava. 'Causes and Leaders of Revolutions'. pp. 83–4.
66. See Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran.* pp. 30–2 and 40–5; and Laszlo Bruszt. '1989: The Negotiated Revolution in Hungary'. pp. 381–2.
67. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 501.
68. Barry Schutz and Robert Slater. 'Patterns of Legitimacy and Future Revolutions in the Third World'. p. 248.
69. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 502.
70. William Foltz. 'External Causes', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds) *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* pp. 54–9.
71. Girard Chaliand. *Revolution in the Third World: Myths and Prospects. (*New York: Viking Press, 1977) p. 40.
72. William Foltz. 'External Causes'. p. 63.
73. See Bruce Miroff. *Pragmatic Illusions: The Presidential Politics of John F. Kennedy.* (New York: David McKay, 1976), especially pp. 110–66. A more up-to-date discussion of US foreign policy towards Latin America can be found in Thomas Paterson, J. G. Clifford and Kenneth Hagan. *American Foreign Policy: A History.* (Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath & Co., 1991), pp. 588–90, 627–32.
74. Quoted in Clifford Krauss. 'Revolution in Central America?' *Foreign Affairs.* vol. 65, no. 3 (1987), p. 564.
75. Ibid. pp. 564–5.
76. Thomas Paterson, J. G. Clifford and Kenneth Hagan. *American Foreign Policy.* p. 588.
77. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* p. 34.
78. See above, Chapter 1.
79. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* p. 37.
80. Ibid. p. 56.
81. Ibid. p. 403.
82. Ibid. p. 21.

83. Irma Adelman and Janus Hihn. 'Crisis Politics in Developing Countries'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*. vol. 33, no. 1 (October 1984), p. 20.
84. Elbaki Hermassi. *The Third World Reassessed*. (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980), pp. 59–60.
85. Ibid. p. 44.
86. See above, Chapter 1.
87. For a discussion of 'corporatism', see Rod Hague and Martin Harrop. *Comparative Politics and Government: An Introduction*. (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1987), pp. 134–7. See also above, Chapter 1.
88. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 500.
89. John Dunn. *Rethinking Modern Political Theory*. p. 77.
90. John Dunn. *Modern Revolutions*. p. 236.
91. In *Political Order in Changing Societies*, Samuel Huntington classifies revolutions into 'Eastern' and 'Western' (p. 266).
92. Planned revolutions correspond closely to the variety Robert Dix calls 'Latin American'. Such revolutions occur, he writes, 'in regimes that have been narrow, modernizing, military-based dictatorships rather than, say, weak monarchies. They have not simply collapsed, almost of their own weight, as in the Western style of revolution. Instead, they have had to be overthrown and their supporting armed forces defeated or demoralized in combat with those bent on revolution' (Robert Dix. 'Varieties of Revolution'. *Comparative Politics*. vol. 15, no. 3 (April 1983), p. 283).
93. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 492.
94. Carlos Vilas. 'Popular insurgency and Social Revolution in Central America'. *Latin American Perspectives*. vol. 15, no. 1 (Winter 1988), p. 69.
95. Ibid. p. 70.
96. James Scott. 'Hegemony and the Peasantry'. *Politics and Society*. vol. 17, no. 3 (1977), p. 294.
97. Theda Skocpol. 'What Makes Peasants Revolutionary?' *Comparative Politics*. vol. 14, no. 3 (April 1982), p. 364.
98. James Scott. 'Hegemony and the Peasantry'. p. 295.
99. Girard Chaliand. *Revolution in the Third World*. p. 48.
100. Ibid. pp. 42–3.
101. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. p. 290.
102. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 496.
103. Girard Chaliand. *Revolution in the Third World*. p. 35.
104. Stuart Schram. *The Political Thought of Mao Tse Tung*. (New York: Praeger, 1972), p. 253. See also ibid. pp. 236–64.
105. James Scott. 'Hegemony and the Peasantry'. p. 289.
106. Eric Wolf. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century*. (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 276.
107. Ibid. p. 279. Also see Theda Skocpol. 'What Makes Peasants Revolutionary?'
108. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 497.
109. T. David Mason. 'Indigenous Factors'. p. 42.
110. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 493.
111. Ibid. There are, of course, instances (especially in Central America and in Africa) where guerrilla armies levy heavy 'revolutionary taxes' on local peasants, disrupt village lives by raping women or forcibly recruiting children into their armies, and ransack and pillage villages which refuse to support their cause.
112. Jerrold Green. 'Countermobilization as a Revolutionary Form'. p. 147.

113. Ibid. pp. 160–1.

114. Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.* p. 101.

115. This was precisely the case in the revolutions that occurred in France, Iran and Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s. In the Russian revolution, however, the soviets played an important organisational role.

116. Girard Chaliand. *Revolution in the Third World.* p. 40.

117. See Mehran Kamrava. *Revolution in Iran.* chapter 5, esp. pp. 128–30; for Eastern Europe, see the special edition on Eastern European revolutions in *Social Research.* vol. 57, no. 2 (Summer 1990).

118. Gerald Greene. *Comparative Revolutionary Movements.* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974), p. 57.

119. This was particularly the case in the Cuban and the Ethiopian revolutions, where the ideological orientations of post-revolutionary political leaders did not fully become apparent until some time after their success.

120. Jeff Goodwin and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. p. 494.

121. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* pp. 300–1.

122. Gerald Greene. *Comparative Revolutionary Movements.* p. 63.

123. T. David Mason. 'Indigenous Factors'. p. 48.

124. Ibid. p. 44.

125. Barrington Moore. *Injustice: The Social Base of Obedience and Revolt.* (London: Macmillan, 1978), p. 459.

126. Peter Calvert. *Politics, Power, and Revolution.* p. 168.

127. See above, Chapter 2.

128. Ted Gurr. *Why Men Rebel?* pp. 121–2.

129. James Davies. 'Toward a Theory of Revolution'. p. 8.

130. Ted Gurr. *Why Men Rebel?* p. 46. For a full analysis of relative deprivation, see ibid. pp. 46–56.

131. Ibid. p. 37.

132. Ibid. p. 205.

133. Manus Midlarsky. 'Rulers and the Ruled: Patterned Inequality and the Onset of Mass Political Violence'. *American Political Science Review.* vol. 82, no. 2 (June 1988), p. 492.

134. Ibid. p. 493.

135. See Jack Goldstone. 'State Breakdown in the English Revolution: A New Synthesis'. *American Journal of Sociology.* vol. 92, no. 2 (September 1986), pp. 257–322.

136. Ibid. pp. 310–11.

137. Manus Midlarsky. 'Scarcity and Inequality: Prologue to the Onset of Mass Revolution'. *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* vol. 26, no. 1 (March 1982), p. 34.

138. Manus Midlarsky. 'Rulers and the Ruled: Patterned Inequality and the Onset of Mass Political Violence'. pp. 493–4.

139. Jerome Himmelstein and Michael Kimmel. 'Review Essay: States and Revolutions: The Implications and Limits of Skocpol's Structural Model'. *American Journal of Sociology.* vol. 86, no. 5 (March 1981), p. 1147. Also see Theda Skocpol. 'What Makes Peasants Revolutionary?'

140. Jeffrey Paige. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movements and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World* (New York: Free Press, 1975), p. 41.

141. Val Moghadam. 'Industrial Development, Culture, and Working Class Politics: A Case Study of Tabriz Industrial Workers in the Iranian Revolution'. *International Sociology.* vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1987), pp. 164–5.

142. Chalmers Johnson. *Revolutionary Change.* p. 62.

143. See above, Chapter 2.

144. Samuel Huntington. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* p. 290.

145. See John Dunn. *Modern Revolutions.*

7 Civil society and democratisation

From the mid- to late 1970s, dictatorial systems began collapsing one after another, first in Southern Europe, then in South America in the early and mid-1980s and in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and the early 1990s. Eventually, national movements aimed at instituting democracy also bore fruit in a number of African countries – not just in South Africa but in the continent's Francophone countries – and in South Korea. Even in the Middle East, a bastian of 'authoritarian holdouts', demands for political accountability and democratic representation began to dominate the national discourse in Morocco, Algeria, Egypt, Jordan, Iran and elsewhere. As more countries joined the ranks of democracies, Professor Samuel Huntington's declaration that a 'third wave' of democratisation was under way was becoming prophetic.[1]

Gradually, however, the euphoria of global democratisation gave way to a number of sobering realities. It soon became apparent that democratic *transitions* were only half of the equation. Equally problematic were the dilemmas involved in democratic *consolidation.* The new democracies were confronted with a plethora of economic and political problems with which they had to contend, many continuing to suffer from the squalid legacies of the authoritarian systems they had replaced. These included, among others, the challenges of economic liberalisation and globalisation, the modalities and procedures necessary for conducting elections and other necessary democratic practices, reformulating civil–military relations and ensuring that democratic pacts and bargains were observed. This chapter focuses on one specific facet of democratic transitions and consolidation, namely civil society, and the pivotal role it plays in significantly influencing the overall nature of the transition process itself and the general character of the incoming democratic political system. It is by now a truism that the outcomes of the recent wave of democratisation cannot all be considered as equally democratic, some of the new states being truer to the spirit of the phenomenon than others. These differences are due to a variety of reasons, ranging from past experiences with democracy to the nature and intents of the actors involved, and the structural and institutional

limitations and/or opportunities within which they operate. While each of these differentiating factors is in itself important, civil society plays a far more significant role in determining the overall character of the post-democratisation polity. This crucial role of civil society has often been overlooked by the literature on democratisation, especially in so far as democratic consolidation is concerned. Despite the unprecedented proliferation of studies on democratisation in recent years, there is little consensus in the current literature about the exact role of civil society both before and after the transition to democracy. Much of the democratisation literature has either focused on the role of civil society *before* the transition from the non-democratic state was set into motion or it has overplayed the importance of political crafting and institutional consolidation in the post-transition phase.[2] Overlooked in the process has been the pivotal role that civil society in general and civil society organisations in particular can have in shaping the exact nature of the post-transition, democratic state.

This chapter argues that the more truly representative, viable democracies that have emerged out of the recent transitions must by nature have a strong social and cultural footing among the social actors who were active in the transition. However, less representative, more restricted quasi-democracies are less culturally grounded and are more dependent on intra- and inter-elite political pacts rather than socio-cultural imperatives for democratic maintenance.

Democratic transitions are set into motion due to the workings of two general sets of dynamics that could broadly be classified as either structural or cultural. All democratic transitions involve structural transformations, for without such changes the actual institutional mechanics of democracy – ranging from inter-elite pacts to constitutional guarantees – would not come about.[3] In such instances democratisation is often initiated from above and is set into motion, at least initially, as a direct result of changes and developments that are indigenous to the state. Economic paralysis or political malaise results in state breakdown, or at best profound weakness, and compels old political elites to open up the political process and to accommodate other contending elites.[4] When the transition is complete the new elites face the arduous task of democratic consolidation, chief among which are the politically hazardous neoliberal economic reforms that almost all newly democratic states decide to undertake soon after assuming power.[5] But sacrificed in the process is the popularisation of democratic norms and ideals among the larger population, made all the more difficult under worsening economic conditions, declining real wages and removal of many of the previous state's social security networks.[6] Most post-democratic political elites are simply too preoccupied with institutional and economic concerns to pay sufficient attention to the popular norms that are beginning to take hold in their country's new, post-transition political culture or to worry about the larger population's general dispositions towards democracy. This is all the more important given that in these countries democracy has become a political and economic reality and is no longer an abstract, sought-after ideal. Many of the

democratic states that have recently appeared in the developing world, therefore, face crises of social and cultural legitimacy and, as demonstrated most starkly in Fujimori's Peru and to a lesser extent in Turkey, remain susceptible to demagogic, populist and at times outright anti-democratic movements.

Exceptions do exist, and such democracies as those found in Argentina, Brazil, Chile and South Korea (as well as in Greece, Portugal and Spain) all seem to enjoy high levels of cultural consolidation despite having come about as a result of pacted negotiations among elites. In all of these cases democracy was initiated from above, but, sooner in some cases and later in others, it appears to have become culturally accepted and popularised among the various social strata.

For whatever reason, however, democratic elites do not always actively try to or succeed in consolidating democracy culturally. The ensuing democratic system often ends up comprising largely isolated, elite groups whose main interests lie in securing their own positions within the new institutions of the democratic system (especially in the parliament, or in their own political party) rather than representing their constituents. This has taken place in many of the ostensibly democratic countries of the developing world, both old and new: Kenya, Tanzania, Zambia and Madagascar in Africa, to name a few; Costa Rica, Colombia, Panama, Peru, Nicaragua and Venezuela in Latin America; Taiwan, India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Pakistan in South and Southeast Asia; and Lebanon and Turkey in the Middle East.[7] Democratic transitions from above, in short, face the *potential* (rather than inherent) danger of resulting in elitist, quasi-democratic polities that have all the institutional and structural trappings of democracy but lack a strong cultural component that would give them resonance among the different strata of society.

Not all democratic transitions are initiated from above, however, and there are some that come about as a result of societal pressures in general and civil society agitations in particular. In such cases the incoming democratic system cannot help but have a strong cultural component, enjoys comparatively higher levels of popular legitimacy and tends to be more representative of the broader strata of society. In these transition types the impulse to democratise begins not within the state but with non-state actors, some of whom ask specifically for democratic rights while others may have demands that are limited to particular issues. In either case in the pre-democratisation era demands for greater space and political autonomy are made by certain societal actors, many of whom over time cluster into organised or semi-organised grassroots movements which turn into civil society organisations.[8] If these civil society organisations, which by definition must operate democratically internally, begin collectively to demand and succeed in bringing about a democratic polity, they themselves in turn become the societal and cultural cushions on which the new system rests. In a way the new democratic polity is already culturally consolidated *before* the democratic transition takes place, for, otherwise, civil society organisations could not have gained enough support and momentum to force the

authoritarian state to agree to democratic concessions. And now that broadly based, increasingly popular civil society organisations have finally succeeded in bringing about a democratic polity, they are not about to take their newly won liberties for granted or to allow democratic rights to be practised primarily by specific elite groups. They seek to participate actively in the political process and to ensure the democratic and representational integrity of the system.

Civil society-driven, viable democracies are comparatively rare, but they have come about in recent years in Poland, Hungary and, most notably, South Africa. These democratic systems are both more truly representative of broader strata of society and highly self-conscious. Eventually, such democratic systems may begin to be taken for granted by their citizens, as most long-established democracies often are. But in the years immediately following the democratic transition they are far more vibrant than quasi-democracies could ever hope to become, a vibrancy maintained by their very youth and popular legitimacy. In viable democracies, membership levels in political parties tend to continue to increase, voter turnouts are relatively high, elections – national, regional and local – are often hotly contested and taken very seriously, the media are free and by-and-large vigilant, and, frequently, a growing plethora of issue-driven grassroots organisations spring up and help facilitate increasing levels of popular political input.

CIVIL SOCIETY

The concept of civil society has gained increasing currency in much of the recent literature on democratic transitions.[9] Despite much scholarly advance on the subject, a clear distinction has yet to be drawn between the two concepts of 'civil society' and 'civil society organisation'. While inextricably linked, the two phenomena are distinct. Civil society organisations, once they emerge, become permanent or semi-permanent features of the social landscape, whereas civil society may emerge immediately before and during the democratisation process and later die out once the transition is over.

Civil society organisations are a part and subcomponent of the larger civil society. A civil society organisation could be any politically autonomous group that can articulate and in turn further both a corporate identity and a specific agenda. In itself such an organisation may or may not be democratically inclined, although its very existence does to a certain extent bode well for democracy as it necessitates at least some rolling back of the powers of the state. Religious societies, ethnic and/or tribal confederacies and women's groups are representatives of this type of civil society organisation. On its own a civil society organisation – which may be found in any social setting – does not necessarily result in the increasing prevalence of demands for political space and representation among social actors. It simply has a corporate identity which it seeks to further. But when this civil society organisation

is one of a number of other, similar organisations that also begin to emerge within society, its social and political resonance becomes all the more pronounced.

The simultaneous emergence and/or operations of civil society organisations are likely to result in two concurrent outcomes: on the one hand, a self-sustaining and self-perpetuating momentum develops within society that makes it want to safeguard and maintain its newly won sense of autonomy from the state; on the other hand, the state finds itself increasingly on the defensive, and, if it is sufficiently vulnerable, will be forced into giving democratic concessions to society. Why and how civil society organisations emerge and operate is context-specific and a result of developments within society itself, because of its relations with the state, or both (discussed below). In whichever case a politically charged and politically laden sense of civicism overtakes a majority of social actors, which in turn compels them, among other things, purposefully to seek democratic liberties and demand representational privileges. This is civil society, which is in turn the linchpin of a viable democracy.

The most apparent manifestations of civil society are such pressure groups as Mothers of Plaza de Mayo in Argentina, Solidarity in Poland and the New Forum in the former East Germany. These organisations may be diverse in their intents and compositions; they may even have nothing in common in so far as their stated purposes and agendas are concerned. But they all have one crucial common denominator: they are pressure groups pressing the state for greater autonomy and political space – *they demand democracy.* Social and political autonomy by such a self-organised group is of critical importance, but it is not enough. If we were to stop here, backgammon players in the tea-houses of the Middle East or every beer lover in Poland and former Czechoslovakia would have to be considered as progenitors of civil society. They are not. Nor is civil society made up of just any group that manages to exert pressure on the state for political cooperation or space. Had this been the case, most corporatist institutions pressing demands on the state – labour groups or the Catholic Church in Latin America in the 1960s and the 1970s – would also have to be considered as components of civil society, and that is not always the case. Civil society gives rise to a very specific type of organisation, one that is *social* in its genesis and composition but is *political* in its agendas and initiatives.[10] It is an organisation that is formed out of the independent, autonomous initiatives of politically concerned individuals. These social actors are united by a common concern, often rallying around a specific issue (greater political space or less literary censorship). But irrespective of their specificities, if their demands on the state are met, they would either directly or indirectly result in a greater opening up of the political process. Ernest Gellner has argued that civil society is first and foremost a liberator from the tyranny of social and cultural rituals more than anything else.[11] But in addition to its social and cultural ramifications, civil society has a more pointed political function and agenda. Knowingly or unknowingly, civil society

organisations are agents and proponents of democratisation, the cumulative effects of their pressures on the state, at a particular moment of regime crisis, too much to bear for political leaders with exhausted legitimacies and few other non-coercive means of governance.

As earlier argued, transition to a viable democracy can be greatly facilitated by the prior existence of civil society. But civil society may not always usher in a democratic transition; the state may put up an effective fight and hang on to the reins of power. A viable democracy necessitates civil society, but civil society in itself does not necessarily mean democratisation. To have democratic consequences, civil society organisations must embark on democratising themselves and the larger social and political environments within which they operate. Often with halting steps and at times with full force and determination, these soldiers of democracy march on, and, *if successful,* they bring about a democratic revolution, one that may be either negotiated or as cataclysmic as any other revolutionary episode. The point to bear in mind here is the chronological order in which civil society and democratisation take place: there are first social pressures for democratic openings; these pressures crystallise in the formation of civil society organisations that are democratic in nature and democratising in pursuit; if these groups coalesce or individually mount a political challenge that the state cannot fend off, then a successful process of democratisation takes place. Once democratisation has taken place, there is a more hospitable environment in which further civil society groups may take form and evolve.

How does civil society come about? A number of reinforcing and complementary social and political forces need to be simultaneously present for civil society and groups representing it to emerge. A praetorian political system is a most essential prerequisite, for democratic yearnings must at first be formulated and in turn frustrated in an authoritarian setting for groups to look to alternative, non-state agencies for political expression. More specifically, the praetorian state and the larger society must operate in two different, mutually alien cultural realms. The average person must feel not just disenchanted with the state; he or she must feel completely detached from and disgusted with it. There are no norms or values attached to the state with which he or she can identify, and there is a stark contrast between his or her innermost cultural orientations and whatever it is that the state represents. Examples would be states that seem to operate in a world of their own, detached from the cultural contexts of their societies, apparently unaware of or insensitive to social and cultural nuances emanating from below. Within such a context, civil society organisations offer alternative, non-official and therefore seemingly untainted forums and organisational alternatives through which social actors could mobilise and express their concerns towards specific issues or towards politics in general.[12] With the exception of Tito's somewhat charismatic rule in Yugoslavia, former communist states in East and Central Europe fit this model

perfectly, as do the many bureaucratic-authoritarian states that dotted Latin America in the 1960s and the 1970s. If society is at its core religious, the state is either aggressively secular or deliberately anti-religious; if industrialisation has not progressed to the point of overwhelming agrarian life, the state pretends to be industrially advanced and highly modernised; if society wants to be left alone and subject to its own internal dynamics, the state seeks to penetrate and change it; if society wants to express itself politically and to participate in the system, the state subdues and controls it. At every turn, the state and society diverge and differ from one another. Nothing binds them but animosity and distrust – no political cultures that could be manipulated by politicians and bought by the people, no half-hearted democracies that could placate demands for real participation, no charismatic leaders who would find devotees among the masses.

But this is only the political half of the equation, an equation based on a clash of perspectives on the part of the state and those who see it as at best apathetic and at worst adversarial to their hopes and aspirations. The political roadblocks erected by the state compel these individuals to form civil society organisations of their own in an attempt both to replace some of the specific functions of the state and to provide themselves with channels of democratic expression. Who exactly are these individuals who come together and form civil society organisations? And what social and cultural imperatives prompt them to do so? The answers lie in the particular formation of social forces that the state is seeking to subdue. The pivotal role of intellectuals in the flowering of civil society has already been discussed at length elsewhere.[13] Intellectuals alone are not enough, however, as every society has its own literati elite no matter how minuscule and socially vacuous they may be. If civil society is to develop, the intellectual elite must have three particular characteristics. First and foremost, it must be committed to the principles and practices of democracy to the point of having internalised them. Simple rhetoric and heroism do not a democratic intellectual make; he or she must be both a believer and a practitioner of democracy in everything from relating to those at work to accommodating family members or others with different viewpoints. Equally important is the social resonance of intellectuals, both in terms of the message they have and their accessibility to the rest of society. Elite intellectuals, in other words, can no longer be so *elite* in their social standing and the learned planes on which they dwell. They must have drawn themselves close enough to the population at least to be heard and understood by them, even if not necessarily followed. Lastly, these intellectuals must give themselves an institutional forum, no matter how informal, through which they can meet and circulate ideas, solidify their links with one or more social classes, and bear direct or indirect pressures on the state. These institutional forums may range from *ad hoc* clubs and syndicates (e.g. a writers' association or the Civic Forum) to full-blown grassroots organisations (Base Ecclesiastical Communities) and political parties (Solidarity).

The resonance of civil society's intellectual progenitors itself requires certain necessary social preconditions, chief among which are the existence of a nationally

uniform cultural milieu and a spirit of tolerance. To begin with, there must exist a national culture that is homogeneous and not made up of smaller cultural subunits that may at best overlap but continue to retain distinctive qualities in such core areas as communication, rituals, status and the like. There is in such a society a 'standardisation of idiom', where 'communication occurs, if not with man as such, then at any rate with man-as-standard-specimen-of-a-codified-culture'.[14] Civil society requires cultural uniformity on a national level, where people are bound not by segmentary, exclusivist institutions that differentiate, but by associations that are unsanctified, instrumental, revocable and yet effective.[15]

Uniform national cultural homogeneity is important, but again not enough. In addition civil society requires a near-total psychological transformation, both of the individual on a personal level and of the larger collective whole – be it a syndicate, a political party or an entire nation – to which he or she belongs. Communicating through the same idiom that is free of ritualised sub-contexts is an essential prerequisite of forming voluntary associations and groups. Thus members of the same national entity who come from different parts of the country, have different accents, and prefer particular kinds of food may join together to form an association in which the goals of the association are far more binding on them than any of their specific idiosyncrasies. In countries with at least a semblance of a national culture, this is how most workers', teachers', merchants', writers' and other types of syndicate organisations are formed and operate.

But taking part in a syndicate organisation alone, while quite important, is an insufficient indication of a burgeoning civil society. What must take place is an internalisation of democratic norms and mores on an emotional, personal level. There must first be a democratisation of the self, and then selves, and from there on and on to the larger community, until a critical mass of like-minded, democratic aspirants begins to exert pressure on the state. If a syndicate, or a group of syndicates, were simply to press its own narrowly defined demands upon the state, the state might easily absorb it into itself or placate its demands with minor adjustments to state policies. At most, the state might reorient its agendas and institutions better to fit an emerging corporatist arrangement.[16] But if there is an element of corporatism in civil society, it must be decidedly democratic: groups and organisations that are self-democratising and democratising of the larger polity, if successful, force the state also to become democratic.

Here the contest becomes political. Civil society presses democratic demands on the state and its various institutions, and much of the outcome of the transition depends on the precise manner in which these state institutions react to pressures from below. In this respect the politically grounded analyses of Huntington and Di Palma have much to offer, especially in so far as the role of the military is concerned.[17] The state and its various institutional arms must be vulnerable enough to democratic pressures from below for a viable democratic transition to take place. The specific

political actors who are in official positions at the time of democratisation must have already been weakened and thus eager to compromise with the opposition – the specific reasons for their weakness and vulnerability may differ from case to case.[18] Moreover, the different auxiliary institutions on which the officeholders' powers are directly or indirectly based (the military, the official political party, the bureaucracy, etc.) must also be willing to negotiate away some of their present privileges. The paralysis of the state need not necessarily be complete for a viable democratic transition to occur, but it must be sufficiently extensive to compel those in official positions to come to the bargaining table. The situation in pseudo-democratic transitions is often quite different, as seldom are all state institutions sufficiently weakened to go along with a fully open democratisation process. In some instances (Turkey, Peru, Venezuela and the Philippines) state institutions, and especially the military, demand extensive guarantees in the post-transition era and exert considerable influence afterward.[19] But transition processes do not always succeed, even partially, and in these cases the powers and intentions of state actors have proven critical. In such instances elements within the state are unwilling to yield to any democratic opening and thus seek to abort the democratisation process altogether.

Examples from successful, partial and aborted democratic transitions illustrate the point better. In most of the former communist states of Eastern Europe in the mid- and late 1980s such crucial arms of the state as the communist party and the bureaucracy were in a state of near paralysis, if not fully paralysed already, but the army still maintained much of its coercive capabilities and had not undergone the extensive atrophy of the other two institutions. Nevertheless, when the democratic transition process gathered steam and began threatening the very existence of the communist state, the army did not, and in some instances could not, intervene in the political process.[20] This sequence of events is markedly different from what took place in Algeria in the early 1990s, when the country witnessed a bloody reversal of a democratisation process that had started in the late 1980s.[21] As President Chadli Bendjadid inaugurated the country's ostensibly liberal democratic constitution of 1989 and promised open parliamentary elections, the military begrudgingly looked on as its once-extensive powers were greatly reduced and the Islamic Salvation Front (FIS), whom the military considered 'anti-democratic', gained strength. When the FIS won a majority of seats in the 1992 parliamentary elections, the military duly stepped in, removed Bendjadid from power, annulled the elections and reasserted itself as the dominant institution of the state. The military had either not been weakened enough or was somehow unwilling to face the uncertain possibilities of a fully democratic transition. Between these two extremes, one a viable transition and the other an aborted one, falls the Turkish case.[22] The Turkish army has always considered itself as the ultimate guardian of the Turkish Republic and the protector of the legacy of the country's modern founder, Kemal Atatürk. Consistent with this self-ascribed mission, the army launched a coup in 1980 in

reaction to what it saw as the inability of politicians to maintain domestic order, in turn handing power over to elected civilians in 1983. As this was a controlled transition, initiated and directed from above, in today's Turkey the military retains extensive powers and there are severe limits imposed on the country's democratic system. The overall flavour and nature of Turkey's political system, at best a pseudo-democracy, is very different from the viable democratic systems of Poland and Hungary, both of which were largely the results of pressure from below.

Does civil society ever end or die out? Developments in post-communist Poland, where civil society was at one point on the most solid footing, are most instructive. Within three to five years after the democratic transition there, some of the civil society organisations that were once the primary engines of the country's new democracy had begun a steady decline in popular legitimacy and social resonance. Solidarity and the Catholic Church were especially affected, having lost much of the unparalleled popularity that they had acquired at the height of the democratisation process in 1989 and 1990. By December 1995 Poles had elected an ex-communist as their new president.[23] What does this say about civil society's resonance and its relationship with democratisation? These events demonstrate not necessarily the demise of civil society but rather the institutionalisation and routinisation of civil society organisations. In today's Poland, as in most other post-communist countries, no longer are civil society organisations operating in a non-democratic environment, where they constantly have to guard against possible state encroachment. They can now take their operations and their very existence for granted, gradually, therefore, losing the defensive zeal which marked their earlier years. Once the democratic polity has been established and the threat of authoritarian reversal appears remote, most civil society organisations (the Church, intellectual groups, etc.) begin to look like any other social institution.

Poland is a classic case of a country in which *civil society* has ceased to exist but *civil society organisations* continue to operate. Unlike in the days of the communist collapse, Polish society today is neither actively nor self-consciously democratising itself – as Anthony Giddens would maintain, most Poles would these days consider themselves to have gone beyond the phase of 'emancipatory politics' and to have entered the era of 'life politics'.[24] But the institutional residues of civil society are still there, and, although not as feverishly active now as they once were, could again kick into action if need be (i.e. if their individual members deem necessary their political activism and defence of representative democracy). As such organisations once served as powerful vehicles for the establishment and institutionalisation of a democratic polity by incorporating social actors into themselves, they now have an easier time in mobilising the population in defence of specific corporate interests or larger democratic goals.

Thus the relationship between civil society organisations and civil society is cyclical: civil society organisations may combine to give rise to civil society; given the right political environment, civil society may usher in a democratic polity; once

a democracy is established, civil society tends to peter out, although civil society organisations continue to operate, albeit in a more routinised and less feverishly defensive form; if the newly established democratic system faces serious threats to its existence, the existing civil society organisations, conceivably reinforced by new ones, could once again mobilise social actors in defence of the political system and reactivate the civil society that had become dormant. So long as the political system is democratic and allows autonomous self-organisation on the part of society, the cycle could repeat itself indefinitely.

DEMOCRATIC TRANSITIONS

Most of the recent English-language literature on democratisation has focused on the political variables involved both before and after the process of democratic transformation takes place. This is particularly true of American political scientists writing on the topic; most European and especially British scholars tend to be more receptive to the idea of social and cultural analysis along with their political analysis.[25] Nevertheless, few if any of the published works on the subject have yet drawn a systemic parallel between the socio-cultural emergence of civil society and the political institutionalisation of democratic states. Examination of the two phenomena of democracy and democratisation needs to have a sharper cultural and sociological focus. Concurrent with political analysis, attention must be paid to the exact juncture in which civil society appears and the precise role that it plays. In some democratisation processes civil society either does not initially play a determining role and emerges only later on, or it does not appear at all, even well into the life of the supposedly democratic country.

Examples from Southern Europe are most instructive in this respect. In Greece, Portugal and Spain during the mid-1970s, when each country witnessed a democratic transition, civil society was only nascent at the time of the change-over and was caught largely off guard by the collapse of the old order and its reconstitution into a democratic one.[26] Today, however, by most accounts democracy appears to be on a solid social and cultural footing in each of these countries and is built on a strong foundation of civil society.[27] Turkey, on the other hand, is an exception, for while the political transformation there into a democratic system has long been completed, a similar, compatible social and cultural change has not yet taken place.[28] Civil society, in other words, has not evolved yet and does not appear to be in the offing anytime soon.[29] Thus the Turkish political system is at best quasi-democratic and is highly susceptible to populist and demagogic movements from below.[30] This is not, however, what has happened in most of the democratic transitions of Eastern Europe and South America. There are instances where civil society appears first and eventually leads to democratic political change. In such countries as Poland, Hungary, former Czechoslovakia and South Africa (and one may even include

Argentina and Brazil), civil society organisations preceded, sometimes by many years, the political transformation of authoritarian structures into democratic ones. From the start, therefore, the ensuing political system in each of these countries began as a viable democracy, sustained not just by democratic institutions but by a democratised and democratising society.

As mentioned earlier, democratic transitions that result in viable democracies must necessarily have a social component and are often brought about as a result of pressures exerted on the state by various autonomously organised social groups. In such instances the pre-democratic state and its society have very little or absolutely no cultural links that bind them together, their interrelations being based largely or exclusively on coercion on the part of the state and submission by society. The state, therefore, is praetorian *par excellence,* having practically no popular ideological legitimacy, instead relying overwhelmingly on a mammoth bureaucracy and a brutal police force to stay in power. This was particularly the case in the former fascist or neo-fascist states of Southern Europe, the bureaucratic-authoritarian states of Latin America and communist states in Eastern and Central Europe.[31] Most contemporary African and Middle East states, however, have managed to devise a variety of cultural, uninstitutionalised means both to solidify and complement their institutional ties with their respective societies. In Africa most nominally democratic states, and even some overtly authoritarian ones, have allowed just enough political space to contending social forces to blunt their potentially disruptive nature, although not always successfully.[32] A vast majority of Middle Eastern states have, however, been highly erudite at placating social opposition by playing up (and into) whatever culturally resonant forces happen to dictate popular norms and values: they adopt religion and make it official (hence *Islam rasmi,* 'official Islam'), the leader becomes a father to the nation and relies on a patriarchal cult of personality, government nepotism becomes a normal method of co-option into the system and so on.[33]

In addition to political dynamics society also experiences its own nuances in transitions to democracy. Lack of viable cultural and functional links with the state prompts social actors to look to themselves for providing organisational alternatives to those official agencies of the government which they perceive as useless, corrupt, coercive and manipulated. These are, most frequently, members of the middle classes who, although a direct product of praetorian economic policies, cannot nevertheless be absorbed or co-opted by the state. Through social change and economic development, these middle-class professionals have reached a comparatively high level of education and affluence. But this very elevated social status makes them all the more alienated from the state, which they can only view in an adversarial light. Thus they form politically autonomous groups and organisations that are not only independent of the state but also, even if only indirectly, meant to replace some of the specific cultural and functional operations of it. Whereas the state does not

allow open expression of political thought, for example, these organisations provide a forum for exactly that (e.g. the Civic Forum in Czechoslovakia).[34] While the state may ridicule or suppress religion, some of these organisations may be devoted to spreading religious gospel and other teachings (e.g. Base Ecclesiastical Communities in Latin America).[35] While the state's glorification of the workers may be hollow propaganda, such groups may be trying to do something to enhance work conditions and wages (Solidarity in Poland).[36] These organisations are the building-blocks of civil society: they are autonomous, self-organised and political in consequence if not in original intent. But they must also have an additional characteristic, one which is of great significance: they must be democratic in their internal workings as well as in their larger political goals. In itself, forming a politically autonomous syndicate organisation is no indication of a burgeoning democratic civil society. Most states can easily dismantle or co-opt such organisations through repression or corporatist modifications. A civil society organisation must have overtly democratic goals, no matter how specific or narrowly defined those goals might be, and press the state for a general opening up of the political process rather than simply asking that particular demands be met. Civil society formations may come perilously close to corporatist ones; they cannot advocate non-democratic agendas, however, having at all times to retain subtle as well as overt taints of democracy. This is not a minor feat, for it involves not only democratically committed intellectuals but, more importantly, an internal, psychic transformation of the authoritarian self into a democratic one.[37] Democratic intellectuals must establish links of their own with the larger population to give popular purchase to their ideals – they must sell the idea of democracy to the people – and that is neither easy nor, under authoritarian circumstances, always possible.

How a democratic political culture comes about and civil society flourishes varies from case to case. There are some universals, however. To begin with, there must exist a democratically committed core of intellectuals. Not every university student or professor is an intellectual, and not every intellectual is a democrat.[38] In the developing world, it is only recently that a number of intellectuals have become dismayed with the more prevalent ideological strands of communism, socialism, nationalism or some other 'ism' and have embraced the tenets of democracy.[39] It is also one thing to call oneself democratic and it is quite another to be a true democrat. Additionally, democratic intellectuals must sell the idea of democracy to the popular classes and there needs to be a genuine, popular imperative for a democratic political system. Ironically, often the most brutal authoritarian dictatorships are the best catalysts for the growth of popular democratic yearnings among the masses. The insanity of Nazism in Germany, the horrors of fascism in Southern Europe and of bureaucratic-authoritarianism in South America, and the fallacies of life under communism in Eastern Europe were all instrumental in instilling in the average person in each place a fundamental yearning for democracy. Democracy becomes

culturally popular when all the other 'isms', especially those with a penchant for bombastic self-glorification, exhaust themselves and fail to provide the salvation they promise. Again, not every authoritarian system drives its citizens in the opposite extreme and makes democrats out of them. Few systems exhaust all of their legitimacy in the way those mentioned above did. Most of the non-democratic political systems found around the world today are successful in at least one or two of the functions that give them some legitimacy. Some effectively manipulate certain popular sentiments (nationalism is a favourite); others are economically successful enough to keep the middle classes preoccupied or content; and still others give in just enough to placate potential opposition activists. Most, meanwhile, retain enough of their powers and capabilities not to take seriously pressures for democratisation.

It is only logical that a transition to democratic rule involves different phases, and that in each phase a different set of factors and dynamics is at work. Transition phases are, of course, often overlapping and the nuances involved in one phase often spill over into the next. Nevertheless, especially given the determining influence that the timing of civil society's emergence plays, it is important to distinguish between the characteristics of one transition phase and those of another. In cases where the democratic impulse emanates from below social actors begin to agitate, not just for political space but specifically for democratic liberties. They either begin to organise themselves into previously non-existent organisations which are specifically set up to further their demands (Solidarity in Poland) or begin reorienting the nature and the message of existing organisations to formulate and express their agendas (the Church in both Latin America and Eastern Europe). As with most spontaneous revolutions,[40] their demands, meeting with increasingly receptive ears in society, begin to snowball and the state is gradually confronted with a serious political crisis it cannot easily contain. Soon negotiations are the only option left open to the political elite, resulting in a transfer of power through elections, followed by the institutional consolidation of the new order via the inauguration of a constitution, appointment of new policy-makers, bureaucrats and the like. The important point to keep in mind is that this type of society-initiated democratisation was brought about as a result of the workings of civil society, which in turn set into motion a host of political dynamics that culminated in the replacement of the old order with a new, democratic one. Thus, social actors, the politically most important of whom are the primary components of civil society, have a vested interest in maintaining the essence and integrity of the new system. It is precisely for this reason that the incoming democratic state is a genuinely democratic, viable one.

But the phases involved in democratic transitions from above, and the precise chronology of when each event occurs, are quite different (Table 7.1). In such instances state actors are first faced with some unsettling development that is often of their own doing, an indigenously initiated turmoil with which they cannot effectively deal. Their inability to deal with their

Table 7.1. Phases in democratic transitions

	Transition from below	*ransition from above*
Catalyst	Civil society	Internal political turmoil
Process	Shake-up Crisis Negotiation and transition Institutional consolidation	Crisis Negotiation and transition Institutional consolidation
Most likely outcome	Viable democracy	Pseudo-democracy

difficulties is compounded by the untenable institutional and structural predicaments that such states often force themselves into, so much so that soon a situation of paralysis and dysfunctionality, at first quite internal to the state, evolves. The structural weaknesses of the state are in turn exploited by various social actors who seize the opportunity to press their specific demands on the state, demands that may or may not be democratic. Negotiations ensue, and a *controlled* process of transition is set in motion.[41] The controlled nature of the transition assures the involved parties that the incoming order will not be too severe in its persecution of those formerly in power. But the negotiations have always had an air of democracy about them, and all the parties gathered around the negotiating table make claims to be acting in democracy's interests. Thus the outcome of the negotiations is ostensibly democratic, complete with elections, a liberal democratic constitution and all the other necessary trappings. But there was no popular, mass element involved in these negotiations (no electrician-cum-national hero), no struggle *per se,* no grand rethinking of national priorities and cultural dispositions. It was the elite who negotiated, and it was the elite who won out, both those belonging to the government's side and those claiming to represent the masses. The system they usher in as a result of their efforts cannot help but be elitist, even if it is democratic. Such a system is in reality a quasi-democracy, a quintessentially elitist political system wrapped in a thin democratic layer.

Slight differences and/or overlappings notwithstanding, four general sets of actors are involved in practically every democratic transition. What differs from one case to another, and what eventually determines the nature and overall direction of the transition, is the exact point in the transition process at which each actor becomes involved, and the cultural as well as institutional ties each has with a larger constituency it claims to represent. The four actors are intellectuals, who at first act as representatives of the larger society; specific political actors from the state; various other state institutions, whose influence may not be direct but is nevertheless consequential; and social institutions, on whose behalf intellectuals claim to be acting. In one form or another each of these actors is found in almost every transition process (Table 7.2).

The ties that intellectuals have with the rest of society are an important

Table 7.2 Nature and chronological involvement of transition actors

	Viable democratic transitions
Intellectuals	Grassroots movements and political parties
Political actors	Weakened, eager to compromise
State institutions	(Military, political parties, etc.) willing to negotiate
Social institutions	(Religion, family, etc.) democratising and/or democratise
	Pseudo-democratic transitions
Political actors	Compelled to reform
Intellectuals	Seeking democracy; weak ties to the masses
State institutions	Retain many privileges and non-democratic traits
Social institutions	Not always fully democratised

determinant of the precise nature of a democratic transition. In transitions that are brought about as a result of pressure from below, where intellectuals have spearheaded an increasingly popular social movement to overturn the dictatorial state, intellectuals possess incredibly strong ties to the rest of society. These ties, more than anything else, are cultural and valuative: the intellectuals' call for political democracy has real and tangible meaning for the rest of the social classes they address. The intellectuals are operating within a civil society, where their calls for democracy are occurring simultaneously with a democratically hospitable social and cultural transformation of society. *Ad hoc,* unofficial groups spring up at the grassroots level – the New Forum in the former East Germany, Solidarity in Poland, Mothers of Plaza de Mayo in Argentina, Base Ecclesiastical Communities throughout Latin America – and make the abstract ideal of democracy a tangible, or at least reachable, reality at the local level. As Solidarity and the 'Beer Drinkers Party' in Poland show, some of these grassroots movements go on to become political parties in the democratic era. It is this crucial axiom of civil society that turns successful democratic transitions initiated from below into viable democracies. At a time when intellectuals are pressing for democratic openings, society is also undergoing its own democratic transformation of sorts, and the two complement and reinforce one another. The emerging democratic system cannot help but have a strong social and cultural component.

If the widespread prevalence of democratic ideals is important before and during the transition process, it is all the more so after democracy has been politically institutionalised, especially in cases where the non-democratic state itself took the lead in handing over power. The tenets of political culture, democratic or otherwise, do not emerge independently and are contingent on several variables. These variables include political economy, the choices and capabilities of the new political elite, political history and degree of past experience with democracy, and such other contingent factors as political geography and transnational cultural forces. A political system acquires widespread and resonant popular legitimacy when it delivers on

the promises for which it stands and keeps up with the political and economic expectations of the politically relevant classes. The pursuit of neoliberal market reforms – necessitated by the ruinous results of years of import-substitution industrialisation or state-led capitalist policies – often greatly jeopardises the legitimacy of the newly democratic states.[42] Many of the new democracies of South America have brought with them real declines in standards of living for most lower and middle classes, have removed former protectionist barriers that helped insulate small and medium-sized industries from international competition, and have completely washed their hands of any policies aimed at helping the burgeoning armies of the poor and the indigent.[43] In the long run the successful implementation of anti-inflationary measures and steady improvements in economic output and growth may restore popular confidence in the system and help expedite the popularisation of democratic ideals. This has evidently happened in Brazil and Argentina, where the overall economic picture has improved and the democratic state has withstood several challenges from within and without. In the short run, however, the Fujimorismo phenomenon is a real possibility not only in Peru (where it is a reality) but also in places like Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador and most of Central America.[44] The fragile economies of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania and Ukraine pose similar fundamental challenges to the cultural consolidation of democratic norms in the post-Soviet era in each of these new republics.[45] But further west, in Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic and to a lesser extent Bulgaria, the steady pouring in of Western investments and financial assistance has reinforced popular desires not only to be anti-communist but to become more like their West European cousins.

This relates directly to the transnational influence of political norms and values. In today's world, or at least in the non-Muslim world where religion is not being politically used as an all-encompassing source of identity, most people consider it fashionable to be called democrats. East Europeans and Latin Americans want to be known as simply *European* and *American* respectively (meaning affluent and democratic); Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, Ukrainians and Turks want to be known as West European, and so on. Soft power seems to have had its most compelling effect in the global currency of democratic norms and ideals.[46] This is frequently reinforced by romantic images of an indigenous democratic golden age once in existence and by the living memories of an authoritarian nightmare that was reality only a few years ago.

Domestic political performance is an equally consequential legitimising agent, as corruption and nepotism may not only threaten the legitimacy of the new holders of power but make the public question the wisdom of the entire political system. Similarly, the strategic choices that elites make in the post-transition era about how responsive they should remain to grassroots pressures from below and how much of a democratic role-model they should make themselves for the rest of society are

crucially important in the overall perceptions of the population towards the larger democratic system. Are the elites more interested in maintaining power or in upholding democratic principles if the two come into conflict? Are they willing to abide by the rules of the democratic game or are they not above resorting to some of the dirty tricks that the old elite practised? All of these are areas from which the larger population can take its cue and in turn internalise, or at least be influenced by, the norms that seem to govern the political behaviour of those in power.

CONCLUSION

The cultural consolidation of democracy in post-transition democracies is one of the major areas that future research needs to explore further. Although few of the structural, political and economic aspects of democratic transitions remain unexplored, the social and cultural dynamics at work in pre- and post-transition democratic polities have been largely overlooked by the major theorists in the field. Examining the choices that elites and actors make, or systemic economic successes and failures, or class and international forces will tell us much about some of the most important aspects of the possibilities for democratic opening and/or reversal. But such perspectives overlook the equally significant contributions that norms and cultural values make in compelling social actors to seek and act on their democratic ideals, and, if they succeed in getting rid of the non-democratic state, either to hold on to those ideals and popularise them or to abandon them altogether.

Cultural forces are important components of the transition to democracy, either before the transition process is set into motion or after the transition is complete, or in both phases. A successful democratic transition does not simply end with careful and non-violent negotiations, even if state institutions are genuine in their intent to relinquish power to groups having emerged from grassroots movements. That merely signals the end of the *transition* process. It does not signify the continued operation and integrity of a representative, democratic polity. It is fully conceivable for a democratic transition to take place and for previously authoritarian political structures to become democratic. But such a transition process in itself does not give currency to the spirit of democracy among all social actors or even only among those who are charged with articulating society's larger demands (intellectuals). A democratic political culture – conditioned by the political and economic performance of the new elite, historical considerations and elite choices – must evolve and complement the political and institutional characteristics of the new system. Without such a popular, cultural base for the legitimacy of the new state, the incoming system is likely to be pseudo-democratic at best. A true, viable democracy is as culturally grounded as it is politically free and representative.

NOTES

1. Samuel Huntington. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century.* (Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991).
2. See, for example, Larry Diamond, Juan Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset. 'Introduction: Comparing Experiences with Democracy', in Larry Diamond, Juan Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds) *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990), pp. 1–37; Doh Chull Shin. 'On the Third Wave of Democratisation'. *World Politics.* vol. 47, no. 3 (October 1994), pp. 135–70; and Larry Diamond. 'Introduction: Political Culture and Democracy', in Larry Diamond (ed.) *Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993), pp. 1–33.
3. Bouhui Zhang. 'Corporatism, Totalitarianism, and Transitions to Democracy'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 27, no. 1 (April 1994), pp. 108–9.
4. Giuseppe Di Palma. *To Craft Democracies: An Essay on Democratic Transitions.* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990), p. 35.
5. Adam Przeworski. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reforms in Eastern Europe and Latin America.* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), p. 136.
6. Stephen Haggard and Robert Kaufman. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions.* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), pp. 158–9.
7. Claude Ake. 'Rethinking African Democracy', in Larry Diamond and Marc Plattner (eds) *The Global Resurgence of Democracy.* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), p. 75.
8. Victor Pérez-Diaz. 'The Possibility of Civil Society: Traditions, Character and Challenges', in John Hall (ed.) *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison.* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995), p. 103.
9. See, for example, Ernest Gellner. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Critics.* (New York: Penguin, 1994); John Hall (ed.) *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison;* Ian Budge and David McKay (eds) *Developing Democracy.* (London: Sage, 1994); and Keith Tester. *Civil Society.* (London: Routledge, 1992), to mention only a few books on the topic.
10. Victor Pérez-Diaz. 'The Possibility of Civil Society'. p. 83.
11. Ernest Gellner. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Critics.* p. 103.
12. Mehran Kamrava. *Understanding Comparative Politics: A Framework for Analysis.* (London: Routledge, 1996), p. 162.
13. Ibid. p. 164.
14. Ernest Gellner. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Critics.* p. 105.
15. Ibid. p. 101. Gellner's arguments in this regard are much more thorough and complex than can be done justice to in the context of the present chapter. Briefly, Gellner considers the development of a modern, homogeneous culture as a natural by-product of the emergence of 'the modular man', someone who is changeable, unbound to uncompromising, non-rationalised rituals and traditions, adaptable in outlook and social functions to the changing realities of social desires and political roadblocks. For more, see ibid. pp. 97–108, especially pp. 99–101.
16. Fascist Italy and bureaucratic-authoritarian Latin America remind us that, unlike present-day Germany, corporatism is not always democratic.
17. See especially Samuel Huntington. *The Third Wave.* pp. 110–74; and Giuseppe Di Palma. *To Craft Democracies.* pp. 103–4.
18. Samuel Huntington. *The Third Wave.* p. 124.
19. Claude Welch. 'Changing Civil–Military Relations', in Robert Slater, Barry Schutz, and Steve Dorr (eds) *Global Transformation and the Third World.* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993), p. 85.

20. For a brief survey of the revolutions of 1989, see David Mason. *Revolution in East-Central Europe: The Rise and Fall of Communism and the Cold War.* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 1992), pp. 54–67.

21. As of 1996, Algeria had been plunged into a costly civil war, with scores having been killed by FIS commandos and in clashes between government soldiers and FIS supporters.

22. J. Brown. 'The Military and Society: The Turkish Case'. *Middle Eastern Studies.* vol. 21 (July 1989), pp. 387–404.

23. 'President Elect Aleksander Kwasniewksi'. *Donosy.* no. 1707 (Monday, 20 November 1995), p. 1.

24. Anthony Giddens. *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and the Society in the Late Modern Age.* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991), pp. 209–10.

25. Compare, for example, such books by British authors as Ernest Gellner, *Conditions of Liberty*; John Hall (ed.) *Civil Society*; and Ian Budge and David McKay (eds) *Developing Democracy,* with Americans like Di Palma. *To Craft Democracies;* Samuel Huntington. *The Third Wave*; and, Robert Dahl. *Democracy and its Critics.* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989), to name only a few.

26. See Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead (eds) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Southern Europe.* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

27. Philippe Schmitter. 'An Introduction to Southern European Transition from Authoritarian Rule: Italy, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and Turkey', in Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead (eds) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Southern Europe.* p. 9.

28. Ilkay Sunar and Sabri Sayari. 'Democracy in Turkey: Problems and Prospects', in Guillermo O'Donnell, Philippe Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead (eds) *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Southern Europe.* p. 186.

29. In Eastern Europe, Romania and Albania are also in the same predicament after their respective democratic transitions. See J. F. Brown. *Surge to Freedom: The End of Communist Rule in Eastern Europe.* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991), pp. 199–220 and 221–45.

30. For more on this point see, Rusen Cakir. *Ne Seriat, Ne Democrasi: Refah Partisini Anlamak* (*Neither Shariat, Nor Democracy: Understanding the Refah Party*). (Istanbul: Siyahbeyaz, 1994).

31. Stephen White, John Gardner and George Schopflin. *Communist Political Systems.* pp. 20–1.

32. See, Jean Francois Bayart. *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly.* (London: Longman, 1993), pp. 242–52.

33. Iliya Harik. 'The Origins of the Arab State System.', in Ghassan Salame (ed.) *The Foundations of the Arab State.* (London: Croom Helm, 1987), pp. 22–3.

34. David Mason. *Revolution in East-Central Europe.* p. 37.

35. Daniel Levine. 'Assessing the Impact of Liberation Theology in Latin America.' *Review of Politics.* vol. 50, no. 2 (Spring 1988), p. 253.

36. Andrew Michta. *The Government and Politics of Postcommunist Europe.* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994), p. 12.

37. Victor Pérez-Diaz. 'The Possibility of Civil Society: Traditions, Character and Challenges'. p. 82.

38. Mehran Kamrava. *Politics and Society in the Third World.* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 160–3.

39. Ibid. p. 162.

40. Mehran Kamrava. *Revolutionary Politics.* (Westport, CT: Praeger, 1992), pp. 27–8.

41. Samuel Huntington. *The Third Wave.* pp. 124–5.

42. Adam Przeworski. *Democracy and the Market.* p. 136.

43. Scott Mainwaring. 'Democracy in Brazil and the Southern Cone: Achievements and Problems'. *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs.* vol. 37, no. 1 (Spring 1995), p. 145.

44. Karen Remmer argues the opposite, maintaining that 'Latin America is not merely experiencing another episode in a cycle of democratic and authoritarian alterations, but has instead entered a distinctive historical phase in which broad electoral participation and respect for oppositional rights have become widespread and relatively durable features of the political landscape.' See Karen Remmer. 'Democratization in Latin America.' Robert Slater, Barry Schutz and Steven Dorr (eds) *Global Transformations and the Third World.* p. 107. Mainwaring disagrees, maintaining that 'democratic institutions are not only weak in Brazil, but, though to a lesser degree, in Argentina as well. So long as this situation remains, the prospects for the further consolidation of democracy are in doubt' (Scott Mainwaring. 'Democracy in Brazil and the Southern Cone: Achievements and Problems'. pp. 114–15).

45. Alexander Motyl. *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine after Totalitarianism.* (New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993), pp. 63–4.

46. Joseph Nye. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power.* (New York: Basic Books, 1990), pp. 190–1.

8 Conclusion

The developing world is a battlefield. It is a battlefield of forces clashing with each other head-on, brutal in their confrontation, naked in their defence. It is where dramas unfold constantly, unravelling themselves, and in their midst political, economic, social and cultural dynamics traumatise the region and its inhabitants. It is a dynamic arena, changeable and in constant flux.

It is these perplexing changes that have made the developing world enigmatic for students and observers and full of uncertainty and trial for those living there. The developing world keeps changing faster than academics can understand and theorise about it, and even faster than its people can become accustomed to its transient socio-political and cultural forms. A multiplicity of forces, meanwhile, keep cropping up with unabated strength and frequency. Political systems evolve and collapse; industrial projects are launched, revised, abrogated and launched again; populations shift and gravitate towards existing centres; cherished values are ridiculed and the ridiculous cherished; political religions and prophets come and go; and people rise up, but are subdued again—all in the name of state building, all the inevitable trials of national growth and development.

Nowhere have the painful reverberations of the developing world's dramas been so vocally and publicly played out as in the political arena. Although the advent of democracy has brought with it significant improvements in political stability and civility, much of the political arena in places such as Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and Central Asia is still marked by violence and instability, greed and corruption, avarice and malice. To this day, embedded ethnic and tribal animosities continue to tear many nations apart, segregating and separating their peoples along racial, tribal and linguistic lines. While the process of state building may for the most part have given birth to structurally viable systems, such states have been unable to devise polities capable of overwhelming centrifugal forces engendered through centuries of cleavages. The Nigeria of the 1970s or the Lebanon of the 1980s may no longer be the norm, but the pushes and pulls of non-state loyalties are still strong enough to spark mass protests at the death of a tribal notable or the vitriolic speeches of a separatist leader. From among these torn societies come personalist leaders,

claiming to be the solitary holders of a saving vision, men whose continued hold on power is indispensable to national unity, cohesion and progress. Many are soldiers in mufti, generals who like to be presidents, men who think their military background and discipline provide the panacea their country needs. Some are aspiring civilians, either thrust on the national scene during the struggle for liberation or having risen through the ranks of the bureaucracy. A few, as of late, are turbaned, believing their righteous ways offer both political and socio-cultural salvation.

Despite their garb, however, few Third World leaders have withstood the temptations associated with their office. Tanzania's Julius Nyerere, who in 1985 voluntarily gave up political office, is indeed a rare breed, as are the democracies of Botswana and South Africa. Some political leaders have dispensed with pretensions and declared themselves president for life, and those who maintain a semblance of electoral accountability act as if ending their tenure would usher in disaster and catastrophe. The consolidation of viable democracies notwithstanding, the developing world still has many presidents but comparatively few meaningful elections. In their different ways leaders cling on to office as if there were no tomorrow, often placing themselves at the centre of a stale and inherently fragile political universe. Whether by patrimonial or clientalist manipulations, by the sheer brutality of military force or by rigging elections and intimidating voters, they remain in office until forced out by powers more brutal than their own. Coups and assassinations may no longer be as endemic as they were in the 1960s and the 1980s, but in many places fear and suspicion are ever present, with instability brewing just beneath the surface. In some cases it takes nothing short of full-scale revolutions and civil wars to force self-declared saviours out of office. Even the seemingly peaceful democratisation of Latin America was not that peaceful considering that misguided economic policies brought Latin American societies close to falling apart at the seams. For its part, the Argentine junta had to deal with the additional burden of a humiliating defeat at the hands of the British forces after the Falklands fiasco.

The political drama is played out within the context of changing norms, fluctuating classes and groups, disjointed cultures and fractured traditions. The many consequences of change – demographic, economic, industrial and cultural – torment Third World societies just as much as they throw its political world into chaos and confusion. The problem of figuring out how to survive in the world of international economy, never mind getting ahead, is just one dilemma. At least economic issues create definite problems, those of unemployment and hyperinflation, international indebtedness and budget deficits. That such shortcomings have become lingering features of developing economies doesn't necessarily mean they cannot be solved; perhaps the political will is lacking, perhaps the problems are too deep to be solved by mere cosmetic reforms. But the problems of social and cultural malady are much less easily discernible. They are, however, equally fierce in afflicting Third World societies and their peoples, their ways of life and their spirits and cultures. Counter-

cultures and escapism may not be as hard on the stomach as are poverty and unemployment, but they are psychologically as debilitating as the former are physically. To cry over drowning in the shifting of cultural sands shows a sentimental twitch for nostalgia, not the stuff of which academic analysis is made. But to overlook the dramatic ramifications of ailments resulting from social and cultural change, the alienating effects of sudden changes in one's environment, the demoralising consequences of being told what to read and what to think, and the strength of the energy released when there is an opportunity for self-expression, would be as unforgivably shortsighted.

Where the developing world is heading is not fully clear. Only ideological diehards dare make predictions and back them up with conviction and moral force. Had Che Guevara been alive today he would most likely be leading an intellectually distraught life, disillusioned because the revolutions he advocated for Latin America and elsewhere never materialised, and the one that did take place, Iran's Islamic revolution, occurred under religious auspices. Communism saw its stronghold of Eastern Europe turn into its own burial ground in the 1980s, and with that its chances of growth in the developing world grew even dimmer than the time when powerful international patrons like Mao exported it. Third Worldism, meanwhile, which was so noisily hailed in the 1960s by the likes of Tito, Nehru and Sukharno, has long been dead, having succumbed early on to longstanding national enmities, competition over scarce resources and the intricacies of international diplomacy. By the 1990s the race was to bring on speedier 'globalisation' and to draw oneself closer to the advanced economies of the West.

But it is inaccurate to assume that the failure of non-Western 'isms' in the developing world is tantamount to a victory for Western ways and means for developing countries. To the contrary, imported Western models are as likely to crumble under the weight of indigenous conditions as the Eastern imports that faltered some time ago. Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, to take a random example, was as shattering to the dogma of Ronald Reagan as it was to that of the late Nasser.[1] Reagan was hardly alone among Western leaders who saw in Saddam Hussein a secular, 'Westernised' alternative to Iran's revolutionary, 'barbaric' leaders.[2] Africa has already taught us that emulating Western institutions and practices frequently leads to a mockery of their underlying principles and beliefs. From East Asia to the Middle East and Africa, and even in Latin America, imported Western institutions frequently cast a thin mask over what are in reality tailor-made political systems and offices.

Where the developing world goes is not determined by any grand and universal processes or by an overwhelming movement in one specific direction. Its future direction is, rather, dependent on the initiatives and policies of its individual leaders and the particular social and cultural characteristics of the countries they lead. It is their ability not just in surviving the tumults of the political arena but in stewarding their nations towards specific ends which ultimately determine their success or

failure. It is hard not to set ideal goals: balanced opportunities for economic prosperity; greater attention to rural areas and the economic well-being of their inhabitants; advancements in education, not just in literacy but in nurturing intellectual independence; and, perhaps prerequisites to all, political systems and cultures in which liberties are safeguarded and security assured. Pontificating on these and many other ideal goals is easy; the challenge lies in getting them implemented. To assert that the success of their implementation depends solely on the intentions of politicians would be to reduce the level of analysis to unforgivably reductionist proportions. But the centrality of human agency to the political drama is irrefutable. Clearly, the international political, military and economic frameworks within which states operate determine a good measure of their domestic characteristics, a factor of which most Eastern Europeans would these days happily remind the rest of us. Also determinant are domestic conditions, those ingrained practices validated by decades (at times centuries) of social acceptance and experience. Brutal as they were, the efforts of 'modernising' dictators such as Turkey's Atatürk, Iran's last Shah and the many juntas of Latin America have hardly left an imprint except on the most superficial aspects of their societies. All tried to do away with tradition, viewing it as *the* obstacle to progress and modernisation. All failed in their efforts, neither eradicating traditions completely nor implanting lasting legacies of modernity.

Writing on the American experience nearly two hundred years ago, de Tocqueville claimed that 'the causes which mitigate the government are to be found in the circumstances and the manners of the country more than in its laws'.[3] His words could not have been more prophetic for today's developing world, given the plethora of democratic constitutions there in the face of non-democratic systems. To accuse Third World cultures of fostering anti-democratic principles finds uncomfortable parallels with the claims of modern-day Rudyard Kiplings for whom 'we told you so' has become a favourite phrase. But it is true none the less. Democracy will not spread in the developing world unless many national cultural foundations are changed or reconstructed anew. Much social engineering has and continues to occur in the region, most of it directed by leaders seeking to appease their own vanity and enhance their personal tenure. The direction of these engineering efforts needs to change, as do some of the institutional means through which they are instilled. At the same time, ignoring indigenous social and cultural circumstances for the sake of higher ideals would be to fall into the same traps that the Atatürks and the Shahs fell into earlier.

NOTES

1. Gamal Abdel Nasser, the late president of Egypt, was a staunch advocate of Arab unity. Even after Egypt's defeat by Israel in the 1967 war, Nasser remained greatly popular through the Arab world, the hero of the youth who saw in his ideas visions of grandeur

and power. See Fouad Ajami. *The Arab Predicament: Arab Political Thought and Practice since 1967*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), pp. 84–94.

2.   James Bill. *The Eagle and the Lion: The Tragedy of American–Iranian Relations*. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988), p. 307. For Reagan's pre-Iraqi sympathies, see ibid. pp. 306–7.

3.   William Ebenstein. *Great Political Thinkers: From Plato to the Present*. 4th edn. (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1951), p. 548.

Bibliography

Abrams, Charles. 'Squatting and Squatters', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* Chicago: Maaroufa Press, 1977, pp. 293–9.

Adelman, Irma and Jairus Hihn. 'Crisis Politics in Developing Countries'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 33, no. 1 (October 1984), pp. 1–22.

Aguirre, B. E. 'The Conventionalization of Collective Behavior in Cuba'. *American Journal of Sociology.* vol. 90, no. 3 (1984), pp. 541–66.

Ahmad, Zakaria. 'The Evolution and Development of the Political System in Malaysia', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986, pp. 221–40.

Ajami, Fouad. *The Arab Predicament: Arab Political Thought and Practice since 1967.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Alatas, Syed Hussein. *Modernization and Social Change.* London: Angus & Robertson, 1972.

Al-Haj, Majid. 'The Changing Arab Kinship Structure: The Effects of Modernization in an Urban Community'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 36, no. 2 (January 1988), pp. 237–58.

Almond, Gabriel and G. Bingham Powell. *Comparative Politics: Systems, Processes and Policy.* Boston: Little, Brown, 1978.

Almond, Gabriel and Sidney Verba. *The Civic Culture.* London: Sage, 1989.

Altbach, Philip and S. Gopinathan. 'Textbooks in the Third World: Challenge and Response', in P. Altbach, A. Arboleda and S. Gopinathan (eds), *Publishing in the Third World: Knowledge and Development.* London: Mansell, 1985.

Anderson, Lisa. *The State and Social Transformation in Tunisia and Libya, 1830–1980.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.

Armstrong, Warwick and T. G. McGee. *Theatres of Accumulation: Studies in Asian and Latin American Urbanization.* London: Methuen, 1985.

Ashford, Douglas. 'Attitudinal Change and Modernization', in Chandler Morse, Douglas Ashford, Frederick Bent, William Friedland, John Lewis and David Macklin. *Modernization by Design: Social Change in the Twentieth Century.* London: Cornell University Press, 1969, pp. 147–88.

Aya, Rod. 'Theories of Revolution Reconsidered: Contrasting Models of Collective Violence'. *Theory and Society.* vol. 8, no. 1 (1979), pp. 39–99.

Ayubi, Nazih. 'The Politics of Militant Islamic Movements in the Middle East'. *Journal of International Affairs.* vol. 36, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 1982–3), pp. 271–87.

Bakhash, Shaul. *The Reign of the Ayatollahs: Iran and the Islamic Revolution.* London: I. B. Tauris, 1985.

Becker, Charles and Andrew Morrison. 'The Determinants of Urban Population Growth in Sub-Saharan Africa'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 36, no. 2 (January 1988), pp. 259–78.

Bent, Frederick. 'A Comparative Analysis of Public Administration in Modern, Traditional, and Modernizing Societies', in Chandler Morse (ed.), *Modernization by Design: Social Change in the Twentieth Century.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1969, pp. 189–237.

Berg-Schlosser, Dirk. 'African Political Systems: Typology and Performance'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 17, no. 1 (1984), pp. 121–51.

Berry, Brian. *Comparative Urbanization: Divergent Paths in the Twentieth Century.* New York: St Martin's, 1981.

Berry, Sara. 'Work, Migration, and Class in Western Nigeria: A Reinterpretation', in Fredrick Cooper (ed.), *Struggle for the City: Migrant Labor, Capital, and the State in Urban Africa.* London: Sage, 1988, pp. 247–73.

Beyart, Jean Francois. *The State in Africa: The Politics of the Belly.* London: Longman, 1993.

Bigo, Pierre. *The Church and Third World Revolution.* Jeane Marie Lyons, trans. New York: Orbis, 1977.

Bill, James. *The Eagle and the Lion: The Tragedy of American–Iranian Relations.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1988.

Bill, James and Robert Springborg. *Politics in the Middle East.* Glenview, IL and Boston, MA: Scott, Foresman/Little, Brown, 1990.

Birand, Mehmet. *The Generals' Coup in Turkey.* M. A. Dikerdem, trans. London: Brassey's, 1987.

Biswas, Basudeb and Rati Ram. 'Military Expenditure and Economic Growth in Less Developed Countries: An Augmented Model and Further Evidence'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 34, no. 2 (January 1986), pp. 361–72.

Blumer, Herbert. *Industrialization as an Agent of Social Change: A Critical Analysis.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1990.

Boyd, Douglas and Joseph Straubhaar. 'Developmental Impact of Home Video Cassette Recorders on Third World Countries'. *Journal of Broadcasting and Electronic Media.* vol. 29, no. 1 (Winter 1985), pp. 5–21.

Brandt, Vincent and Man-gap Lee. 'Community Development in the Republic of Korea', in Ronald Dore and Zoe Mars (eds), *Community Development.* London: Croom Helm, 1981, pp. 49–136.

Braveboy-Wagner, Jacqueline. *Interpreting the Third World: Politics, Economics, and Social Issues.* New York: Praeger, 1986.

Brekelbaum, Trudy. 'The Use of Paraprofessionals in Rural Development'. *Community Development Journal.* vol. 19 (October 1984), pp. 232–5.

Bromley, Ray. 'Working in the Streets: Survival Strategy, Necessity, or Unavoidable Evil?', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 161–82.

Brown, J. 'The Military and Society: The Turkish Case'. *Middle Eastern Studies.* vol. 21 (July 1989), pp. 387–404.

Brown, J. F. *Surge to Freedom: The End of Communist Rule in Eastern Europe.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.

Bruneau, Thomas and W. E. Hewitt. 'Patterns of Church Influence in Brazil's Political Transition'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 22, no. 1 (October 1989), pp. 39–61.

Bruszt, Laszlo. '1989: The Negotiated Revolution in Hungary'. *Social Research.* vol. 57, no. 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 365–87.

Budge, Ian and David McKay (eds), *Developing Democracy.* London: Sage, 1994.

Butterworth, Charles. 'State and Authority in Arabic Political Thought', in Ghassan Salame (ed.), *The Foundations of the Arab State.* London: Croom Helm, 1987, pp. 91–111.

Cakir, Rusen. *Ne seriat, Ne Democrasi: Refah Partisini Anlamak* (*Neither Shiriat, Nor Democracy: Understanding the Refah Party*). Istanbul: Siyahbeyaz, 1994.

Calvert, Peter. *Politics, Power and Revolution: An Introduction to Comparative Politics.* London: Wheatsheaf, 1983.

Calvez, Jean-Yves. *Politics and Society in the Third World.* M. J. O'Connell, trans. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1973.

Cammack, Paul, David Pool and William Tordoff. *Third World Politics: A Comparative Introduction.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Castelli, Manuel. 'Squatters and the State in Latin America', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988. pp. 338–66.

Chaliand, Girard. *Revolution in the Third World: Myths and Prospects.* New York: Viking Press, 1977.

Charques, Richard. *The Twilight of the Russian Empire.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Chazan, Naomi. 'The New Politics of Participation in Tropical Africa' *Comparative Politics.* vol. 14, no. 2 (January 1982), pp. 169–90.

Chilcote, Ronald. 'Introduction: Dependency or Mode of Production? Theoretical Issues', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* London: Sage, 1983, pp. 231–55.

Chileshe, Jonathon. *Third World Countries and Development Options: Zambia.* New Delhi: Vikas, 1986.

Chilton, Stephen. 'Defining Political Culture'. *Western Political Quarterly.* vol. 41, no. 3 (September 1988), pp. 419–45.

Chin-wee, Chung. 'The Evolution of Political Institutions in North Korea', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986, pp. 18–41.

Claessen, Henri. 'Changing Legitimacy', in R. Cohen and J. Toland (eds), *State Formation and Political Legitimacy.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988, pp. 23–44.

Clements, Kevin. *From Right to Left in Development Theory: An Analysis of the Political Implications of Different Models of Development.* Singapore: The Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1980.

Cohen, Abner. 'The Politics of Ethnicity in African Towns', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 328–37.

Cohen, Youssef. 'The Impact of Bureaucratic-authoritarian Rule on Economic Growth'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 18, no. 1 (April 1985), pp. 122–36.

Conway, M. Margaret. 'The Political Context of Political Behavior'. *Journal of Politics.* vol. 51, no. 1 (February 1989).

Cooper, Frederick. 'Urban Space, Industrial Time, and Wagelabor in Africa', in Fredrick Cooper (ed.), *Struggle for the City: Migrant Labour, Capital, and the State in Urban Africa.* London: Sage, 1988, pp. 7–50.

Cornelius, Wayne A. 'The Political Sociology of Cityward Migration in Latin America: Towards Empirical Theory', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* Chicago: Maaroufa Press, 1977, pp. 213–24.

Cosio, Ignacio Algara. 'Community Development in Mexico', in Ronald Dore and Zoe Mars (eds), *Community Development.* London: Croom Helm, 1981, pp. 337–432.

Cotton, J. 'From Authoritarianism to Democracy in South Korea'. *Political Studies,* vol. 37 (June 1989), pp. 244–59.

Dahl, Robert. *Democracy and its Critics.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1989.

Davies, James. 'Toward a Theory of Revolution'. *American Sociological Review.* vol. 27, no. 1 (February 1962), pp. 7–19.

Decalo, Samuel. 'African Personal Dictatorships'. *The Journal of Modern African Studies.* vol. 23, no. 2 (1985), pp. 209–37.

de Gennaro, Bruno Musti. 'Ujamaa: The Aggrandizement of the State', in Rosemary Galli (ed.), *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* Albany, NY: SUNY, 1981, pp. 111–55.

Dhaouadi, Mahmoud. 'An Operational Analysis of the Phenomenon of the Other Underdevelopment in the Arab World and in the Third World'. *International Sociology.* vol. 3, no. 3 (September 1988), pp. 219–34.

Diamond, Larry. 'Introduction: Political Culture and Democracy', in Larry Diamond (ed.), *Political Culture and Democracy in Developing Countries.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993, pp. 1–33.

Diamond, Larry and Marc Plattner (eds), *The Global Resurgence of Democracy.* Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993.

Diamond, Larry, Juan Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset. 'Introduction: Comparing Experiences with Democracy', in Larry Diamond, Juan Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds), *Politics in Developing Countries: Comparing Experiences with Democracy.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 1–37.

Di Palma, Giuseppe. *To Craft Democracies: An Essay on Democratic Transitions.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1990.

Dix, Robert. 'The Varieties of Revolution'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 15, no. 3 (April 1983), pp. 281–94.

Dror, Yehezkel. 'Public-policy-making in Avant-garde Developing States', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 278–86.

Dube, S. C. *Modernization and Development: The Search for Alternative Paradigms.* Tokyo: United Nations University, 1988.

Dunn, John. *Rethinking Modern Political Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

——. 'Revolution', in T. Ball, J. Farr and R. Hanson (eds), *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

—— . *Modern Revolutions: An Introduction to the Analysis of a Political Phenomenon.* 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Ebenstein, William. *Great Political Thinkers: From Plato to the Present.* 4th edn. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1951.

Eckstein, Harry. 'A Culturalist Theory of Political Change'. *American Political Science Review.* vol. 82, no. 3 (September 1988).

Eckstein, Susan. 'Politics of Conformity in Mexico City', in J. Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 294–307.

Edwards, Sebastian and Simon Teitel. 'Introduction to Growth, Reform, and Adjustment: Latin America's Trade and Macroeconomic Policies in the 1970s and the 1980s'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 34, no. 3 (April 1986), pp. 423–31.

Eisenstadt, S. N. 'Problems of Emerging Bureaucracies in Developing Areas and New States', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 286–93.

Ellul, Jacques. *Propaganda: The Formation of Men's Attitudes.* Konrad Kellen and Jean Lerner, trans. New York: Vintage, 1973.

Enayat, Hamid. *Modern Islamic Political Thought.* London: Macmillan, 1982.

Epstein, Edward. 'Legitimacy, Institutionalization, and Opposition in Exclusionary Bureaucratic Authoritarian Regimes: The Situation in the 1980s'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 17, no. 1 (1984), pp. 37–54.

Eun Sung, Chung. 'Transition to Democracy in South Korea'. *Asian Profile.* vol. 17, no. 1 (February 1989), pp. 25–37.

Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Mask.* Charles Lam Markmann, trans. New York: Grove Press, 1967.

Farhi, Farideh. 'State Disintegration and Urban-based Revolutionary Crisis: A Comparative Analysis of Iran and Nicaragua'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 21, no. 2 (July 1988), pp. 231–56.

Farr, James. 'Historical Concepts in Political Science: The Case of Revolution'. *American Journal of Political Science.* vol. 26, no. 4 (November 1982), pp. 688–708.

Feder, Ernest. 'The World Bank–FIRA Scheme in Action in Temporal, Veracruz', in Rosemary Galli (ed.), *The Political Economy of Rural Development.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1981.

Feit, Edward. *The Armed Bureaucrats: Military Administrative Regimes and Political Development.* Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin, 1973.

Fields, Gary. 'Place to Place Migration in Colombia'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 539–58.

Findlay, Allen and Anne Findlay. *Population and Development in the Third World.* London: Methuen, 1987.

Foltz, William. 'External Causes', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds), *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 54–68.

Foster, Phillip. 'The Educational Policies of Postcolonial States', in Lascelles Anderson and Douglas Windham (eds), *Education and Development: Issues in the Analysis and Planning of Postcolonial Societies.* Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1982, pp. 3–25.

Frank, Andre Gunder. 'Crisis and Transformation of Dependency in the World-system', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* London: Sage, 1983, pp. 181–200.

Freeman, Michael. 'Review Article: Theories of Revolution'. *British Journal of Political Science.* vol. 2 (1972), pp. 339–59.

Friedland, William. 'A Sociological Approach to Modernization', in Chandler Morse, *et al. Modernization by Design: Social Change in the Twentieth Century.* London: Cornell University Press, 1969, pp. 34–84.

Gaikwad, V. R. 'Community Development in India', in Ronald Dore and Zoe Mars (eds), *Community Development.* London: Croom Helm, 1981.

Galli, Rosemary (ed.). *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1981.

Gareau, Fredrick. 'Another Type of Third World Dependency: The Social Sciences'. *International Sociology.* vol. 3, no. 2 (June 1988), p. 173.

Gellner, Ernest. *Conditions of Liberty: Civil Society and its Critics.* New York: Penguin, 1994.

Ghai, Dharam and Cynthia Hewitt de Alcantara. 'The Crisis of the 1980s in Sub-Saharan Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean: Economic Impact, Social Change and Political Implications'. *Development and Change.* vol. 12 (1990), pp. 389–426.

Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-identity: Self and the Society in the Late Modern Age.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.

Gilbert, Alan and Josef Gugler. *Cities, Poverty, and Development: Urbanization in the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1982.

Goldstone, Jack. 'State Breakdown in the English Revolution: A New Synthesis'. *American Journal of Sociology.* vol. 92, no. 2 (September 1986), pp. 257–322.

——. (ed.). *Revolutions: Theoretical, Comparative, and Historical Studies.* 2nd edn. London: Harcourt Brace, 1994.

Goldthrope, J. E. *The Sociology of the Third World, Disparity and Development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Goodwin, Jeff and Theda Skocpol. 'Explaining Revolutions in the Contemporary Third World'. *Politics and Society.* vol. 17, no. 2 (December 1989), pp. 489–509.

Green, Jerrold. 'Countermobilization as a Revolutionary Form'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 16, no. 2 (January 1984), pp. 153–69.

Greene, Gerald. *Comparative Revolutionary Movements.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Gugler, Josef. 'Overurbanization Reconsidered', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 74–92.

——. 'The Urban Character of Contemporary Revolutions', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 399–412.

——. (ed.). *The Urban Transformation of the Developing World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Gurr, Ted Robert. 'War, Revolution, and the Growth of the Coercive State'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 21, no. 1 (April 1988), pp. 45–65.

——. *Why Men Rebel?* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1970.

Haggard, Stephen and Robert Kaufman. *The Political Economy of Democratic Transitions.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Hague, Rod and Martin Harrop. *Comparative Politics and Government: An Introduction.* Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press, 1987, pp. 134–7.

Hall, John (ed.). *Civil Society: Theory, History, Comparison.* Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.

Han, S. J. 'South Korea in 1988: Revolution in the Making'. *Asia Survey.* vol. 29 (January 1989), pp. 29–38.

Hansen, Klaus. *Mormonism and the American Experience.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Harik, Iliya. 'The Origins of the Arab State System', in Gessan Salame (ed.), *The Foundations of the Arab State.* London: Croom Helm, 1987.

Harris, John and Alden Speare. 'Education, Earnings, and Migration in Indonesia'. *Economic Development and Culture Change.* vol. 34, no. 2 (January 1986), pp. 223–44.

Hartmann, Elizabeth and James Boyce. 'Needless Hunger: Poverty and Power in Rural Bangladesh', in Rosemary Galli (ed.), *The Political Economy of Rural Development: Peasants, International Capital, and the State.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1981, pp. 175–210.

Hay, Richard. 'Patterns of Urbanization and Socio-economic Development in the Third World: An Overview', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* Chicago, IL: Maaroufa Press, 1977, pp. 71–101.

——. 'Rural–Urban Mobility in South and Southeast Asia, Different Formulations ... Different Answers?', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* Chicago: Maaroufa Press, 1977, pp. 196–212.

Herbert, John. *Urban Development in the Third World: Policy Guidelines.* New York: Praeger, 1979.

Hermassi, Elbaki. *The Third World Reassessed.* Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1980.

Hernandez, Gloria. 'Political Institution Building in the Philippines', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986.

Higgot, Richard. *Political Development Theory: The Contemporary Debate.* London: Croom Helm, 1983.

Hillmann, Michael (ed.). *Iranian Society: An Anthology of Writings by Jalal Al-e Ahmad.* Lexington, KY: Mazda Press, 1982.

Himmelstein, Jerome and Michael Kimmel. 'Review Essay: States and Revolutions: The Implications and Limits of Skocpol's Structural Model'. *American Journal of Sociology.* vol. 86, no. 5 (March 1981), pp. 1145–54.

Hinnebusch, Raymond. 'Charisma, Revolution, and State Formation: Qaddafi and Libya'. *Third World Quarterly.* vol. 7, no. 1 (January 1984), pp. 59–73.

Hintzen, Percy. 'Bases of Elite Support for a Regime: Race, Ideology, and Clientalism as Bases for Leaders in Guyana and Trinidad'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 16, no. 3 (October 1983), pp. 363–91.

Horowitz, Dan. 'Dual Authority Politics'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 14, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 329–49.

Howe, Elizabeth. 'Responsive Planning and Social Development Programs in the Third World'. *Journal of Planning Literature.* vol. 2, no. 4 (Autumn 1987), pp. 384–404.

Hoy, Terry. 'Octavio Paz: The Search for Mexican Identity'. *Review of Politics.* vol. 44, no. 3 (July 1982), pp. 370–85.

Hsu, Immanuel. *The Rise of Modern China.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Huntington, Samuel. *Political Order in Changing Societies.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1968.

——. 'Social and Institutional Dynamics of One-party Systems', in S. Huntington and C. Moore (eds), *Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society.* London: Basic Books, 1970, pp. 3–47.

——. *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century.* Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press, 1991.

Inglehart, Ronald. 'The Renaissance of Political Culture'. *American Political Science Review.* vol. 82, no. 4 (December 1988), pp. 1203–30.

Jackson, Robert, and Carl Rosberg. 'Personal Rule: Theory and Practice in Africa'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 16, no. 4 (1984), pp. 421–42.

Jellinek, Lea. 'The Changing Fortunes of a Jakarta Street-trader', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 220–3.

Jimenez, Emmanuel. 'The Value of Squatter Dwellings in Developing Countries'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 4 (July 1982), pp. 739–52.

Johnson, Carlos. 'Ideologies in Theories of Imperialism and Dependency', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* London: Sage, 1983, pp. 75–104.

Johnson, Chalmers. *Revolutionary Change.* London: Longman, 1983.

Johnson, Dale. 'Class Analysis and Dependency', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* London: Sage, 1983, pp. 231–55.

Jones, R. Ben. *The French Revolution.* London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1967.

Kamrava, Mehran. 'Intellectuals and Democracy in the Third World'. *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies.* vol. 14, no. 2 (Summer 1989).

——. 'Causes and Leaders of Revolution'. *Journal of Social, Political, and Economic Studies.* vol. 15, no. 1 (Spring 1990), pp. 79–89.

——. *Revolution in Iran: Roots of Turmoil.* London: Routledge, 1990.

——. *Revolutionary Politics.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1992.

——. *Understanding Comparative Politics: A Framework for Analysis.* London: Routledge, 1996.

Kavanagh, Denis. *Political Culture.* London: Macmillan, 1972.

Kedouri, Elie. *Politics in the Middle East.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.

Keesing, Donald. 'Small Population as a Political Handicap to National Development', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 318–26.

Keller, Edmond. 'Revolution and the Collapse of Traditional Monarchies: Ethiopia', in Barry Schutz and Robert Slater (eds), *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 81–98.

Kelley, Allen and Jeffrey Williamson. 'The Limits to Urban Growth: Suggestions for Macromodeling Third World Economies'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 595–623.

Keyfitz, Nathan. 'Development and the Elimination of Poverty'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 649–70.

Kim, Hyung-Chang. 'The Americanization of Higher Education in Korea'. *Asian Profile.* vol. 17, no. 2 (April 1989).

Krauss, Clifford. 'Revolution in Central America?' *Foreign Affairs.* vol. 65, no. 3 (1987), pp. 564–81.

Kroeber, A. L. 'Diffusionism', in Edwin R. A. Feligman and Alvin Johnson (eds), *The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences III.* New York: Macmillan, 1937.

Kromnick, Isaac. 'Reflections on Revolution: Definition and Explanation in Recent Scholarship'. *History and Theory.* vol. 11, no. 1 (1972), pp. 22–63.

Kuyunsa, Bidum. 'The Priest as a Change Agent'. *Community Development Journal.* vol. 19 (October 1984), pp. 252–60.

Laite, Julian. 'The Migrant Response in Central Peru', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Landim, Leilah. 'Non-governmental Organizations in Latin America'. *World Development.* vol. 15, supplement (1987), pp. 29–38.

Ledent, Jacques. 'Rural–Urban Migration, Urbanization, and Economic Development'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 507–38.

Leeds, Anthony. 'Housing-settlement Types, Arrangements for Living, Proletarianization, and the Social Structure of the City', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* Chicago, IL: Maaroufa Press, 1977, pp. 330–7

Le Grande, William. 'Central America', in B. Schutz and R. Slater (eds), *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 142–60.

Levine, Daniel. 'Religion and Politics in Contemporary Historical Perspective'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 19, no. 1 (October 1986).

——. 'Assessing the Impact of Liberation Theology in Latin America'. *Review of Politics.* vol. 50, no. 2 (Spring 1988).

Levy, Daniel. 'Comparing Authoritarian Regimes in Latin America: Insights from Higher Education Policy'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 14, no. 1 (October 1981), pp. 31–52.

Linn, Johannes. 'The Cost of Democracy in the Developing Countries'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 625–48.

Lipton, Michael. 'Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 40–51.

Litwak, Robert. *Detente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984.

Liviga, Athumani, and Jan Kees van Donge. 'Tanzanian Political Culture and the Cabinet'. *The Journal of Modern African Studies.* vol. 24, no. 4 (1986), pp. 619–39.

Lomnitz, Larissa. 'The Social and Economic Organization of a Mexican Shantytown', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 242–63.

McCormick, Gordon. 'The Shining Path and Peruvian Terrorism'. *The Journal of Strategic Studies.* vol. 10, no. 4 (December 1987), pp. 109–26.

McDermott, Anthony. *Egypt from Nasser to Mubarak: A Flawed Revolution.* London: Croom Helm, 1988.

McDonough, Peter. 'Repression and Representation in Brazil'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 15, no. 1 (October 1982), pp. 73–99.

McGee, T. G. *The Urbanization Process in the Third World: Explorations in Search of a Theory.* London: G. Bell & Sons, 1971.

——. 'The Persistence of the Proto-proletariat: Occupational Structures and Planning of the Future of the Third World Cities', in Janet Abu-Lughod and Richard Hay (eds), *Third World Urbanization.* Chicago, IL: Maaroufa Press, 1977, pp. 257–70.

Macklin, David. 'A Social-psychological Perspective on Modernization', in Chandler Morse *et al. Modernization by Design: Social Change in the Twentieth Century.* London: Cornell University Press, 1969, pp. 85–146.

Mainwaring, Scott. 'Democracy in Brazil and the Southern Cone: Achievements and Problems.' *Journal of Interamerican Studies and World Affairs.* vol. 37, no. 1 (Spring 1995), pp. 113–79.

Ma'oz, Moshe. *Syria under Hafiz Al-Asad: New Domestic and Foreign Policies.* Jerusalem: Hebrew University Press, 1975.

Maravall, J. M. 'Subjective Conditions and Revolutionary Conflicts: Some Remarks'. *British Journal of Sociology.* vol. 27, no. 1 (March 1976), pp. 21–34.

Marcos, Ferdinand. *Notes on the New Society of the Philippines.* Manila: Marcos Foundation, 1973.

——. *Five Years of the New Society.* Manila: Marcos Foundation, 1978.

Marenin, Otwin. 'Policing African States: Toward a Critique'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 14, no. 4 (July 1982), pp. 379–96.

Marshall, Susan. 'Politics and Female Status in North Africa: A Reconsideration of Development Theory'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 32, no. 3 (April 1984), pp. 499–524.

Marton, Katherin. *Multinationals, Technology, and Industrialization: Implications and Impact in Third World Countries.* Lexington, VA: Lexington Books, 1986.

Mason, T. David. 'Indigenous Factors', in B. Schutz and R. Slater (eds), *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 30–53.

——. *Revolution in East-Central Europe: The Rise and Fall of Communism and the Cold War.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1992.

Mattelart, Armand. *Transnationals and the Third World: The Struggle for Culture.* David Buxton, trans. South Hadley, MA: Bergin & Garvey, 1983.

Mecham, J. Lloyd. 'Latin American Constitutions: Nominal or Real', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 219–27.

Michta, Andrew. *The Government and Politics of Postcommunist Europe.* Westport, CT: Praeger, 1994.

Midlarsky, Manus. 'Scarcity and Inequality: Prologue to the Onset of Mass Revolution'. *Journal of Conflict Resolution.* vol. 26, no. 1 (March 1982), pp. 3–38.

—— 'Rules and the Ruled: Patterned Inequality and the Onset of Mass Political Violence'. *American Political Science Review.* vol. 82, no. 2 (June 1988), pp. 491–509.

Migdal, Joel. *Peasants, Politics, and Revolution: Pressures toward Political and Social Change in the Third World.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1974.

Miroff, Bruce. *Pragmatic Illusions: The Presidential Politics of John F. Kennedy.* New York: David McKay, 1976.

Moghadam, Val. 'Industrial Development, Culture and Working Class Politics: A Case Study of Tabriz Industrial Workers in the Iranian Revolution'. *International Sociology.* vol. 2, no. 2 (June 1987), pp. 151–75.

Moore, Barrington. *Injustice: The Social Base of Obedience and Revolt.* London: Macmillan, 1978.

Moore, Clement. 'The Single Party as a Source of Legitimacy', in S. Huntington and C. Moore (eds), *Authoritarian Politics in Modern Society.* London: Basic Books, 1970, pp. 48–72.

Moore, Sally Falk. 'Legitimation as a Process: The Expansion of Government and Party in Tanzania', in R. Cohen and J. Toland (eds), *State Formation and Political Legitimacy.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books, 1988, pp. 156–60.

Moore, Wilbert. *Social Change.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1963.

Moshiri, Farrokh. Revolutionary Conflict Theory in an Evolutionary Perspective', in Jack Goldstone, Ted Robert Gurr and Farrokh Moshiri (eds), *Revolutions of the Late Twentieth Century.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1991, pp. 4–36.

Motyl, Alexander. *Dilemmas of Independence: Ukraine after Totalitarianism.* New York: Council on Foreign Relations Press, 1993.

Mushi, Samuel. 'Community Development in Tanzania', in Ronald Dore and Zoe Mars (eds), *Community Development.* London: Croom Helm, 1981, pp. 139–242.

Nash, Manning. *Unfinished Agenda: The Dynamics of Modernization in Developing Nations.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1984.

Nelson, Joan. *Access to Power: Politics and the Urban Poor in Developing Nations.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Nettl, J. P. 'Ideas, Intellectuals, and Structures of Dissent', in Philip Rieff (ed.), *On Intellectuals.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1970.

Nkrumah, Kwame. *Consciencism.* London: Heinemann, 1964.

Nordlinger, Eric. 'Soldiers in Mufti: The Impact of Military Rule Upon Economic and Social Change in the Non-Western States', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 250–61.

——. *Soldiers in Politics: Military Coups and Governments.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Nwabueze, B. O. *The Presidential Constitution of Nigeria.* London: C. Hurst & Co., 1982.

Nye, Joseph. *Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power.* New York: Basic Books, 1990.

O'Donnell, Guillermo, Philippe Schmitter and Laurence Whitehead (eds). *Transitions from Authoritarian Rule: Southern Europe.* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Ogburn, W. F. *Social Change with Respect to Culture and Original Nature.* New York: Viking, 1950.

O'Kane, Rosemary. 'A Probabilistic Approach to the Causes of Coups d'Etat'. *British Journal of Political Science.* vol. 11 (1981), pp. 287–398.

Onibokun, Adepoju G. 'Urban Growth and Urban Management in Nigeria', in Richard Stern and Rodney White (eds), *African Cities in Crisis: Managing Rapid Urban Growth.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989, pp. 69–111.

Ortega, Marvin. 'The State, the Peasantry and the Sandanista Revolution'. *Journal of Development Studies.* vol. 26, no. 4 (1990), pp. 122–42.

Pahlavi, Mohammad Reza. *Mission for My Country.* New York: McGraw Hill, 1960.

——. *Answer to History.* New York: Stein & Day, 1980.

Paige, Jeffrey. *Agrarian Revolution: Social Movement and Export Agriculture in the Underdeveloped World.* New York: Free Press, 1975.

Parker, Richard. 'Anti-American Attitudes in the Arab World'. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences.* vol. 497 (May 1988).

Parsa, Misagh. 'Theories of Collective Action and the Iranian Revolution'. *Sociological Forum.* vol. 3, no. 1 (Winter 1988), pp. 41–71.

Paterson, Thomas, J. G. Clifford and Kenneth Hagan. *American Foreign Policy: A History.* Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath, 1991.

Paz, Octavio. *The Labyrinth of Solitude: Life and Thought in Mexico.* Lysander Kemp, trans. London: Evergreen, 1961.

Philips, George. 'Military-authoritarianism in South America: Brazil, Chile, Uruguay and Argentina'. *Political Studies.* vol. 32 (1984), pp. 1–20.

Pinkney, Robert. *Democracy in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1994.

Portis, E. B. 'Charismatic Leadership and Cultural Democracy'. *Review of Politics.* vol. 41, no. 2 (Spring 1987), pp. 231–50.

Preston, Samuel. 'Urban Growth in the Developing Countries: A Demographic Reappraisal', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 211–31.

Przeworski, Adam. *Democracy and the Market: Political and Economic Reform in Eastern Europe and Latin America.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Pye, Lucian. 'Identity and Political Culture', in Lucian Pye, Leonard Binder, James Coleman, Joseph La Palombara, Sidney Verba and Myron Weiner. *Crises and Sequences in Political Development.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.

——. The Legitimacy Crisis', in Lucian Pye *et al. Crises and Sequences in Political Development.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.

——. 'Political Development and Political Decay', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofis, 1973, pp. 53–60.

——. 'The Concept of Political Development', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 49–52.

——. 'The Non-Western Political Process', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 21–31.

Randall, Vicky and Robin Theobald. *Political Change and Underdevelopment: A Critical Introduction to Third World Politics.* London: Macmillan, 1985.

Ranger, Terence. 'Religion, Development, and African Christian Identity', in Kirsten H. Petersen (ed.), *Religion, Development and African Identity.* Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute for African Studies, 1987.

Remmer, Karen. 'Redemocratization and the Impact of Authoritarian Rule in Latin America'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 17, no. 3 (April 1985), pp. 253–76.

Richards, Gordon. 'Stabilization Crisis and the Breakdown of Military Authoritarianism in Latin America'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 18, no. 47 (January 1986), pp. 449–85.

Richardson, Harry. 'Inefficiency and Welfare in LDC Mega-cities', in John Kasarda and Allan Parnell (eds), *Third World Cities: Problems, Policies, and Prospects.* London: Sage, 1993, pp. 32–57.

Robert Bryan. *Cities of Peasants: The Political Economy of Urbanization in the Third World.* London: Sage, 1978.

Roett, Riodan. 'Anti-Americanism in the Southern Cone of Latin America'. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences,* vol. 497 (May 1988), p. 71.

Rogers, Andrei. 'Sources of Urban Population Growth and Urbanization, 1950–2000: A Demographic Accounting'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 483–506.

Rogers, Andrei and Jeffrey Williams. 'Migration, Urbanization, and Third World Development: An Overview'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 30, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 463–82.

Rohrer, Wayne. 'Developing Third World Farming: Conflict between Modern Imperatives and Traditional Ways'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 34, no. 2 (January 1986), pp. 299–314.

Rondinelli, Dennis. *Secondary Cities in Developing Countries: Policies for Diffusing Urbanization.* London: Sage, 1983.

Rosenbaum, Walter. *Political Culture.* New York: Praeger, 1975.

Rubenstein, Alvin and Donald Smith. 'Anti-Americanism in the Third World'. *Annals of the American Academy of Social and Political Sciences.* vol. 497 (May 1988), p. 35.

Rubin, Barry. *Modern Dictators: Third World Coup Makers, Strongmen, and Populist Tyrants.* New York: McGraw-Hill, 1987.

Rustow, Dankwart. 'Ataturk's Political Leadership', in R. Winder (ed.), *Near Eastern Round Table 1967–68.* New York: NYU Press, 1969, pp. 143–55.

Sabot, Richard. 'Migration and Urban Surplus Labor: Policy Options', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 93–108.

Salert, Barbara. *Revolutions and Revolutionaries.* New York: Elsevier, 1976.

Samudamanija, Chai-Anan. 'Political Institutionalization in Thailand: Continuity and Change', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986, pp. 241–60.

Sandbrook, Richard. 'The State and Economic Stagnation in Tropical Africa'. *World Development.* vol. 14, no. 3 (1986), pp. 319–32.

Sarduy, Pedro Perez. 'Culture and the Cuban Revolution'. *The Black Scholar.* vol. 20, nos 5–6 (Winter 1989), pp. 17–23.

Scalapino, Robert. 'Legitimacy and Institutionalization in Asian Socialist Societies', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986, pp. 59–94.

Schahgaldian, Nikola. *The Clerical Establishment in Iran.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1989.

Schneider, Cathy Lisa. *Shantytown Protest in Pinochet's Chile.* Pittsburgh, PA: Temple University Press, 1995.

Schram, Stuart. *The Political Thought of Mao Tse Tung.* New York: Praeger, 1972.

Schutz, Barry and Robert Slater. 'A Framework for Analysis', in B. Schutz and R. Slater (eds), *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 3–18.

——. 'Patterns of Legitimacy and Future Revolutions in the Third World', in B. Schutz and R. Slater (eds), *Revolution and Political Change in the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1990, pp. 247–50.

Scott, James. 'Hegemony and the Peasantry'. *Politics and Society.* vol. 7, no. 3 (1977), pp. 267–96.

Scruton, Roger. *A Dictionary of Political Thought.* London: Macmillan, 1982.

Seligson, Mitchell. 'Democratization in Latin America: The Current Cycle', in J. Malloy and M. Seligson (eds), *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Changes in Latin America.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1987, pp. 3–12.

Shin, Doh Chull. 'On the Third Wave of Democratization'. *World Politics.* vol. 47, no. 3 (October 1994), pp. 135–70.

Simmons, Ozzie. *Perspectives on Development and Population Growth in the Third World.* London: Plenum, 1988.

Skocpol, Theda. *States and Social Revolutions.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.

——. 'What Makes Peasants Revolutionary?' *Comparative Politics.* vol. 14, no. 3 (April 1982), pp. 351–75.

——. 'Rentier State and Shi'a Islam in the Iranian Revolution'. *Theory and Society.* vol. 11, no. 3 (May 1982), pp. 265–83.

——. 'Social Revolutions and Mass Military Mobilization'. *World Politics.* vol. 40, no. 2 (January 1988), pp. 147–68.

Slater, Robert, Barry Schutz and Steve Dorr (eds), *Global Transformation and the Third World.* Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 1993.

Sorensen, Georg. *Democracy and Democratization.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1993.

Spalding, Rose. 'State Power and its Limits: Corporatism in Mexico'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 14, no. 2 (July 1981), pp. 139–61.

Speare, Alden and John Harris. 'Education, Earnings, and Migration in Indonesia'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 34, no. 2 (January 1986), pp. 223–44.

Stark, Oded and David Lavhari. 'On Migration and Risk in LDCs'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 31, no. 1 (October 1982), pp. 191–6.

Stark, Oded and Robert Lucas. 'Migration, Remittances, and the Family'. *Economic Development and Cultural Change.* vol. 36, no. 3 (April 1988), pp. 465–82.

Stern, Richard. 'Urban Local Government in Africa', in Richard Stern and Rodney White (eds), *African Cities in Crisis: Managing Rapid Urban Growth.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989, pp. 20–36.

——. 'The Administration of Urban Services', in Richard Stern and Rodney White (eds), *African Cities in Crisis: Managing Rapid Urban Growth.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989, pp. 37–63.

Stokes, Randall and David Jaffee. 'Another Look at the Export of Raw Materials and Economic Growth'. *American Sociological Review.* vol. 47, no. 3 (June 1982), pp. 402–7.

Stone, L. 'Theories of Revolution'. *World Politics.* vol. 18 (1966), pp. 159–76.

Strasser, Hermann and Susan Randall. *An Introduction to Theories of Social Change.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.

Stultz, Newell. 'Parliaments in Former British Black Africa', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 262–77.

Sung-joo, Han. 'Political Institutionalization in South Korea, 1961–1984', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute for East Asian Studies, 1986, pp. 116–37.

Tachau, Frank and Metin Heper. 'The State, Politics, and the Military in Turkey'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 16, no. 1 (October 1983), pp. 17–37.

Tester, Keith. *Civil Society.* London: Routledge, 1992.

Timothy, Bankole. *Kwame Nkrumah from Cradle to Grave.* Dorchester: Gavin Press, 1981.

Todaro, Michael. *Economic Development.* 6th edn. New York: Addison Wesley, 1997.

Torp, Jens Erik. *Industrial Planning and Development in Mozambique.* Uppsala: The Scandinavian Institute of African Studies, 1979.

Vacs, Aldo. 'Authoritarian Breakdown and Redemocratization in Argentina', in J. Malloy and M. Seligson (eds), *Authoritarians and Democrats: Regime Transition in Latin America.* Pittsburg, PA: University of Pittsburg Press, 1987, pp. 15–42.

Veltmeyer, Henry. 'Surplus Labor and Class Formation on the Latin American Periphery', in Ronald Chilcote and Dale Johnson (eds), *Theories of Development: Mode of Production or Dependency?* London: Sage, 1983, pp. 201–30.

Vilas, Carlos. 'Popular Insurgency and Social Revolution in Central America'. *Latin American Perspectives.* vol. 15, no. 1 (Winter 1988), pp. 55–77.

Watson, Keith. 'Educational Neocolonialism – The Continued Legacy', in Keith Watson (ed.), *Education in the Third World.* London: Croom Helm, 1982, p. 184.

Weiner, Myron. 'Political Participation: Crisis of the Political Process', in Lucian Pye *et al.* *Crises and Sequences in Political Development.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971.

——. 'Institution Building in South Asia', in R. Scalapino, S. Sato and J. Wanandi (eds), *Asian Political Institutionalization.* Berkeley, CA: Institute of East Asian Studies, 1986, pp. 288–312.

Weinstein, Jay. 'The Third World and Developmentalism: Technology, Morality, and the Role of Intellectuals', in Raj Mayhan (ed.), *The Myth-makers: Intellectuals and the Intelligentsia in Perspective.* Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1987.

White, Rodney. 'The Influence of Environmental and Economic Factors on the Urban Crisis', in Rodney White and Richard Stern (eds), *African Cities in Crisis: Managing Rapid Urban Growth.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1989.

Whyte, Martin King. 'Social Control and Rehabilitation in Urban China', in Josef Gugler (ed.), *The Urbanization of the Third World.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988, pp. 246–86.

Wiarda, Howard. 'Political Culture and the Attraction of Marxist–Leninism: National Inferiority Complex as an Explanatory Factor'. *World Affairs.* vol. 151, no. 3 (Winter 1988–9).

Willner, Ann Ruth and Dorothy Willner. 'The Rise and Role of Charismatic Leaders', in Harvey Kebschull (ed.), *Politics in Transitional Societies.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1973, pp. 227–36.

Wolf, Eric. *Peasant Wars of the Twentieth Century.* New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

Wolpin, Miles. 'Sociopolitical Radicalism and Military Professionalism in the Third World'. *Comparative Politics.* vol. 15, no. 2 (January 1983), pp. 203–21.

World Bank. *World Development Report 1990.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

——. *World Development Report 1997* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Zagorin, Perez. 'Theories of Revolution in Contemporary Historiography'. *Political Science Quarterly.* vol. 88, no. 1 (March 1973), pp. 23–52.

Zhang, Bouhui. 'Corporatism, Totalitarianism and Transitions to Democracy'. *Comparative Political Studies.* vol. 27, no. 1 (April 1994), pp. 108–9.

Index