

Comparing Pluralist, Hyperpluralist, Elite, Class, and Traditional Theory of Government Essay Sample It is much easier to contrast the four contemporary theories of American democracy than to compare them, as pluralist, hyperpluralist, elite and class, and traditional theory each highlights the competitive foundation of politics.

Contextualization[edit] Comparative media system research[edit] The field of comparative media system research has a long tradition reaching back to the study *Four Theories of the Press* by Siebert, Peterson and Schramm from This book was the origin of the academic debate on comparing and classifying media systems, [2] whereas it was normatively biased [3] and strongly influenced by the ideologies of the Cold War era. Comparative media system research has been subject to several changes since its establishment. Another trend is that researchers factor in political systems more intensively to explain and compare media systems. A more fundamental development is the shift from normative to empirically based approaches. There are still problems of comparative media studies in various countries which must be faced. The validity of the country sampling procedure is one problem, beside the adequate definition of the scope of the comparison to meet the specific national features of the cases, and the definition of adequate indicators as the basis for the comparison. The comparative design is a bridge between traditional and nation-centered studies of media systems and new media as well as globalization perspectives. According to this heuristic, the approach from Hallin and Mancini can be identified and localized as one specific combination of the components along these three dimensions of analysis. Their perspective of analysis is focused on a systematic comparison of media systems within Western democracies. Consequently, their level of analysis concentrates on media systems within the context of nation states. Their main objectives are media-politics relations primarily on the level of structures, but in addition to it, they consider all objects of analysis to gain an encompassing understanding of these relations. Objectives[edit] Developing a unifying conceptual framework for comparing media systems was essential for Hallin and Mancini. They focused on theory building rather than testing theories, as the then prevailing *Four Theories of the Press* and its subsequent normative modifications showed deficiencies in adequately analyzing present media systems. Following this design, they conceptualized dimensions containing particular variables to analyze similarities and differences between the 18 countries under study. Since the dimensions and the resulting models cover specifically the media-politics relations of the Western world, Hallin and Mancini do not claim universal validity of their framework. Hence, it must be reconceptualized to meet the specific conditions of media-politics relations beyond the Western world. According to specific constellations of the variables within these dimensions, Hallin and Mancini conceptualized the three models of media and politics. The authors highlight several variables which can be used to describe the characteristics of press systems: They have to be assessed empirically for every new case under study. They took relevant concepts from the literatures on comparative politics and political sociology to gain a better understanding of the political influences on the development of media systems. The resulting dimensions are presented as dichotomies , but they are just poles on a continuum. The first dimension is the role of the state. The main difference between these two categories is the interventional activity of the state e. This difference takes shape in the relative importance of private business or social institutions within the political system in question. A further important dichotomic dimension is labeled consensus vs. Furthermore, the Cabinet predominantly influences political decision processes. By contrast, the consensus politics model encompasses a multi-party system which is based on the power sharing principle according to the proportional representation so that compromise and cooperation between the opposing forces are central. Additionally, there is a separation of power between legislative and executive. The third dimension is the distinction between individual and organized pluralism [27] resp. Following Max Weber , Hallin and Mancini use the term rational-legal authority in its meaning as a form of governance whose main influence is maintained through formal and universalistic rules of procedure, i. This apparatus is the main institution of an efficient rational-legal system. In contrast, the orientation on common interests is much weaker within clientelism systems because individual interests and private relationships are the main forces maintaining the social organization. An important indicator is the existence

of anti-system parties and factions. Compared to this, moderate pluralism is mainly characterized by stronger tendencies toward the center, lower ideological differences between the political parties , greater acceptance of the political system , and better chances to gain consensus during political controversies. Hallin and Mancini could identify specific patterns by geographical regions which were crucial for labeling the individual models:

Chapter 2 : Comparing Media Systems - Wikipedia

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

Reyes-Gonzalez 1 Comparing and contrasting rational choice, pluralist and Marxist theories: Contributions to the study of public policy By Jose Antonio Reyes-Gonzalez Diverse conceptualisations of power between states, groups and individuals generate several political theories. Political matters can be analysed and criticised at a more abstract and general level through the use of three competing approaches that will be examined in this paper. Political theory is defined as a technique of analysis, which can be used to overturn or to uphold any argument, it describes and explains politics with a critical scope Goodwin, , p. In this sense, rational choice, the newest and also the most bounded approach to economics, refers to the principle that policies can be explained in terms of individuals and their rationality. Methodological individualism is the underlying assumption that describes rational choice, where individual decisions form a set of explanatory variables Arrow, , p. The second approach is pluralism, which sees the power widely distributed among all the actors in a political setting. The contention of pluralism is based on competitive and open policy processes, where individual decisions must be integrated with decisions of others Lindblom, , p. The history of politics and economics is included in the theory of Marxism. Attempting to explain what the state and power are, Marxism correlates them with social classes and it stresses the systematic bias in power owing to the economic arrangements of the capitalist structures behind it Abrams, , p. All the three theories can agree and disagree at some points of their conjectures; however, they cannot be discarded in political debates. Marxism, rational choice and pluralism influence policy-making considerably. Therefore, to have a better understanding of them, firstly, the theoretical section explains the classical arguments of the three theories; it outlines the key concepts in order to gain practical insights into their values. The main arguments and critiques are examined regarding how the theories impact on the role of power and the state in policy-making. Secondly, an appraisal and comparison between them is introduced, making three possible combinations of the theories and exploring the implications of contemporary versions. To compare and contrast the three paradigms, differences and commonalities were analysed. Finally, the conclusion argues that the theories show diverse standpoints regarding the world of politics. However, the conceptions are not mutually exclusive, even though they present divisions and conflicts. Rather than being fixed models, each theory shows a propensity to be adapted with new approaches and views that strengthen and prolong its existence. It forms a complete set of explanatory, transitivity of preferences consistency that determines and explains the micro-foundations of political and economic behaviour Arrow, , p. Hayek put it in the next simple quote: Therefore, rational choice seems to be a simple method of analysing social processes and policy depending on the given configuration of individuals, their situation, beliefs and resources. In the words of Watkins, it is the rock- bottom of explanations , p. However, the theory is a victim of substantial criticism on the grounds that society is a compound of individuals; therefore, social behaviour cannot be explained without individuals and individuals cannot be explained without society. Inconsistencies can be found if social phenomena are considered as fictional and individuals as a factual phenomenon Lukes, , p. Lack of falsifiability is one of its main features. Therefore, policy analysis under this approach becomes theory driven rather than problem driven Green and Shapiro, , p. The classical statement of pluralism is supported by the key assumption that there are many groups competing with each other in an open political system; the state is just an arena and that policy-making is the result of these interactions Birkland, , p. Political outcomes are determined by the balance of influences and resources of groups. Thus, power is widely distributed and the representation of interests is relatively equal, although the theory can improve or diminish the efficiency and legitimacy of policy-making Borzel, , p. From this point of view, democratic rights acquire a relevant role in the theory, due to its approach to social integration, stability and order Ackers, , p. Pluralism has been prominently criticised by authors who stated that it ignores the power in the agenda of dominant groups. The important decisions are made by

relatively few people affecting the public policy Birkland, , p. Consequently, power is seen as elusive and therefore exclusive and centralised Bachrach and Baratz, , p. Bachrach and Baratz brightly noted this divergence in one of their articles, where power analysis has indeed two faces , p. Given the political arrangements behind the agenda of non-decision making, it remains difficult to measure and assert that elite groups are the ones who lead the power in societies, which critics of pluralism claim to be the real origins of power. Although this argument is contested by pluralists, there seems to be an understood notion that the power structure cannot be distributed and shared indefinitely, as in doing so, systematic inaccuracies would be introduced in social reality Bachrach and Baratz, , p. In this sense, individuals are formed by socioeconomic factors, which give rise to the existence of classes in society Goodwin, , p. Marxism sought the revolutionary transformation of an antagonistic society into both a free and just society Bobbio, , p. Bobbio in the same way pointed out that government authorities always depend on economic forces to operate , p. Therefore, a strong relationship between the state and the capital is assumed inherently in benefit for both Poulantzas, , p. Policy-making is just an instrument to perpetuate this alliance. Sometimes Marxism falls into contradictions. In countries that have implemented the principles of this theory, some of them have already disappeared and have shown a concentration of power either in socialist or communist regimes. Single-party monopolist rule in the policy-making is evidenced as a result of Marxism, which creates in turn political elites who enjoyed power and privileges Miliband, , p. Therefore, a government of the people for the people is a statement that cannot be relied on at all. Its presumptions on class struggle can be deterministic and narrow, whose time has passed and is deeply questionable to the more complicated realities nowadays Harvey, , p. Nevertheless, Marxism remains constant in the political debate as a theory that can be adapted by its peers. Individual interests, therefore, would be sunk under the general interest of Marxist premises because individualism is seen as an inherent element of the capital evolution in the world. For this reason, Marxism and the individualism of rational choice are in tension as theories because equality cannot be easily reconciled with liberty. In the same way, rational choice theorists have sought to increase their understanding of political complexities and enrich the model Green and Shapiro, , p. As the two theories contrast in their understandings of reality, the influence of one over the other can converge some views and produce new approaches. For instance, new strands of Marxism have been developed, where the interests of the working class and capitalism are neither irreconcilable nor in conflict Kieve, , p. The materialistic conception of societies in this new Marxist approach has been replaced by the methodological individualism using models of neoclassical economics Kieve, , p. But what does this transformation imply? One clear answer is that it changes radically the Marxist rationale; however, this will further postpone its so claimed irrelevance in the study of political ideas in the 21st Century. It should be acknowledged that in both theories, accordingly to their deterministic feature to make conclusions from assumptions, a combination between them leads invariably to some sort of inequality. Contrary to capitalist exploitation, Analytical Marxism Roemer, sheds light on socialist exploitation; a consideration of exploitation in socialist regimes Lebowitz, , p. Kieve even argues that an attempt at combination of theories is nothing but a descriptive reflection of a society distorted , p. However, any ideology or political doctrine that tended to favour or empower one political force misidentified the true meaning of Marxism Goodwin, , p. As seen, Marxism can be multidimensional, since it can be related closely to democratic ideals through social-democratic parties that generally uphold the capitalist system Goodwin, , pp. Therefore, both approaches, pluralism and Marxism, can be politically managed. Also, a feature that unites them as paradigms for conducting research in politics is their inductive approach, both collect evidence to explain what happens in the world. Nonetheless, the proletariat vindication, as the ultimate power in society, may be interpreted as a non-partial account of reality because it discards the role of other economic classes and this contradicts the normative content of pluralism. Given that the state is strongly influenced by capital power, as an agent of production Poulantzas, , p. Poulantzas also refers to the new versions of Marxism, making at some point of the theory an exception, in which Marxists admit a relative autonomy of the state , pp. By this conception, the state does not always acts on behalf of the dominant economic classes, rather other pressure groups. It acknowledges some sort of command behind the agenda, explained by Bacharach and Baratz through the elites groups , p. In this new version of pluralism cooperation and interdependence of

several principles like hierarchies, markets or policy networks can be coordinated with one such dominant principle Hay, , p. However, if further exploration is undertaken, the conflict between them seems to be reconcilable. Tocqueville in the early 18th Century, after explaining the foundations of society, affirmed: Dahl analysed this further, using as an example institutional democracies, given the pluralism implication inherent in the concept , p. He acknowledged that effective individual participation in a democracy may be drastically reduced or even become subordinated at some point Dahl, , p. Nevertheless, an individual indeed gives up part of his power, but in turn he gains a fraction of power over the other citizens to fulfil his own interests Goodwin, , p. Therefore, rational individuals rather than a theory that predominantly focuses on ex-post facto consequences, may recognise the importance of rules and social norms that constrain their actions, having in mind what Ostrom argues about political institutions as a set of interrelated rules , p. Conclusion The three theories have been shown to be prolific in their views of how the world of politics works, its possibilities and limits. No conception can be excluded conclusively. However, internal divisions and conflicts can often be found when they are contrasted and compared. This paper has reviewed the classical arguments of the theories and some of their new versions, which have been determined by the different combinations of them. What has been clear to notice so far is that political theory is more a technique of gathering and assembling assumptions than a perpetual and fixed model. For instance, Marxism and pluralism have rejected their views of a fallacious assumption that there is some inherent fairness of power between classes and groups. Their new versions elaborate complex theories that fit with the new political scene and actors. Theories like the New Right confirm this propensity, where completely opposing approaches converge like the liberal tendency, which defends the free economy and the conservative tendency, where social and political authority through the state are valued Gamble, , p. Ambiguities like these are not accidental; it is a phenomenon that attempts to complement weaknesses in political theories in order to ensure their existence in the always changing realm of politics. Notes on the difficulty of studying the state. *Journal of Historical Sociology*, 1 1 , *Industrial Relations Journal*, 33 1 , *Methodological individualism and social knowledge. The American Economic Review*, 84 2 , *Two faces of power. American Political Science Review*, 56 4 , *An Introduction to the Public Policy Process: The Failure of Communism and the Future of Socialism*, pp. *Organizing Babylon* on the different conceptions of policy networks. *Public Administration*, 76 2 , *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy. Economics and Philosophy*, 7 91 , The University of Wisconsin Press. *The Free Economy and the Strong State*:

Chapter 3 : Ozan Örmeci Makaleler (Ozan Örmeci Articles): Pluralism vs. Corporatism

Kenneth Barshop Compare and Contrast Contemporary Theories January 9, It is much easier to contrast the four contemporary theories of American democracy than to compare them, as pluralist, hyperpluralist, elite and class, and traditional theory each highlights the competitive foundation of politics.

Pluralist and Elitist Views Article shared by: The students of political science very often come across such terms as liberal democracy, socialist democracy, plebiscitary democracy, etc. There are also many other terms. Perhaps looking at these terms the well-known political scientist Bernard Crick once said that it was the most promiscuous term. It is because a military dictator sometimes claims that his country is democratic. The leaders of the former Soviet Union very often boasted of a perfect democracy though the basic element of democracyâ€™multiplicity of partyâ€™was absent there. The rulers of all bourgeois states demand that theirs is the real democracy. If we bring them into our consideration we shall find that it will be a herculean task to arrive at an agreed view of democracy. Here we are thinking of liberal democracy which means that in such a democracy people are allowed to enjoy maximum amount of freedom and the state intervention in the affairs of individuals is at a minimum level. The liberal democracy possesses few features: The most important feature of liberal democracy is the competition of ideas and competition of views. Once Ernest Barker said democracy is never a one-idea state. There are multiple ideas and all of them always compete or contest among themselves. Because of the multiplicity of ideas there always occurs competition among persons and institutions or organisations. Competition can easily be called life-blood of democracy and liberal democracy is the most secure abode of all sorts of competition. Only in liberal democracy the distinction between state and society is maintained and nurtured. It is believed that individuals can develop their qualities only through strong and autonomous institutions. The distinction also emphasises the decentralisation of power. Liberal democracy is indirect and representative democracy. It works through the representatives elected by the people and elections are periodically held. The periodical elections are indication of accountability. Representatives are to give explanations of their activities to the persons who have elected them. A liberal democracy is another name of limited state and its chief progenitors are Jeremy Bentham and J. Pluralist View of Liberal Democracy: Liberal democracy has been viewed from different angles. One such angle is pluralist interpretation of liberal democracy. Pluralism is opposite to monism. The primary perspective of pluralism of pluralist view is in a democracy there are is no single centre of power, rather multiple centres. Not only this there are a number. Each idea is centred around a particular centre. It also denotes that power is exercised by many centres. It may be that all the centres are not equally powerful. Some exercise more and others less. In spite of this the multiplicity of centres is the basic characteristic of pluralist democracy. John Schwarz mantel in his Structure of Power: An Introduction defines liberal interpretation of democracy in the following words: We thus see that political parties, pressure groups, multiplicity of organisation and association are the hallmarks of liberal democracy. The basic tenet of liberal democracy is competition and the competition is always among all the groups and ideas. If the possibility of competition is removed or blocked the concept of liberal democracy will meet-an untimely death. In this background we can note certain basic features. The main feature of liberal democracy is that there is hardly any scope of the abuse of power because there are many groups and organisations and they are so much vigilant about their power and autonomy that any move by the state to intervene unnecessarily will be resisted by the groups and men. In autocratic political system this is not to be found. The decision of the state is final. Robert Dahl is a great exponent of liberal democracy and he carried out investigation in American liberal democracy. What he found was that though in such a democracy some elite groups are powerful than others, these, under no circumstances, dominate the entire political scene of liberal democracy. Liberal democracy is also called pluralist democracy. Another institutional arrangement is the supremacy of constitution. There is another feature of pluralist democracy which may be stated in this way. Liberal pluralist democracy is regarded by many for example H. Kariel as a historical phenomenon, a normative doctrine and mode of analysis. In British political system there is neither a written constitution nor a clear separation of powers. In spite of this British democracy is of liberal plural type.

British liberal democracy, to use H. Behind the present system of British liberal democracy there is the history of hundreds of years and it is mixed with the British political culture and tradition. Ultimately it has become a part of normative doctrine. Particularly in all liberal democracies economic rights and liberties are always given maximum priority and laissez-faire is its consequence. The consent is expressed through many avenues and a very important avenue is periodical elections. In all liberal democracies elections are periodically held which enable individuals to ventilate their views. For this reason such a democracy is also called electoral democracy. Liberal democracy blends elite rule with a significant measure of popular participation. Professionals administer the state. But at the head of the administration there are political executives who are accountable to the electorate. The importance of the professionals in a liberal democracy is chiefly due to the fact that all categories of people have not the ability to shoulder the onerous responsibility of administration. Only the elites possess the ability. **Elitist View of Liberal Democracy: Sources of Elitism in Democracy:** We have, in the last section, analysed the pluralist interpretation of liberal democracy whose core idea is competition among parties, groups, organisations, ideas, principles etc. A democratic state takes a liberal attitude to all of the above-noted elements and imposes generally no restrictions on them. On the contrary, an elitist approach to liberal democracy pays less stress on competition among parties, groups and ideas and more importance on elite and mass. The original ancestor of elitism is Plato. In *The Republic* he gave excessive stress on elite rule. Elitism is represented by two Italian sociologists they were chiefly known so Gaetano Mosca and Vilfredo and Swiss sociologist Robert Michels. The political analysis of Max Weber, the famous German sociologist, also contains huge amount of elitism. It has been observed that there is a subtle difference between elitism in general and the elitist approach to liberal democracy. There are also other scholars who have strongly advocated the elitist view of democracy. In the first two decades of the twentieth century Max Weber, after studying the democracies of several matured industrialised countries of Western Europe, observed that though in all these countries the structure and functioning of democracy were strictly maintained ultimately a very handful of persons were at the helm of power. In all political systems power is and remains the privilege of a dominating minority. The fact is that though in such system the elite rules, it shows or tries to show to the general public that it rules on behalf of the mass and runs the administration for the general welfare of the society. Elitist view asserts that democracy does not mean that all will participate in the governance of the state because it is not possible. The minority will rule but popular sovereignty prevails. The aim of the administration is to ensure the general welfare of the body politic. The stability in governance is achieved through the minority rule. According to elitism, in all democracies, there are primarily two classes—“one class rules and the other class is ruled. The elections are held and a new class may come to the power and the former ruling class sits in opposition. In this way the cycle moves. But it would be wrong to assume that in this process common people get any opportunity to govern. The constitutional, structural and other arrangements are so made that there is hardly any scope for the general mass to be a part of state administration. An in-depth analysis of elite rule will be found in C. He has portrayed a fine picture of how elites or elite groups capture and hold power. He has said that there is a nexus among different elite groups and in overt and covert ways they share, power and wealth of the state among themselves. Ralph Miliband, a well-known Marxist, offers us the same picture about liberal democracy. He in his *The State in Capitalist Society* has said that in the USA the top businessmen, the bureaucrats, military men and leaders of the upper class rule. Mills also notes about the rule of the triumvirate consisting of big business particularly in the defence-related industries, the US military and political cliques surrounding the president. Mills these three groups practically constitute the power elite. Many political scientists and. Rather it is a state ruled and controlled by a very powerful pressure group or class. Mills correctly observes there is an unholy alliance among all the elite groups and when one elite group seizes power another group or all other groups prefer to stay in opposition. Any opposition to the governing class or group is nothing but mockery. It is frequently observed by all the elite groups that there is widespread mass support behind the elite group.

Chapter 4 : Liberal Democracy: Pluralist and Elitist Views

Comparing Pluralist and Ruling Elite Accounts of Political Power in the U.K. and U.S. Whilst there are not any absolutely accurate interpretations of political power and political system, there are different controversial theories about those, among which, pluralist and ruling elite are the two fundamentally outstanding theories that both have echoing practical influences in the modern world.

John Barry Theories of power: Are such definitions of power adequate for making sense of contemporary societies? Pluralist, Elitist and Marxist Pluralism – how power is distributed Elitism – how power is concentrated Marxism – class conflict and economic power Pluralism Analysed 1. Political power is fragmented and dispersed. The existence of classes, political parties, status groups, pressure groups, interest groups, etc. Groups provide a more effective means of representation than election. Public policy is the outcome of group forces acting against one another. No one group will dominate for every group there will be an equal and opposite. The larger the group the more influence it will have. Policies are the product of bargaining and compromise, will tend to be moderate, fair to all and conducive to social stability. Not always an advantage, since it is conferred upon those with largely compatible views to the government of the day. Outside status a sign of weakness. Elitism Analysed There are many sources of elite power wealth, traditional or religious authority etc. Elitism and Groups Distribution of power in society reflect the inequalities of wealth. Some groups have few resources, other have many. Organisations themselves are inherently oligarchic. Limitations of Elitist theory Not all historical societies have been hierarchical with an elite e. Public policies thus reflect the role of the state in trying to regulate the economy and ensure social and political stability. Ownership and control of economic property, wealth, productive assets of society, including control of finance Control over ideas, through the media and processes of socialisation more generally, such as education: Summary Elitist Pluralist Marxist Source of power elite grouping societal interests capitalist mode of production Nature of power concentrated dispersed concentrated Analysis of neutral positive critical power Ultimate verdict accept the system engage with the overthrow the system system Conclusion 1. Marxist, in which power is distributed according to the accumulation of capital. Owners of capital operate behind the scene to manipulate the political process, and indoctrinate the mass of the working classes into accepting the unequal economic structure of society.

Chapter 5 : Models of Democracy: Behind the Design and Use of New Media in Politics

Compare and Contrast Functionalist and Marxist Theories of Stratification Stratification is the separation of society into layers which are distinguished by unequal rewards and life chances and many systems of stratification have been based on slavery, caste and feudalism.

Corporatism Conflict and consensus are inseparable elements of democracy. In a democratic society, different groups and individuals compete for power and power struggle is a fundamental tendency in the democratic political life. Pluralism, which can be defined as the belief in the desirability and advantages of numerous different social groups ethnic, religious groups, social classes etc. Sometimes, the state can actively support or control these groups by establishing corporations and organizing or mobilizing different interests in the corporatist model. However, some politicians and scholars do not believe in the idea of pluralism and build their discourses, theories on the societal or national interest concept instead of competing different group interests. Democracy means the rule of people and is implemented in the form of representative democracy by the votes of citizens to the representative candidates of their constituency or to the president directly. Even by giving votes, different individuals belonging to different social groups in a sense compete for each other to elect their favorite political party and candidate as the government or president of the country. These power struggles naturally create cleavages between different groups and organizations. In addition, democracy requires the formation of coalition governments and compromise of different sides for a healthy regime. Thus, although there are numerous different struggles between groups, a consolidated democracy needs consensus. In other words, democracy tries to embrace all segments of society and thus, needs pluralism as an important part of its structure. Pluralism in a sense completes democracy by creating and allowing different groups to compete for power and contribute to the decision-making process. Dahl underlines the difference between pluralism and strict bipolarity Dahl, p. Robert Dahl also points out that pluralism is not only a Western bourgeois concept but can be implemented even in communist regimes such as during the decentralized socialist Tito rule in Yugoslavia or in Chile. According to Dahl, contrary to the popular argument, class conflicts take place most in countries where there are no other important cleavages. He gives New Zealand and Finland as examples of this type of countries. Social class difference is also one of the most basic sources of cleavage in democratic countries. For instance in Turkey in addition to struggle between bourgeois and proletariat classes, there are many other cleavages between Alevis and Sunnis, Turks and Kurds, secularists and religious extremists etc. In defining pluralism independently from the type of the system, Dahl argues that both capitalist and socialist regimes can be pluralist or not and ownership is not enough for control. Enterprises owned by proletariat class in socialist regimes can be pluralist like in the Yugoslavia example, if it allows workers to have a word in decisions concerning the working process of the enterprise. However, in capitalist regimes the system can be highly anti-pluralist if decisions are solely taken by the managerial cadre and unionist rights are not very well protected. Nazi Germany is a good example for pluralism lacking capitalist regimes where nearly all decisions are taken by the strong political order. Pluralism is not directly linked with the type of regime but rather with its ability of giving autonomy to different groups in itself. Like Dahl said, what is important is the autonomy of different groups and the degree of decentralization not solely the ownership of the means of production. Especially organizational pluralism has nothing to do with the type of the regime. Even a non-democratic country can be pluralistic in this perspective. In addition, most of the capitalist countries lack pluralism concerning the working of private enterprises. Corporatism is another important application and principle used in democratic regimes. Corporatism refers to the emergence of state-sponsored, monopolistic legal associations for different groups in the society. Corporatism is mostly used for social classes and different professional groups however; it can be used for representing other social groups too. Gabriel Almond criticizes corporatist model for mobilizing people and groups under the state control and preventing them to follow their own interests freely. Corporatist model was used in the fascist Italy and revolutionary Mexico and has been preferred generally by more authoritarian regimes. Lehmbruch offers a historical-sociological classical for corporatism. Nearly in all democracies, a mixture of corporatist

and pluralist models has been used until today. All these discussions are mostly caused by the fundamental problem between common and particular interest clash. The term particular interest, unlike the term common interest, reminds of words like individualism, egoism and creates a negative image. However, when we look at the practice, we see that in the name of representing the common interest and thinking the benefit of society as a whole, some groups may enjoy the chance of following and realizing their particular interests freely by harming many other segments of the society. In my opinion, we can talk about common or national interest only if all groups of the society are in the favor of a particular thing. General will which came into the scene by the writings of famous French philosopher Jean Jacques Rousseau, can cause serious problems for the society if it excludes some groups or represented by a body, person or institution that lacks legitimacy and support of the whole population. Another fundamental problem in democracy is the struggle between centralization and decentralization. One can clearly assert that democracy, considering its emphasis given to autonomy of different groups, is in the favor of decentralization. Centralization, similar to the common interest, may cause a group to develop as ruling elite and increase inequalities in a society. Finally, it must be noted that if democracy is the rule of people and people want to create some sub-groups to protect their particular rights, pluralist model should be adopted by all countries. By restricting rights of people and groups, regimes would have legitimacy and stability problems. However, pluralism and democracy should not be understood as enjoying an unlimited freedom and having right to suppress some other groups. In developing countries as well as in countries where there are many types of cleavages, decentralization and pluralism may cause serious problems and may risk the very existence of the state. That is why; democratization should take place gradually by reforms in developing countries in accordance with a long and well-planned program.

Chapter 6 : Chapter 2 Synopsis

- *The Validity of the Pluralist Analysis in Modern Day Liberal Democracies* Liberal democracies are countries governed by the people or their elected representatives. They are regular elections and referendums with a wide variety of pressure groups taking freedom of speech to the limit.

In this article, the author summarizes each of the five contemporary models and attempts to ascertain how changes in information and communication technology ICT could help, hinder, or have no consequence within each within each of those democratic paradigms. Ultimately, this article is about the positive contribution of the use of ICT to the political system in general and political democracy in particular. Introduction It seems safe to say that there is a relationship between the application of information and communication technology ICT and democracy. For decades now the consequences of ICT for social and political life are disputed in an ideological way. Some call them technologies of freedom de Sola Pool , while for others they are technologies of central control and registration. Visions of the rebirth of Athenian democracy are opposed by nightmares of Orwellian proportions. These are theoretical interpretations of the use of ICT which existed before it was practised on a large scale. In the meantime ICT has massively entered organisations, among them political, government and administrative organisations. The effects of ICT on the practice of these organisations can not be denied any more. The interpretations of the meaning of ICT can be specified now and released from some of the early speculations. This article is about the positive contribution of the use of ICT to the political system in general and political democracy in particular. It deals with several directions of improvement guided by different conceptions of democracy. This does not mean that negative effects of the use of ICT for the political system and democracy, lightly touched upon in the former paragraph, can be ruled out in advance. People who conceive ICT as a technology of central control and registration will not perceive any beneficial effects for democracy and reject particular views of the renewal of democracy, such as notions of direct democracy, as utopian or dangerous views. They tend to think that the best thing which can happen is a preservation of the current political system and the present quality of democracy. One type of analysis can not be ignored. Several analysts argue that the field of democracy itself is losing ground together with the declining influence of the political system of the nation state. The American computer scientist Mowshowitz speaks of the advent of so-called virtual feudalism. This is a type of rule by the fragmented global political power of transnational corporations and other organisations who, like feudal lords, surpass the nation states and undermine their power to take or implement decisions. All kinds of national and international organisations are filling the vacuum and creating undemocratic or uncontrollable types of political power by means of information and communication networks, informal social networks, corruption and even crime. If this dark perspective does not mean the end of democracy, it would surely mean a significant set-back. The democracy within transnational corporations and other global associations is at a far lower level than the democracy of national institutional politics. The power of a European parliament or a United Nations does not match the present power of the nation states with a democratic rule either. The analysis of the decline of the nation state by some other social or political scientists is less dramatic. Ulrich Beck, for instance, in his *Der Risikogesellschaft ; Risk Society*, observes a displacement of institutional politics, not only on global affairs but on civil society as well. The political primacy of the nation state and institutional politics are questioned, not democracy in its own right. Other places and ways of democracy in civil society can replace or add to the institutional democracy of the nation state. This position at least can be located in one of the positive models of democracy to be dealt with now. Models of Democracy From the first introduction of the new information and communication technologies, marked by the design and diffusion of interactive and integrative multi media, these technologies appeared to be connected to conceptions of democracy. The new facilities of telepolling, telereferenda and electronic elections immediately spurred visions of the rebirth of the Athenian agora and other means of direct democracy and self-representation Toffler ; Becker ; Barber These visions were rejected with equal vigour by defenders of an improved representative system and people who were very sceptic about "push- button democracy" Laudon ; Burkert ; Arterton ; Abrahamson, Arterton and Orren The discussion

about the opportunities of the new media for direct or representative democracy has lingered for about twenty years. In these decades two things appeared. First, the conceptions of democracy are much more complicated than a simple dualism between direct and representative democracy. Second, discussions have become less theoretical; the media of ICT are maturing and entering into the daily practice of the political system. One can observe stages of experimentation and beyond. So we will have to do two things: Both can only be done here in the typifying and summarising way imposed by the narrow limits of an article. Still we hope to show in a plausible way that some typical views of democracy are connected to particular practices of ICT in politics. This goes as far as the suggestion of a relationship of these views with concrete instruments of ICT in the political system like computerised citizen enquiries, opinion polls, referenda, public information systems, government information and registration systems, electronic town halls and freenets see Table 1.

REGISTRATION - registration systems for government and public administration - computer-assisted citizen enquiries - electronic polls - electronic referenda - electronic elections CONVERSATION - bulletin board systems - discussion lists - electronic mail and teleconferencing - electronic town halls - group decision support systems We even hope to show that these instruments are disputed by different views of democracy. Sometimes these views are very explicit, as in the conception of direct democracy mentioned above. More often they remain implicit. In this article they are made explicit for the purposes of clarification and explanation. There is not much to prove yet at this stage of introduction of ICT into the political system. The large number of conceptions of democracy can only be summarised by analytical means. A successful attempt to do this has been made by David Held in his *Models of Democracy* Held constructs nine models in the history of democracy. A model is "a theoretical construction designed to reveal and explain the chief elements of democratic form and its underlying structure and relations" Held, 6. He distinguishes four classical and five contemporary models. The contemporary models are competitive- elitist democracy, pluralism, legal democracy, participatory democracy and developmental autonomy. The first four of these models will be used in this article. We have clearly observed views belonging to them in the design and use of ICT in politics. This is not the case with the last model, developmental autonomy, which seems first of all the favourite model of Held himself. Instead of this model we add a fifth one which is based upon direct democracy. It is clearly present in some designs and uses of ICT in politics. We will call it plebiscitary democracy. Two dimensions typify the differences in the present views of democracy: Should its prime goal be opinion formation or decision making? In other words, is democracy primarily a matter of substantial input or of procedure an output? Should these goals be reached first of all by the ways of representative or direct democracy? The selected models of democracy can be located in a two-dimensional analytical space Table 2. So it seems most interesting to find out which means are favoured in the design and use of this technology in the political system. In Table 1 a spectrum is drawn of representative and direct means which will be described in the next sections. Here we will also observe a third dividing line most often corresponding to the representative-direct distinction. ICT can be used to reinforce the present, mainly representative political system to confront its difficulties mentioned in the introduction and to rescue or revive the primacy of institutional politics. ICT can also be used to displace politics on to civil society by means of participation, pluralism and direct citizen power, abandoning the attempts to save the present political system attached to the nation state in crisis and removing the political primacy, at least partially, to the associations and individuals of civil society. With the aid of ICT, politics can be moved to the market as well. In this case the freedom of choice of producers and consumers is made equal to the vote of citizens. ICT is treated as a technology of freedom offering ways of decision making which can replace traditional ways of political decision making. It is very important to realise that these models are theoretical constructions. In fact they are ideal types. In the reality of political systems and views several of them can be combined, often in contradictory ways. For instance, the political system of the United States is a combination of a legalist model stressing the constitutional separation of powers and the checks and balances in the system, a competitive model a presidential state and the election of individual political leaders, a plebiscitary model direct elections of officials and a growing number of referenda in the states and a pluralist model America as a multicultural society from the very start. Still, these models describe real institutions, conceptions and differences of opinion, as we hope to show in the next five sections. Legalist

Democracy The first model is based on the classical Western conception of democracy which came into being after the decline of the absolutist state in Western Europe. It is reflected in most contemporary constitutions. The first advocates of the legalist model were Locke and Montesquieu. It is called legalist as it clearly is a procedural conception which takes the constitution and the law as the basis of democracy. According to most contemporary constitutions state authority is separated into three powers *trias politica* controlled by a system of checks and balances. Another important principle is majority rule. This rule is taken to be universal except for particular basic rights of the individual which are also part of the constitution. In the legalist model, democracy is a means to safeguard the freedom of individuals from authoritarian power. It is not a goal in its own right. A system of representation is proposed. The heart of our political system is the judgement of heterogeneous interests and complex problems by representatives of the people. Direct democracy is rejected. The power of every political institution and public administration has to be limited by the least possible, but effective rules. The system of politics and public administration has to be small and effective. For this reason the legalist model is very popular among conservatives and liberals see, e. The basic assumption in this model with regard to the meaning of ICT for the political system is that it should solve its basic problem: The present crisis of the political system and the nation state see the Introduction is viewed as the crisis of organisations which can not sufficiently deal with the increasing complexity of the environment and the system itself, as information is lacking, among others by the obstructions caused by bureaucracy. The so-called gap between governors or administrators and citizens is also conceived as a kind of information shortage on both sides. Finally, all kinds of threats to the separation of powers, and checks and balances in the system, most often caused by the rising power of the executive as compared to the legislative state, are accounted to deficiencies of information as well. It is a matter of sharing the power of information. The problem can be solved by an equal supply of the resources of information to the executive and to parliaments, municipal councils, political parties and other representatives. So, following the legalist model ICT is designed and used as a means to remove information shortages and reinforce the present political system by more effective and efficient ways of information processing and organisation. ICT is also applied to increase the transparency of the political system. By all these means the system would be capable to confront the problems of complexity.

In Pluralist Democracy in the United States (), Robert Dahl advanced the FUNDAMENTAL AXIOM of pluralism: "Instead of a single center of sovereign power, there must be multiple centers of power, none of which is or can be wholly sovereign." (p.

Search Power Elite vs. Pluralist Model Both the Elite and the Pluralist models are a means by which public policy is created. Both do not conform to the democracy created by our fore-fathers; a government for the people and by the people. The Elite model is one in which a small group of wealthy white males hold the power and control the policy making for our country. In contrast, the Pluralist model suggest that the power is distributed among interest groups that compete to control public policy. Both Karl Marx and C. Through money and power, the power elite has a large influence on how the government elects, makes laws and operates on a daily basis. Many blame citizens of the lower and middle class, claiming that they are lazy or that they simply do not care. Are citizens really to blame or has the government itself created apathy among the masses? Dating back to , the signing of the Declaration of Independence, money equaled power. This leads to the question of: Is our country a true democracy, something we have prided ourselves on for centuries, or are we closer to a plutocracy, a government ran by the wealthy Krugman? By taking a closer look at special interest, policy-making and candidate selection processes, we can see how heavily our government relies on and answers to the power elite instead of the masses. Who are the Power Elite? They are not dictators or terrorists; just citizens who were either born into wealth and adopted the elite theory or those who worked their way up through the tiers. A few hundred are political and military leaders, while the rest are owners of large corporations; i. General Electric and Boeing to name a few. Their interest lyes in their business but in order to prosper, they utilize their governmental ties to benefit their company. How are they able to influence governmental officials? What has changed over the recent decades to cause such a shift? There was a period of time when income and wealth were more evenly distributed. The government programs that aided the poor, such as social security, caused wide acceptance of more economic equality in America. These new attitudes about equality helped to lessen the gap between the rich and the poor. The poor actually saw a decrease in income or an increase in unemployment. This is largely due to the outsourcing to other countries by our large corporations. The consequence of this large gap is a loss in hope for prosperity and in turn, resentment towards democracy and political instability. This has only benefitted the power elite, giving them more political control as the masses have become dis-interested and more focused on their day-to-day. How do the Power Elite Influence Special Interest Groups A special interest group is a membership of people with the same or similar interests, banded together to shape public policy. The larger the membership, the more influence a group can have on a politician. They can use their size as a threat to support another politician or a more powerful tool is money. They may also use lobbying, the attempt to influence government or legislators by using their company as a tool, usually because of their high membership or powerful placement in society, where no finances are exchanged. The influence that is seen most widely, especially by the masses, is the Power Elites use of propaganda. These are the numerous television advertisements we as viewers see in the media that largely influence how voters feel about a specific candidate. These ads are funded by interest groups, most often aimed at making the opposing candidate look less desirable. It is the larger interest groups are heard, seen and responded to by candidates and the masses. These groups are larger because they are headed by the Power Elite who have the numbers and money, creating an un-equal playing field which contradicts the assumptions of the pluralist theory. Public policy is a response by government to a problem or issue that exists in this country. Sometimes public policy can be mistaken for a law; they are based on law but set by various groups other than legislators. The typical steps to forming public policy are: Aside from times of war or the time immediately after a president has been elected, priority of agenda setting goes to the interest groups with the most influence; power and money Independence Hall Association, para. This is where government recognizes there is a problem and it should be solved. Next, special task forces, research groups and legislators are assigned to the problem in hopes to formulate a new policy to remedy the problem. Last,

the policy must be evaluated to determine whether it is accomplishing what it was set forth to do initially. Although policy making is divided between various entities, the power elite still have a major influence on what problems are brought forth and heard. Pressure from interest groups in the form of bribery for votes or money is one way the power elite get the attention of policy makers. Lobbyists are also effective for pushing issues on policy makers. An example of an issue pushed by interest groups is smoking. Using media, tobacco companies have been made out to be the villain while alcohol companies face much less criticism, a substance that kills more people each year. The reason for the difference is agenda setting. The media, owned and essentially run by the power elite, have put pressure on the government. Their influence created laws that banned smoking in almost all public places. To run for Presidential or Vice-Presidential office, it takes millions of dollars in funding. The candidates are selected by the elite, where they compete in elections run by organizations that are supported by the elite political parties. Prior to voting, the mass-public receives their information about the social and political world through mass media, controlled by the elite, which the public in turn uses to vote for their desired candidate. From start to finish, the elite have control of who is selected as candidate, what the candidate will stand for and how the public will view the candidate. The masses are essentially kept at a distance in regards to real political participation. The masses are like pawns, used to portray a democratic system when in reality, they have little input as far as who their candidates will be or action towards controlling what policies will be enacted. In essence, the public is only important to our government on election day. Once elected officials are in office, they must maintain their seat by serving those who funded their way to election. By serving, they are adopting and implementing policies pushed by the powerful interest groups who may have funded them. This is how the elite continue to control elected officials, even after they have assumed office. As our nation has grown and progressed since the signing of the Declaration of Independence, our government has changed a great deal as well. The democratic nation that we were hundreds of years ago was vastly different from the technological, capitalistic society that we currently live in. The corporations and government have become so intertwined, it is hard to decipher where one begins and one ends; both need each other for survival. There is no doubt that the elite theory is more than just a theory. The extent to how much influence the elite has is a question that is difficult to answer. There are checks and balances for a reason, so that no one group or person can overpower everyone. They may not run the nation but their influence can almost be considered a fourth branch of government. References Anderson, Margaret L. Understanding a diverse society. Thomson Wadsworth Domhoff, G. The class domination theory of power. Retrieved August 27, , from <http://www.nytimes.com/2004/08/27/us/politics/27democracy.html>: The irony of democracy: An uncommon introduction to American politics. Thomson Wadsworth Independence Hall Association. The New York Times.

Chapter 8 : Pluralist, Elite, Class And Hyper-Pluralism Theories

Pluralist democracy does not demand that citizens have much knowledge. _____ is the view that a small group, a stable minority often marked by wealth and business connections, should make most important government decisions.

Theories of truth under pluralism postulate that there is a possibility of there being several properties which make propositions true, and not one. In a political set up the pluralist theory posits that activities by interest groups make representation of all people in groups and these groups counterbalance each other after competing. The elite theory postulates that there are a few groups of people, especially; the wealthy who have a lot of power. This theory seeks to explain the distribution of power in society under sociology and political terms. The theory holds that a minority of people grouped up in society consisting mainly of the financially well off and policy-formulating groups have control of much of the power of a nation and thus the control of the nation and societies. The power held by the elitist is independent and cannot be influenced by the democratic process of election because these elite groups can still wield influence and power over the process. This may occur through holding control over corporate boards and over policy formulating bodies or institutions. The elite groups are also made of the think tanks in society. This theory opposes pluralism because it suggests democracy is unattainable and it is utopian Lineberry et al. Therefore, the theory posits that ideological and political consciousness or thought is defined through the class that one belongs to in society. Thus the structure of production in society is the determinant of the political construct. On the other hand, hyper-pluralism theory posits that numerous groups in society get too much of their desires fulfilled through lobbying the government and finally this leads to formulation of government policies that are often lacking direction and contradictory in nature. The American society can be well explained by the hyper-pluralism theory. Voter turn out has actually declined since the sixties thus implying that the pluralist theory may not apply in the American case. The elite theory may also have no influence in American politics because there are no distinct elitist classes that can be seen wielding any political power. The Marxian class theory may also not be applicable to the American case because, there is no class that currently seems to wield any major power in the nation Lineberry et al. The American situation can best be described under the hyper-pluralism theory. This can be proven by the rise in the number of interest groups. Notably, as the voter turn out has been declining since the sixties, the number of these groups have been on the rise. Between these groups have increased from a measly to , and this reflects the kind of influence that they may have on society and politics Anonymous, References Anonymous ,. The role of interest groups, retrieved on 5th March from [http: People, Politics, and Policy; Brief S. Edition, 8th edition, Longman Publishing Read times](http://People, Politics, and Policy; Brief S. Edition, 8th edition, Longman Publishing Read times).

Chapter 9 : Compare and contrast the theories of pluralism and power elitism. | eNotes

Compare And Contrast Pluralism And Elitism. Pluralism vs. Elitism The term lobbying conjures up visions of a cigar-chomping interest group representative, his arm around the shoulder of an important senator or representative, advising him how he ought to vote on some obscure provision of the Tax Code and slipping an envelope, fat with currency, into his jacket pocket.