Impacts of Pressure Groups on Political System

Kuldip Singh

(Fellow PU) Associate Professor, PG Department of Political science Guru Nanak National College, Doraha-141421-Punjab, India

Abstract

The study of pressure groups usually a twentieth development. One thing is certain and rightly established by the academic discoveries that in modern society there are different types of groups, quite distinct from political parties that continue influencing the political system. Robert H. Salisbury describes that "pressure groups is only more pejorative but perhaps more familiar a term for interest group". This difference is also supported by the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences where the pressure group is defined by its techniques and an interest group by its objectives but whenever an interest group adopts the technique of pressure for the fulfillment of its objectives then it converts into "pressure groups

 "Pressure groups forge different strategies to protect and promote their interests, taking into consideration the temperament of the people and legal and constitutional framework of the nation".

The effectiveness of groups in the sphere of politics depends on a number of factors. It depends on the nature and size of the group, its cohesiveness and informal unity, the degree to which it speaks for all interested in a particular function, activity or issue, the degree of its sustained organisation, and the amount of interest its members have in issues that affect them. The behaviour and impact of groups will depend on the political culture of the community.

The four fold classification made by Almond and Coleman is more suitable and applies equally well to pressure phenomenon in India. The four folded classification is (a) institutional interest group (b) non-associational interest group; (c) associational interest groups, (d) anomic interest groups.

In fact, pressure group activity is an outstanding characteristic of industrialized political system of liberal democracies of Western Europe and America. Pressure groups are well developed and effective in these countries.. It does not mean that pressure groups are non-existence in an under-developed country. But it is only a truism to say that nature of pressure group activity in under developed and developing system is different from the one in the developed democracies of liberal persuasion. India is a developing country which has now acquired a necessary infrastructure for the rapid industrialization of the country's economy.

KEYWORDS: pressure groups, interest group, advocacy group, organised interest group, lobbying.

Introduction: The present research paper pertains to the theoretical study of pressure/interest/advocacy/political interest/organized/catalytic/sectional/ groups' also known as lobbying, invincible government, anonymous empire, syndicates, unofficial government, private organizations etc. The paper deals with origin of the study, its definition, its different nomenclature,

its classification, its various strategies, its determinants of effectiveness, its impacts on political system, its recognition, its role in different political systems. The paper deals with the study of pressure groups in Western and Liberal Democracies of Developed world as well study of developing societies.It comprehensively deals with the study of pressure group politics in India.

The study of pressure groups usually a twentieth development. It was initiated by the group approach to politics introduced by Arthur F.Bentley[1]. It was further reinforced by David B Truman's[2] book "The Governmental process"(1957).The term 'Pressure Group', however, was used neither by Bentley nor by Truman. It was used, for the first time by, Peter Odegard[3] in his book "Pressure Politics". More over V.O. Key's[4] book "Political Parties and Pressure Groups"(1943) became so monumental that it attracted all social scientist towards this important field of study. But the field of study(pressure group) was contributed with different names by the social scientists ,as S.E.Finer[5] named it as "Anonymous Empire", Thoresten Sellin and Richard D. Lambert called it "Un-official Government", D.D. Mikean described it as "Invisible Government", H.R. Mahood[6] called it "Private Government", Allen Potter[7] named it "Organised Group", J.W. Grove called it "Sectional Groups", Bertram M. Gross called it "Private Organisation", Fred W. Riggs described it as "Catalytic Groups", Edgar Lane[8] gave the name of "Lobbying",J.D.S.Miller[9] described it "Syndicates" and sometimes it is believed to be the "Third House of Congress" in America.

 One thing is certain and rightly established by the academic discoveries that in modern society there are different types of groups, quite distinct from political parties that continue influencing the political system. But very often the term attitude groups, interest groups and pressure groups are being used interchangeable by the social scientists.

Before proceeding further we should make a distinction between attitude groups and interest groups. An attitude group is formed on the basis of its members sharing some common attitudes or values. David Truman defined interest group as a "collection of individuals which on the basis of one or more shared attitudes makes certain claims upon other groups in the society for the establishment, maintenance or enhancement of forms of behaviour that are implied in the shared attitudes----------- The shared attitudes constitute the interest"[10]. In this sense an interest group is an attitude group, but then, it is something more than that in as for as its members reach this attitudinal unity by the virtue of fact that they all represent the same interest. In fact, the basic difference between the two is that while the attitude group is to be known by its subjective base, the interest group has very much an objective base.

Sometimes pressure groups are used interchangeably with interest groups and both are considered synonymous. Jotten and Anderson[11] argue that both are used interchangeably. Similarly Robert H. Salisbury describes that "pressure groups is only more pejorative but perhaps more familiar a term for interest group"[12]. David Truman altered its name from pressure group to political interest group and made slight distinction between the two. He argued, "if and when (an interest group) makes its claim through or upon any of the institutions of government, it becomes a political interest group"[13]. But Jean Danial argues "when interest groups act at political level they are called pressure group." This difference is also supported by the Encyclopedia of Social Sciences[14] where the pressure group is defined by its techniques and an interest group by its objectives but whenever an interest group adopts the technique of pressure for the fulfillment of its objectives then it converts into "pressure groups". This distinction is also supported by Huge Bone who defines it as "every group is an interest group or a group with an interest but not every group attempt to influence public policy"[15]. Stephen K Bailey clarified that "trade unions and manufactures associations are interest groups when they interact with each other over question like hours of work and wages .But when they try to influence the content of legislation by acting through or upon the institution of government, i.e. when they assume direct political significance they become pressure groups"[16].

Here we have used the term 'pressure group' or political interest group to a group which endeavor to influence the public policy. We can summaries the three different concepts (viz. attitude group; interest group and pressure group) into a definition that in a group the shared attitude is a subjective, interests are objective and to achieve these objectives pressure is a

technique. But we should keep in mind that interaction within the group is very important which is based on what is shared. Francis G. Castle argues that "pressure group is a broader term which subsumes interest groups and attitude groups"[17]. For the purpose of our study we will follow the common and popular usage in India and prefer the term pressure group. B.K. Sarivastva is also of the opinion that "in the Indian political system, it is very difficult to draw a distinction between an interest group and pressure group because they convert themselves according to the need of an hour"[18].

Definition

According to the Dictionary of Political Analysis, "pressure group is an organised interest group in which members share common views, objectives and activities carry on the programme to influence the government officials and policies"[19]. International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences although assign it with political function and calls it interest group, "the interest group is a conscious desire to have the public policy or authoritative allocation of values to move in a particular, general or specific direction"[20]. To Alfred De Gracia,"a pressure group is a privately organised aggregation, which attempts to influence public policy"[21]. To Allen Potter,"pressure groups are groups organised for political purpose except governmental bodies and party groups in the politics of state"[22]. To N C. Hunt," pressure group is an organization which seeks to influence government policy without at the same time being willing to accept the responsibility of public office"[23]. Although S E Finer described the same views as given by Hunt in identical words yet he assigned it in the name of an interest group. He says" all pressure groups or association which seek to influence public policy in their own chosen direction while declining to accept direct responsibility for ruling the country."[24]

From the above definitions, we can sum up that 'whenever a body of individual group themselves organised together with shared attitudes to achieve an end or interest, promoting the interest of its members which requires the technique of pressure on government policies or authoritative allocation of values, without being to accept the responsibility of public office, it may be termed as pressure group'. Thus a social group called pressure group only when (a) it has a clearly identifiable formal structure (b) its members are linked to each other in terms of their common attitudes and interests, and (c) it seeks to influence the process of public decision-making.

Strategies of Pressure Group

"Pressure groups forge different strategies to protect and promote their interests, taking into consideration the temperament of the people and legal and constitutional framework of the nation"[25]. Pressure group may use any strategy, which serve their purpose effectively. They aim at producing the maximum desired result, so as to accomplish their target. Their prevailing strategies or techniques are; lobbying, propaganda, pressing the button, links with political parties and bureaucrats, strikes, bandhs, ghetto, dharna, picketing, civil disobedience, bribery, violence like riots or political murders etc. In spite of these strategies there is a peculiar strategy which was used under the leadership of Nanayna Swamy Naiad in Tamil Nadu in its 'Cart Agitation' i.e. imposition of curfew in the influential areas, in which ban is imposed on the entry of politicians or public servants and trespassers are prosecuted in the self made jails (wheat-shaff-store). This strategy is also being used by the pressure group under study.

Lobbying is a favorite strategy of pressure groups operating in every liberal or totalitarian political system. Even some scholar like Edgar Lane prefers the term lobbying than pressure groups. To Edgar Lane, "lobbying means men acting to influence the government decisions." [26] Lobby in its original meaning referred to the efforts of individuals to influence the votes of legislators, generally in the lobby, outside the legislature chamber. "In its broadest modern sense it means any attempt by individuals or groups to influence the decisions of government. It is most commonly associated with the activities of private interest groups, often called pressure groups, although even public officials may be said to lobby when they attempt to influence the

making of public policy by other officials"[27]. Thus in brief, lobbying is a political strategy to influence the government and lobbyist is the key to intermediatory between pressure group and the government. Lobby may take any form like personal meetings, delegations and deputations to the members of the decisions making body. As pressure groups have secured an institutional stud and the right of approach to legislators is widely recognised as a part of the constitutional right of citizens, lobbying has become a dominant feature of democratic politics.

There are certain kinds of lobbying among them 'mass body', 'social lobbying', 'pressing-the-button', 'propaganda' etc. Mass lobby means objective is to persuade legislators to desist from supporting a bill unfavorable to their cause by expressing their feelings and by advancing arguments against it. Social lobbying when pressure groups lavishly entertain the legislators and his family in order to create in him a sense of indebtedness or obligation which largely will control his legislative behavior towards promoting their objectives, "As a matter of fact, social lobbying amounts to simple bribery".[28] Another technique of bringing pressure to bear upon legislators is phrased 'pressing-the-button'. If a legislative measure is found to be adversely affecting interest of pressure groups, an avalanche of letters, telegrams and a spate of telephone calls moves to the legislator pleading their cause that he might take or alter his stand in, defense of their cause. Signature campaign and submission of mass petitions are another version of pressing-the-button tactics. "A strongest weapon in the hands of pressure groups is propaganda which include any attempt by the manipulation of words and word substitutes to control the attitude and consequently the behavior of number of individual concerning controversial matter".[29]

Pressure groups penetrate all branches of government viz. legislature, executive and judiciary. "The activities of pressure groups at the time of election in terms of support rendered to the candidates to fight election battles with men and material are also a part of lobbying".[30] Pressure groups also resort to influencing the legislators through his friends and associates often at the instance of their attention to the sphere of legislation but legislation is largely dependent on the manner or method of its enforcement and the interpretation it receive from the Courts.

Executive is the most powerful organ of the government by virtue of its policy making and policy implementing powers and as such lobbyist have their eyes in real executive, weather to be the president in presidential form of government or prime minister in the countries having the parliamentary system of government. Apart from the routine activities for getting or denying the real executives approval for legislative measures, groups, also interact with administrative organs of government. "The constitution of committee for the purpose of advice and consolation convenient channel for such interacts."[31] Help of judiciary is to be taken by pressure groups when they suffer defeat at the hands of legislative and executive, "Pressure groups also, use the strategy of alliances and logrolling for mutual assistance or benefits."[32] An alliance normally involves the development of a common strategy in pursuit of a policy, which bears some substantive relation to their interests. Logrolling is the technique of rendering mutual assistance in terms of their struggle organised for fluttering their interests or realising their demands. Apart from the lobbying pressure groups also used some peaceful and agitational strategies to achieve their interest. Usually pressure groups used agitational means when the other peaceful means failed to bring fruits. But it is the matter of consideration or choice to decide which strategy will serve the purpose affectively.

Strikes are most common technique in the hands of pressure groups. Strike attempts a temporary stoppage of work with the expectation of getting their legitimate or illegitimate demands fulfilled. It may be non-violent or at time it may turn violent depending upon the success or failure in meeting out their demands. The phenomenon of strike is more common in labour circle as result of confrontation between the interest of the labourers and capitalists.

Bandh implies the closure linked to a general strike of all offices, shops, markets, transports and others. It said to be a blind revolt staged by pressure groups to obstruct, weaken or over throw

the established order. As a constructive activity it may help to strengthen the democratic norms by opposing exploitive relationships and by forcing the establishment to concede the just demands.

Gherao is another Indian term; it implies the encirclement or confinement of the employers or the governmental bodies for forcing to meet their demands to their own satisfaction. It is described as most unpalatable technique in agitation politics, and one might say it cannot even be justified method by any norms of expediency. J.C Johri[33] described this strategy as 'Un-Gandhian' yet the justice and legitimacy of the ghetto or even other worst means, is drawn by the fact that it is restored in such situation where the establishment against whom this action is undertaken has violated the given norms of justice. The lack of justice, in the action of establishment therefore justifies the action. Dharna is also an Indian term, t implies to sit in front of the office of concerning authority for forcing them to meet their demands. Picketing means group of workers stationed at the gates of factory or dockyard etc during strike to try to persuade others not to go to work.

Apart from above discussed strategies or techniques both, legitimate or illegitimate, noticed some other strategies of pressure groups. "Sometimes, pressure groups endeavor to secure the nomination and election of sympathetic legislator who may be used in the enactment of favourable laws." [34] Pressure groups influence policy makers to provide those accurate data and information's. The chances of pressure groups to secure their interests are brighter where the authorities are incompetent to deal with the matter under consideration. Even some times drafts of bills are prepared by pressure groups themselves and submitted to the legislators for legislation. Pressure groups also create a favourable climate for their particular cause by appealing to public opinion through speeches, books, pamphlets, special articles, news releases, radio and motion pictures. "It is also, alleged that pressure groups are using wine and women vehemently".[35] It is well known that everything that the group demands, or pressurises for, is not conceded. Some groups sometimes get what they want with little efforts and sometime they fail to alter the decision with best efforts by using all the resources at their command.

Determinants of Effectiveness

The effectiveness of groups in the sphere of politics depends on a number of factors. It depends on the nature and size of the group, its cohesiveness and informal unity, the degree to which it speaks for all interested in a particular function, activity or issue, the degree of its sustained organisation, and the amount of interest its members have in issues that affect them. The behaviour and impact of groups will depend on the political culture of the community. In a unified system pressure groups tend to be nationwide and disciplined as are the political parties.

The effectiveness of the group also depends upon the political activeness of the members. But success of the groups may also depend on the opportunities available to them to articulate their interests, the degree of permitted freedom and tolerance in a society, and their ability to use the media of communication.

Another important variable effecting group effectiveness is the quality of leadership, the nature and background of leaders and their relationship with government personnel. If the leaders of a group come from similar economic and cultural backgrounds, educational institutions, or occupational bodies, or mix in the same social world as members of the political elite, they are likely to have an easy entree into the avenues of power.

Another factor of effectiveness of a group's success is the willingness of political parties to respond to the declared interests of groups by proposing policies and choosing personal acceptance to them. Group effectiveness is contingent of making decisions. Where the locus of power is the regime is in the executive, group concentrate more on influencing the executive than legislature.

The key to understand the varying influence of group is to be found in the nature of group and attitude of the government "The effectiveness of pressure groups depends upon the resources of

a group such as money, organisation, votes, prestige, control over jobs and experts "[36].Harry Ekstein[37] categorised the determinants of group activities under the following headings (1) The form of their activities (2) Their intensity and scope (3) Their effectiveness. He further notes that the groups tend to articulate themselves on the pattern of the governmental institutions with they have dealings knowledge etc. and target of a pressure group. Different groups command different resources and varying degree. Business groups may have resources like money, control over jobs and some expert knowledge. The trade union and peasant union may command greater number of votes and capacity to launch successful agitation. The professional organisation like those of teachers, doctors, engineers and scientists have more expert knowledge. Wooten cautions a group endowments represents only potential use. However, the groups with similar resources may differ in allocation of these resources to exert pressure for getting varying fruits. The intensity and efficiency are also of significance to understand the group influence or determinants. The efficiency use her significances (1) the identification or determinants (2) the choice of the best path to the target. But Harry Eckstein classifies the factors determining the effectiveness under three headings:

(1) A tributes of the pressure groups themselves;

(2) A tributes of the activities of government;

(3) A tributes of the governmental decision making structure

To him perhaps the operative attributes constitutes a forth category, since the ability of a group to moblise public opinion certainly enhances its chances of success in any political system.

The nature of pressure groups state relationship is different from the one which prevails in Western democracies. To Rajni Kothari "there is no place for interest groups except when they are mediated through agencies that have a claim to the government attention, namely parties."[38]

To Weiner, another factor, though an intangible one, the reluctance of government officials to be responsive to any demand coming through unsympathetic and hostile channel. A militant attitude a tactless entrance into the government office, or the failure of a petitioner to present his case through a respectable intermediary may cause the government official whether elected or appointed or nominated to be unsympathetic an unresponsive. The style of presentation is thus an important factor.[39]

In India, apart from above mentioned determinants there are some other factors, such as violence, party linkage and the style of presentation of demands. In India Kochanek argues that "inter relationship between the interest group and political process is more complex than the western societies."[40] Hardgrove observes that, "officials in India regard pressure group activity with distrust. Rational policy maker, argues that the policy should be unaffected by the narrow demands of pressure groups."[41] Myron Weiner argues that violence and mass movements have proved more effective in India than the normal bargaining method. Only when public order is endangered by a mass movement the government willing to make concession not because they consider the demands legitimate, but because they, then recognise the strength of the group making the demand and its capacity for destructiveness.[42] Although pressure groups have to salute every government yet pressure groups aligned with ruling party has more affective ness than the others. As J.C. Johari believes that, "it depends upon the capacity of a group to take as many rewards as possible by revolving around the ruling party."[43]

A pressure group in Indian politics is more likely to succeed in influencing policies in terms of its demands, when it communicates its demands in clear and unambiguous manner. The effectiveness of a pressure group is further conditioned by its ability to successfully identify its sectional interest with general public interest. W e can sum up that the effectiveness of a pressure group in India depends upon the following factors:

I. Whether a group is aligned to a political party or not.

II. Whether a group is aligned to ruling party or an opposition party.

III. Whether a group can lavishly contribute to party decisions or not.

IV. The size of membership and the list of elite members also increase the bargaining power of a group.

V. Whether a group can 'purchase' eminent leaders, writers and politicians or not.

VI. Whether a group can recruit a very competent staff on whose services governmental agencies have to rely on, before taking any final decision.

VII. Whether a group can maintain liaison officer at the decision making level and places for the manipulative activities.

VIII. Whether a group can indirectly oblige bureaucracy and ministers or legislature or not.

IX. Whether a group can organised a mass movement to have the attentions of government and society.

X. Whether a group attracts a large number of people by raising populist demands and slogans.

XI. Whether a government is run by a political party having thin majority, or with the help of coalition partners, the capacity of the government to resist the pressure less than the single party rule having absolute majority.

Classification

Pressure groups have been differently classified by several writers in group politics in India. Myron Weiner explains two kinds of interest articulation in India-functionally specific economic interests, such as those of landlords, peasants, trade union, business etc, and the interests organised around traditional loyalties to caste, tribe and community.[44]

H.S. Fartyal has broadly divided Indian pressure groups into four categories (a) special interest groups viz. business ,trade Unions, students , teachers associations' etc. (b) Communal and religious, (c) Caste, language and religion; and (d) group based on Gandhian ideology.

But the four fold classification made by Almond and Coleman is more suitable and applies equally well to pressure phenomenon in India. The four folded classification is (a) institutional interest group (b) non-associational interest group; (c) associational interest groups, (d) anomic interest groups.

On the basis of classification made by Almond and Coleman, B.L. Fadia divided the Indian pressure groups. In institutional pressure groups he included 'the Congress Working Committee', 'the Congress Parliamentary Board', 'The Chief Minister Club', 'the Central Election Committee', 'the Bureaucracy ' and 'the Army.' Within associational interest groups he included organisation of Businessmen, Peasants, Students, Trade Unions, Government employees, associations and associated groups of community. In non-associational pressure groups he included communal religious, caste, language, Gandhian, syndicate, groups and ideological, Left or Young Turks. Under anomic interest groups he mentioned Shiv Sena , Naxalities , and Nava Narman Samiti of Gujrat , Sarvodya and Tarun Sena etc.

Impacts of Pressure Groups

Pressure groups provide a very important channel of popular representation in liberal states of today. However, their activities are limited in authoritarian states. We have come to accept the idea and reality of pressure groups as central; to the political and social process. Pressure groups operate in the entire arena of the political process. They are as much active among the political parties and the election process as they make their presence felt in the working of government, whether it's a legislative wing executive, bureaucracy or even the judiciary. Even the bureaucracy feels to make their influence and they affect its natural and independent character. It may also be conveyed that pressure groups also infect a country's judicial system through their functioning as the more articulate using of public opinion. On the functioning and the legitimacy of pressure groups Macridis warns that there are only two things to do with pressure groups. If you agree with it remember it, embrace it and welcome it, support it, if you disagree with it' ignore it, it must be borne in mind that our society, nation, government, legislation, political administration-all are comprised 'groups of men' each group cutting across many others." So we cannot ignore them.

Pressure groups have been the object of vigorous and persistent controversy, whether or not they are healthy and desirable element of democracy society. The place of pressure groups, in the institutional structure of democratic, continues as subject of debate. Robert Carr criticize the pressure groups that they seek to advance the interests of small segments of the population at the expense of general welfare[45]. He also argued the employment of improper methods to secure their ends has evoked much public resentment against them. Huge A. Bone argues that "it is often alleged that pressure groups exercised in quietus influence on government and the public."[46]

In fact, pressure group activity is an outstanding characteristic of industrialized political system of liberal democracies of Western Europe and America. Pressure groups are well developed and effective in these countries. Generally speaking pressure groups emerge with industrialization and characterize a developed and modernized political system. It does not mean that pressure groups are non-existence in an under-developed country. But it is only a truism to say that nature of pressure group activity in under developed and developing system is different from the one in the developed democracies of liberal persuasion. India is a developing country which has now acquired a necessary infrastructure for the rapid industrialization of the country's economy. It is argued that pressure group in India have a low level of institutionalization. They are viewed with suspicion and their activities are generally seen as distrust. Rajni Kothari argues that in India a persistent tendency pressure groups[47]. This does not mean that there is no place for intermediate structures. But they have to be more directly more political rather than associational in the Western sense.

Hardgrove believes that Indian groups have been slow to develop but while they now number in thousands they are desperate and weak, they have been unable to accommodate and channel rapidly expanding participation and the emergence of new groups to political consciousness[48]. Palmer has the identical views about Indian groups. To him "besides illiteracy and consequent want or social communication pressure groups are very much existent in India. However, they are not large in number and have acquired different forms compared to those in western countries."[49] Myron Wiener noticed unique features regarding Indian groups. Indian social system hierarchical (caste and class), and horizontal(tribe, religion &linguistic)grouping ,political expressions ,follow suit and since both hierarchical and horizontal division tend to be local or regional in character, there is a multiplicity of local parties and interest groups of an order found in other nations[50].

Therefore, pressure groups have become an integral part of Indian democracy. So it seems reasonable to suggest that pressure groups should be permitted to play their role i.e. promotion of their interests honestly and efficiently, in so far as it does not affect general welfare of the community. The study of B.L. Fadia remarks that politics in India is pre-eminently the politics of pressure groups rather than politics of parties and pressure groups in India are not to be condemned but to be controlled

Criticism of Pressure Groups

"Pressure groups are being criticized by the critics, as selfish agencies which seek to advance the interest of the small segment of the population at the expense of general welfare."[52] Some western thinkers like James Madison and Theodore Lowi have criticized the pressure groups. James Madison brands them as inherently bad and calls them factions. Theodore Lowi criticized the pressure groups on the following grounds;

(I) Pressure groups derange and confuse expectations regarding democratic institutions and reveal a basic disrespect for democracy.

(II) They render government impotent, unable to plan.

(III) They demoralize government by replacing concern for justice with concern for jurisdiction.

(IV) They weaken democratic institutions by opposing formal procedure with informal bargaining.

Pressure groups are also criticized by scholars with iron law of oligarchy in working of pressure groups. Huge A. Bone pointed out the absence of democracy within the internal organization of many groups. Spokesmen of pressure groups, in fact, are not responsible to the people they claim to represent. Many leaders hold office for years and manage to perpetuate themselves in power by manipulating to their advantage the machinery is formal organisation. The rank and file is usually denied any participation in the formation of policies. Even the thinking of individual members on group objectives is influenced by their leaders, criticism of the leaders is not usually encouraged and critics are expelled from the organisation which may result into fractions.

But these criticisms is not only relates to pressure groups but political parties working in Indian politics are also infected from the same problems. But despite its criticism, pressure groups are a reality in modern society. Modern democracies cannot ignore the existence of powerful and organised pressure groups inspiring upon public policy and decision making at all level of government, they should devise ways to cope with them.

The system of pressure groups, like any other system is bound to have its own defects and defaults which should not be used as a justification for denying its due place as legitimate role in democracy. It seems reasonable to suggest that pressure groups should be permitted to play their role, i.e., promotion of interests honestly and efficiently, in so far as it does not affect general welfare of the community.

Pressure groups in India

The study of pressure groups in India is initiated by American and Western Scholars with emergence of behavioual revolution. Hellen B. Lamb was, perhaps, the first scholar who gave his observations regarding pressure groups in his edited book "Leadership and Political Institutions in India, 1959". But, Myron Weiner's book "Politics of Scarcity" is considered to be the first full length survey of public pressure and political response in India. We have number of works on trade unions and business groups. Trade unions have been empirically studied from different angles. A large numbers of such books are on the emergence and growth of trade unionism in India. The important books are such as S.D. Punekar,"[53]Trade Unionism in India" and V.B. Karnik's "Indian Trade Unions: A Survey". Punekar and Karnik present the development of trade union and analyze their problem and prospects. N. Pattabhi Raman[54] argues that the trade union has been and are dominated by or controlled by politicians, in his book "Political Involvement of India's Trade Unions". With same observations H. Chouche has given in his book "Trade Unions and Politics in India". Certain important aspects of leadership of trade unions and workers participation were studied by S.D. Punekar and S. Madhuri in their book "Trade Union Leadership in India". K.N. Vaid in his article proved that workers join unions mainly for social reason and another reason is protection against establishment .All such studies proved one thing that the actions of trade unions are directed and controlled by political parties to which they belong.

Business groups, in India are studied mainly by foreign scholars. Most of the works is in form of articles and books on,"The Federation of Indian Chamber of Commerce and Industry (FICCI).Stanley A. Kochaneak[55] made a full length survey of FICCI in his book "Business and Politics in India". Bernard E. Brown proves the relationship between a ruling party and business interests in his article B.R. Nayyar presents various channels of access through which FICCI exert pressure on policy making and its implementation .He also depicts the attitudes of private enterprise towards planning in India.

B.L. Fadia's book "Pressure Groups in Indian Politics " a case study of FICCI as a pressure group. He concluded that "politics in India is a preeminently the politics of pressure groups rather than the politics of parties". His study established the dominant role of pressure groups in Indian Politics .He argues that "Indian Politics a complex phenomena where it is very difficult to draw a line of distinction between an interest group and pressure group because they convert themselves according to the need of the hour."

Rajni Kothari 's book "Politics in India" does build up certain propositions about the nature and role of pressure group in India .He argues that Indian political system is a mixed rather than discrete. "The government 's attitude has generally been marked by non-recognition of pressure groups except when they are politically organized .Such an attitude has led to an emphasis on loudness of protest and violent out bursts. He further argued that pressure groups are not considered legitimate basis for political bargaining .C.N. Somarajan presented a study on educational and agrarian interest group operating in the state of Kerala .He argues that organised interests in the state of Kerala have become quite legitimate and part of the democratic politics. Like political parties, pressure groups have secured institutional importance in Kerala.

Varinder Grover's[56] edited book, "Pressure Groups and Political of Influence" tried to prove theoretically that pressure groups are very much existed in every states and considerable influence on national and states government. L.P.Mosquita elaborated books, 'Pressure Groups and Democracy in India', studied the pressure groups phenomena empirically from different contexts like peasants , agricultural labourers and organized labour of industry regarding forum of free enterprises . He also studied the pressure groups from agrarian, agricultural labourers and organized labour of industry, from a different context. He established that how pressure groups influenced the working of Indian democracy .He argued "The Indian political system sets the parameter for group activity, and groups can be understood only a part of a larger and more complex set of relationship, which compose the larger political system.'

Foot Notes

1. Arthur Bentley, The Process of Government, San Antonio,1949
2. Ovid B. Truman, The Government Process, New York, Alfred A. Knof,1951
3. Peter Odegard ,Pressure Politics, London, Secker and Warburg,1961
4. V.O. Key Jr., Politics Parties And Pressure Groups, New York, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1964
5. S.E. Finer, Anonymous Empire: A Study of The Lobby In Great Britain, London, the Pall Mall Press,1958
6. H.R. Mahood, 'Pressure Groups in American Politics', New York,1967
7. Allen Potter, Organised Group in British National Politics, London,1961
8. Edgar Lane ,Lobbying and the Law, Berkley, University of California Press,1964
9. J.D.S. Miller , Australian Government and Politics- An Introductory Study, Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., London,1905,P65.
10. David Truman, op. cit., PP 33-34
11. Jotten J. Anderson, Pressure Groups and Inner-Government Relations, The Annals ,Vol.359, May 1969,P20
12. Robert H. Salisbury, Interest Group Politics in America, Harper and Row(n.d.) P.2
13. David Truman, op. cit., P 37
14. Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, New York, Macmillan Press,1935, PP 348-49
15. Huge A. Bone, American Politics and the Party System, New York, Mc Graw, Hill Book Company, INC, 1955
16. Stephen K. Bailey, American Politics and Government-Essays in Essentials, Oxford and IBH Publishing Co., Calcutta ,Indian Edition,1970,P 144
17. Francis G. Costles, Pressure Groups and Political Culture, London, Routledge and Kegan Paul.1967, P2
18. B. Sarivastva, Pressure Politics in India, Bhopal Progress Publisher, 1979, P 101
19. Jack.C.Plano, Dictionary of Political Analysis, Hinsdole, Dryden Press, 1973, P35
20. International Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, the Macmillan Co. and the Free Press, Vol. 7, P 486

21. Alfred de Gracia, Nature and prospects of Political Interest Groups, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences,Vol.319,Sep.1958,P 114

22. Allen Potter, op.cit. P 15

23. N.C. Hunt, 'Pressure Groups in U, S.A.' Occident, Vol.12, 1958, P 114

24. S.E. Finer, op.cit. , P 2

25. J. C. Johari, Comparative Politics, Sterling Publisher Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, 2nd Edition, 1976, P 392

26. Edgar Lane, op. cit., PP 8-9

27. Encyclopedia of Britannica, London,Vol. 14, P 175

28. David B. Truman, op. cit., PP 340-342

29. Ibid, P 327

30. J.D. Stewart, 'British Pressure Groups- The Role in Relation to the House of Commons, Oxford University Press, 1958, P 223

31. Ibid, P 327

32. David B. Truman, op. cit., P 263

33. J.C. Johari, 'Gherao: An - Un- Gandhian Technique of Agitational Politics', Vol. 11, No.2, 1975, P 84

34. B.L. Fadia, Pressure Group in Indian Politics, New Delhi, Radiant, 1980,P 18

35. Ibid, PP 17-18

36. Graham Wooten, Interest Group, New Jeresy, Engaward Elittis, 1970, P 83

37. Harry Eckstein, op.cit. P 34

38. Rajni Kothari, Politics in India, Orient Longmans Ltd., New Delhi, 1970, P 218

39. Myron Weiner, op. cit., P. 215

40. Stanley, A. Kochanek, Business and Politics in India, Barkley, University of California Press, 1974, P 12

41. Robert L. Hardgrove, Indian: Government and politics in Developing Nation, Delhi Freeman Book Co. 1979, P113

42. Myron Weiner, The politics of Scarcity: Public Pressure and Political Response, Bombay, Asia Publications, 10963, P 215

43. J.C. Johari, Indian Politics, Delhi, Vishal Publication, 1984, P 514

44. Myron Weiner, The Politics of South Asia(ed), Almond & Coleman, Politics of Developing Areas, Princeton , Princeton University Press, 1970

45. Robert cereal , American Democracy in Theory and Practice , National State and Local Government, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, Forth Edition,1965, P 188

46. Huge A. Bone, op. cit. PP 224-25

47. Rajni Kothari, op. cit., P 218

48. Robert L., Hardgrove, op. cit.

49. Parlmer, N.O., The Indian Political System, London, Allen and Unwin, 1961, PP 9-10

50. Myron Weiner, op. cit., P 115

51. Robert Carr, op. cit., P 188

52. Robert Carr, op. cit., P 188

53. New Book Company, Delhi, 1948

54. Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1967

55. University of California Press, Berkley, 1974

56. Deep and Deep Publications, Delhi, 1997