

## 2.0 Post-Behaviouralism:

**Introduction:** Behaviouralism dominated in the study of political Science for a decade. However, the behaviouralists drifted away from the path they had chosen for themselves. They got absorbed in finding out new techniques and methods for its study. In the process they lost the real subject matter. They got divided into two groups – the Theoretical behaviouralists and the positive behaviouralists. While the former laid emphasis purely on theory building, the latter concerned themselves with finding out new methods for the study of political phenomena. Consequently, certain behaviouralists got disillusioned with behaviouralism towards the close of sixties. The main attack upon behaviouralism came from David Easton who was one of the leading behaviouralists. According to him, there is a "post – behavioural revolution" underway which is born out of deep dissatisfaction with the attempt to convert political study into a discipline modeled on the methodology of the natural sciences. In their efforts at research and application of scientific method, the behaviouralists had gone far away from the realities of social behavior. In this way, political science again lost touch with the current and contemporary issues.

### 2.1 Reasons for the growth of Post-Behaviouralism:

The chief reasons for the growth of post-behaviouralism are- failure of the behaviouralists in addressing the social problems for their solutions; over-emphasis on research methods and tools, and consuming more time on conceptualizing or theory-building.

### 2.2 Features of Post-Behaviouralism:

Following are the characteristic features of post-behaviouralism-

1. It is a movement of Protest. It is a protest against the wrong direction which the behaviouralists had given to political science. As such, the post-behaviouralists stressed on "Relevance and Action". They held that political science should be directed towards solving actual problems. So that it would be more relevant to the society. Political Scientists, according

to them, should once again try to view political situation as a whole and in a right manner. They should deliberate on the basic issues of society like justice, liberty, equality, democracy etc.

## 2. Opposition to 'Value-free' concept:

David Easton, in his modification says that "value are inextinguishable parts of the study of politics. Science cannot be and never has been evaluatively neutral despite protestations to the contrary. Hence to understand the limits of our knowledge we need to be aware of the value premises on which it stands and alternatives for which this knowledge could be used".

## 3. Future-oriented (Predictability):

Post-behaviouralism wants that the behaviouralists should link their empirical methods of research and approach for making theories that could solve present and future social problems. It must thus be future oriented. According to Easton, "Although the post-behavioural revolution may have all appearances of just another reaction to behaviouralism; it is in fact notably different. Behaviouralism was viewed as a threat to status quo; classicism and traditionalism..... the post-behavioural revolution is, however, future oriented. It does not seek to return to some golden age of political research or to conserve or to destroy a particular methodological approach. It seeks rather to proper political science in new direction."

## 4. It is an Intellectual tendency:

Post-behaviouralism is both a movement and intellectual tendency. As a movement of protest, it has its followers among all sections of political scientists "in all generations from young, graduates to older members of the profession". Easton says, it was "a genuine revolution, not a reaction; a becoming, not a preservation; a reform not a counter reformation."

It would be wrong to identify post-behaviouralism with any particular political ideology. The whole improbable diversity-political, methodological

and generational – was bound together by one sentiment alone, a deep discontext with the direction of contemporary political research.

David Easton, as such, speaks of the following as important features of post-behaviouralism:

1. Importance to substance over technique:

Post-behaviouralists say, it may be good to have sophisticated tools of investigation, but the more important point is the purpose for which these tools are being applied. Unless scientific research is relevant and meaningful for contemporary social problems, it is not worth being undertaken.

2. Emphasis on social change and not social preservation.

3. Greater focus on Reality.

Political science should address the needs of mankind by identifying the future social problems and by suggesting solutions to such problems.

4. Recognition of the existing values:

According to post-behaviouralists, unless values are regarded as the propelling force behind knowledge there is a danger that knowledge would lose purposes. If knowledge is to be used for right goals, values have to be restored to the central position. Human values need protection.

5. It is Action-oriented:

Knowledge must be put to work. "To know", as Easton points out "is to bear the responsibility for acting, and to act is to engage in restoring society". The post-behaviouralists as such, ask for action-science in place of contemplative-science.

According to post-behaviouralists, once it is recognized that the intellectuals have a positive role to play in society, and that this role is to try to determine proper goals for society and make society move in the direction of

these goals, it becomes inevitable to politicize the profession—all professional associations as well as universities thus become not only inseparable but highly desirable.

### **2.3 Conclusion:**

Post-behaviouralists advocate that political science should be related to urgent social problems. It should therefore be purposive. Political scientists should find out solutions to contemporary problems. The research should be relevant to the understanding of social issues. Political scientists must play the leading role in acting for the post-behavioural change. To quote Easton, "the post-behavioural movement in political science is presenting us with a new image of our discipline and the obligations of our profession."

### **3.0 Marxian Approach:**

#### **3.1 Introduction:**

Karl Marx is in fact the greatest political thinker of all times. No other political philosopher has aroused greater controversy or exerted more influence on future generations as Marx. There have been other great thinkers like Plato, Hobbes or Rousseau but even they could not excite imagination of worth of millions of people in all the countries of the world. Marx is the only philosopher who enjoys this distinction. He is intensely hated by millions, admired by millions, and almost worshipped by millions. His greatness and influence is quite clear from the fact that great efforts have been made to refute him. Indeed the whole history of political thought in the twentieth century is a struggle between the opponents and supporters of Marxism.

#### **3.2 The Approach:**

It may be pointed out that Marxian approach to politics means taking note of not only the writings of Marx, Engels and Lenin but all those of a galaxy of later writers such as Luxemburg, Trotsky, Gramsci and many others. Further, an explicitly 'political' treatise cannot be found in the whole range of classical Marxist texts. Milliband rightly points out, "a Marxist politics had to be

constructed or reconstructed from the mass of variegated and fragmented material which forms the corpus of Marxism."

### 3.3 Marx on Individual:

The individual, according to Marx, is individual-in-society. Individual has no meaning without the society. Marx says, "society does not consist of individuals, but expresses the sum of inter-relations, the relations within which these individuals stand." As such, Marx is different from the liberal view which conceives individual as atomized, insular and self-contained.

### 3.4 Marx on Society:

All societies, according to Marxists, in history, have been class societies. The contending classes from 'freeman and slave, patrician and plebian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman to bourgeoisie and proletariat in the epoch of capitalism have stood in constant opposition to one another. All class societies are characterized by domination and conflict which are based on specific, concrete features of their mode of production. Class domination has been a historical process signifying a constant attempt on the part of the dominant classes to maintain and extend their domination on the society.

### 3.5 Marx on Politics:

Politics, in Marxian perspective, can be understood only with reference to the nature of prevailing societal conflict and domination. Politics, as such, conceived in terms of the 'specific articulation of class struggles.' Generally speaking, in Marxian view politics has a derivative and epiphenomenal character. The political life processes are considered as part of 'superstructure' standing on the economic structure of society. The subsidiary and derivative character of politics can be well deduced from the following quotation from the 'Preface' to A contribution to the critique of Political Economy:

"In the social production of their existence, men enter into definite, necessary relations, which are independent of their will, namely, relations of production corresponding to a determinate stage of development of their material forces of production. The totality of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation on which their arises a legal and political superstructure and to which there correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production of social consciousness. The mode of production of material life conditions the social, political and intellectual life-process in general."

Hence for Marx, Politics, economics, culture and ideology are all inseparably intertwined. The 'forces of production' at a particular stage of historical development, are matched by definite 'relations of production' that characterize the society. The relations of production taken together constitute the economic foundation of the society. The legal and political institutions (superstructure) stand on this "real foundation" of economic structure.

In the Marxist view, the real nature of politics, has to be understood from "the hidden basis of the entire social structure." Ralph Miliband rightly says that politics is thus 'a very determined and conditioned activity indeed - so determined' and 'conditioned' in fact, as to give politics a mostly derivative, subsidiary, and 'epiphenomenal' character."

### 3.6 Conclusion:

Marx laid greater emphasis on the materialistic or economic interpretation of history. According to him, the capitalists by controlling the means of production and distribution also controlled not only the political but social and economic structure of the society as well. Especially he stressed economic aspect of life. According to him, every other activity in the society revolved round economics. All social and political activities are based on economic activity.