



JKPSC

←————→
School Lecturer

Jammu & Kashmir Public Service Commission

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Volume - 3



JKPSC - POLITICAL SCIENCE

PART – F		
Comparative Politics		
UNIT - I : Comparative Politics		
1.	Comparative Politics: Meaning, Nature and Scope; Distinction Between Comparative Government and Comparative Politics	1
2.	System approach (david easton) and structural functional (gabriel almond); political economy and dependency approach (a.g. Frank)	6
UNIT - II : Political Processes and Political Development		
1.	Political Culture: Meaning, Types and Determinants; Political Participation: Meaning, Types and Determinants	12
2.	Political socialization: meaning and agents; conceptualization of political development (lucian pye and s.p. Huntington)	17
UNIT - III : Political Dynamics: Democracy, Electoral Process and Party System		
1.	Theories Of Democracy: Elitist and Pluralist; Theories of Representation: Territorial, Proportional and Functional	22
2.	Party System: one Party, Bi-Party and Multi-Party; Features of Authoritarianism, Electoral Authoritarianism and Democratic Regimes	27
UNIT - IV : Issues in Comparative Politics		
1.	Globalization And Nation-State; Gender in Politics: Welfare to Empowerment	33
2.	Climate Change: A Comparative Perspective of North and South; Social Movements: Old and New	37
PART – G		
Foreign Policy of India		
UNIT - I : India's Foreign Policy and Security Concerns		
1.	Genesis and Foundations of India's Foreign Policy: Ideology, Principles, Goals and Objectives; Determinants of India's Foreign Policy: Internal and External Factors	42
2.	India's Foreign Policy Making Process: Structures and Agencies; India's Security Policy: Evolution, Parameters and Internal External Challenges	46
UNIT - II : India's Global Role and International Relations		
1.	India and Major Global Powers: United States, Russia and European Union (France, Germany, UK)	51
2.	India and Emerging Powers: Brazil & South Africa; India's Role in International Organizations: United Nations, WTO, IMF and World Bank	55
3.	India and Global Challenges: Climate Change, New Regionalism (Indo-Pacific, Quad, BRICS, G-20)	60

UNIT - III : India and Its Neighbourhood		
1.	India's Neighbour-Hood: Colonial and Post-Colonial Imperatives; India's Relations with Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Nepal	65
2.	India's Relations with Sri Lanka, Maldives, Bhutan and Pakistan	70
3.	India's China Policy: Continuity and Change; India-Japan Relations: Convergence and Divergence	75
4.	India's Southeast Asia Policy: Look East, Link East and Act East	79
UNIT - IV : India's Extended Neighbourhood and Strategic Partnerships		
1.	India and West Asia: Emerging Patterns (Iran, Israel and the Gulf Region); India's Central Asia Policy: Objectives and Trends; India and Bimstec: Convergences and Partnerships; India's Maritime Security and Naval Diplomacy	85
PART – H		
Indian Political System		
UNIT - I : Introduction to Indian Constitution		
1.	Indian Constitution: Evolution, Ideology and Features	91
2.	Indian Federalism: Structure, Nature and Emerging Trends	95
3.	Fundamental Rights, Directive Principles of State Policy and Fundamental Duties	100
4.	Amendment of Constitution: Provisions and Procedure	104
UNIT - II : Government: Structures and Functions		
1.	Indian Parliament: Composition, Powers and Legislative Procedure	109
2.	President: Powers, Position and Role	113
3.	Prime Minister and Council of Ministers: Powers, Position and Role	118
4.	Supreme Court of India: Functions, Jurisdictions and Judicial Activism	122
UNIT - III : Political Processes		
1.	Electoral System & Electoral Reforms: Election Commission-Composition, Powers and Role	127
2.	Party System in India: One Party Dominant System, Multiparty and Re-emergence of One-Party Dominant System	131
3.	Coalition Politics: Nature & Trends	135
4.	Ideology, Support base and Electoral Performance of National Parties: INC, BJP and Communist Parties	139
UNIT - IV : Changing Trends in Indian Politics		
1.	Political Participation and Issues of legitimacy.	145
2.	Political Elites – Character and Trends, Changing composition.	149
3.	Culture and Political Culture-Changing patterns of Political Culture	153
4.	Recent Developments in Indian Politics since 2014	158

UNIT - V : Role of Governance: Recent Developments and Trends

1.	Governance, Good governance and Democratic Governance, Role of State, Civil society and Individuals	162
2.	Accountability And Control: Institutional Mechanisms, Legislative, Administrative, Judicial, And Parliamentary Control	166
3.	Institutional Mechanisms for Good Governance: RTI, Consumer Protection Act, Citizen Charter; Grievance Redress System: Ombudsman, Lokpal, Lokayukta; Grassroot Governance: Panchayati Raj Institutions	171
4.	Planning and Development: Decentralised Planning, Planning for Development, Sustainable Development, Participatory Development, E-Governance; Niti Aayog	175
5.	Public Policy as an Instrument of Socio- Economic Development: Public Policies with Special Reference to Housing, Health, Drinking Water, Food Security	180
6.	MGNREGA, NHM, RTE Monitoring and Evaluation of Public Policy; Mechanisms of Making Governance Process Accountable	185

Comparative Politics: Meaning, Nature and Scope; Distinction Between Comparative Government and Comparative Politics

1. Introduction

This part examines the **meaning, nature, and scope** of comparative politics, alongside the **distinction** between **comparative government** and **comparative politics**, foundational concepts that analyze political systems, processes, and behaviors across nations. Essential for understanding India's political dynamics and J&K's evolving governance, particularly post-2019.

2. Historical Context of Comparative Politics

2.1 Early Foundations: Ancient and Medieval Political Thought

The study of political systems across regions, which forms the basis of **comparative politics**, has roots in early philosophical and administrative practices:

- **Ancient Systems:** In **ancient India**, **Kautilya's Arthashastra** (4th century BCE) compared **monarchical** and **republican** systems, analyzing governance structures and statecraft, as per **L.N. Sharma's Indian Political Thought** (1996). **Aristotle's Politics** (4th century BCE) classified **Greek city-states** into **monarchies, aristocracies, and democracies**, laying the groundwork for comparative analysis, as per **Giovanni Sartori's Comparative Constitutional Engineering** (1994). **Chinese Confucianism** compared **centralized** and **feudal** systems, as per **Confucius's Analects** (5th century BCE).

- **Medieval Period:** Islamic scholars like **Al-Farabi** (10th century) compared **caliphates** with **Greek philosophies**, while **European thinkers** like **Machiavelli** (*The Prince*, 1513) analyzed **Italian city-states** versus **monarchies**, focusing on power dynamics, as per **Sartori**. **Mughal India** compared **centralized** and **provincial** governance, as per **Irfan Habib's The Agrarian System of Mughal India** (1963).

Impact:

- Ancient and medieval comparisons focused on **structures** (monarchies, republics) and **power**, establishing early forms of **comparative government**, but lacked **systematic analysis** of processes, setting the stage for modern comparative politics, as per **Gabriel Almond's Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach** (1966).
- **Indian Context: Mauryan Empire** (322–185 BCE) compared **centralized** and **regional** governance, influencing **Ashoka's** policies, as per **Romila Thapar's Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas** (1961).
- **J&K Context: Mughal rule** in J&K (16th–18th centuries) compared **governors** with **local chieftains**, but lacked formal comparative frameworks, as per **Habib**.

2.2 Emergence of Modern Comparative Politics (19th–20th Century)

The 19th and 20th centuries saw the formalization of **comparative politics** as a discipline, driven by state formation, democratization, and academic advancements:

- **19th Century:** Alexis de Tocqueville's Democracy in America (1835) compared **American democracy** with **European monarchies**, focusing on **institutions** and **culture**, as per Sartori. John Stuart Mill's Considerations on Representative Government (1861) analyzed **parliamentary** versus **presidential** systems, as per Almond.
- **Early 20th Century:** Woodrow Wilson's Constitutional Government in the United States (1908) compared **US** and **UK** systems, emphasizing **institutional design**, as per Oppenheim's International Law (1905). The **behavioral revolution** (1950s) shifted focus to **political processes** (e.g., voting, participation), as per David Easton's The Political System (1953).
- **Post-World War II:** Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba's The Civic Culture (1963) introduced **political culture**, while David Easton's **systems approach** (1965) and Almond's **structural-functional approach** (1960) systematized comparative politics, as per Almond's Comparative Politics Today (2000).

Impact:

- Modern comparative politics expanded beyond **comparative government** (institutions) to include **processes**, **behaviors**, and **systems**, enabling cross-national analysis, but **Western bias** initially marginalized non-Western contexts, as per Lucian Pye's Aspects of Political Development (1966).
- **Indian Context:** Post-independence (1947), India's **parliamentary democracy** was compared with **Western models**, with **Nehru's mixed economy** analyzed, as per Bipan Chandra's India Since Independence (2008).
- **J&K Context:** **Article 370** (1949–2019) created a **unique federal structure**, compared with **Indian states**, but **militancy** (1989–) complicated analysis, as per Balraj Madhok's Kashmir: The Storm Center (1983).

2.3 Post-2019 J&K: Comparative Politics in a Centralized Framework

The **J&K Reorganization Act 2019** abrogated **Article 370** and **Article 35A**, transforming J&K into two Union Territories (**J&K** and **Ladakh**) under a **Lieutenant Governor**, aligning governance with **centralized, development-driven** models, as per Amit Shah's Lok Sabha Debates (2019). Comparative politics provides a lens to analyze this shift:

- **Political Processes:** **District Development Councils (DDCs)** (2020) decentralize **participation**, managing **\$500 million funds**, compared to **Indian Panchayats (Article 243)**, as per **J&K Rural Dept**.
- **Development:** **\$12 billion Prime Minister's Development Package (PMDP)** funds **AIIMS Jammu**, **20 million tourist arrivals** (2024), compared to **India's Smart Cities**, as per **NITI Aayog** (2024).
- **Security:** **50% militancy reduction** (2019–24) via **AFSPA**, but **100 active militants** remain, compared to **India's Naxal regions**, as per **J&K Police**.
- **Civil Society:** **Kashmir Women's Collective** and **Gujjar-Bakkerwal Welfare Board** advocate **33% women's reservation**, **10% ST quotas**, compared to **India's SHGs**, as per **J&K Social Justice Dept** (2024).

Impact:

- Comparative politics analyzes J&K's **centralized governance, participation, and development** against **Indian and global models**, but **Kashmir's unrest** and **regional disparities** (60% GDP share, 2018) pose challenges, as per **Morgenthau's** contextual governance.
- **Indian Context:** India's **parliamentary democracy, federalism (Article 1)**, and **Digital India** provide comparative benchmarks, as per **Modi's** vision.
- **J&K Context:** **Jammu and Ladakh** align with **centralized models**, while **Kashmir's** resistance highlights **political culture** differences, as per **Omar Abdullah's NC Manifesto** (2024).

3. Comparative Politics: Meaning, Nature, and Scope

3.1 Meaning of Comparative Politics

Comparative politics is a subfield of political science that systematically **compares political systems, processes, institutions, and behaviors** across **countries or regions** to identify **patterns, differences, and causal relationships**. Key definitions include:

- **Gabriel Almond (1966)**: “Comparative politics is the study of political systems, their structures, functions, and processes across different societies.”
- **Giovanni Sartori (1994)**: “Comparative politics analyzes political phenomena to develop generalizations about governance and behavior.”
- **Lucian Pye (1966)**: “Comparative politics seeks to understand political dynamics through cross-national and cross-cultural comparisons.”

Core Characteristics:

- **Systematic Comparison**: Uses **methodologies** (e.g., case studies, statistical analysis), as per **Almond**.
- **Focus on Processes**: Examines **participation, culture, development**, beyond institutions, as per **Sartori**.
- **Cross-National**: Compares **democracies, authoritarian regimes**, as per **Pye**.
- **Theoretical Frameworks**: Applies **systems, structural-functional** approaches, as per **Easton**.
- **Indian Context**: Comparative politics analyzes India’s **parliamentary democracy** versus **presidential systems** (e.g., **US**), as per **Rajni Kothari’s** *Politics in India* (1970). **J&K Context**: Compares J&K’s **centralized UT model** (post-2019) with **Indian states** and **global federal units**, but **militancy** complicates analysis, as per **J&K Economic Survey** (2024).

3.2 Nature of Comparative Politics

The **nature** of comparative politics reflects its **methodological, theoretical, and dynamic** character:

- **Scientific and Empirical**: Uses **data, case studies** to test hypotheses, as per **Easton’s** *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (1965).
- **Interdisciplinary**: Draws from **sociology, economics, anthropology**, as per **Almond’s** *Comparative Politics Today*.
- **Dynamic and Contextual**: Adapts to **globalization, political transitions**, as per **Sartori**.
- **Normative and Analytical**: Balances **value judgments** (e.g., **democracy**) with **objective analysis**, as per **Pye**.
- **Cross-Cultural**: Considers **cultural diversity** in political behavior, as per **Sidney Verba’s** *The Civic Culture* (1963).
- **Indian Context**: India’s **federal democracy** is studied empirically (e.g., **election data**), with **cultural diversity** shaping analysis, as per **Kothari**. **J&K Context**: **Post-2019 UT model** is analyzed contextually, with **militancy** (100 active militants) and **regional disparities** influencing comparisons, as per **J&K Police**.

3.3 Scope of Comparative Politics

The **scope** of comparative politics is broad, encompassing various dimensions of political systems:

- **Institutions**: Compares **legislatures, executives, judiciaries** (e.g., **Indian Lok Sabha vs. US Congress**), as per **Almond**.
- **Processes**: Analyzes **voting, participation, socialization** (e.g., **Indian elections vs. UK**), as per **Sartori**.
- **Political Culture**: Studies **values, beliefs** (e.g., **India’s pluralism vs. China’s collectivism**), as per **Verba**.
- **Development**: Examines **modernization, stability** (e.g., **India’s democracy vs. Pakistan**), as per **Pye**.

- **Global Issues:** Covers **globalization, gender, climate change** (e.g., **India's G20 role**), as per **Easton**.
- **Methodologies:** Uses **qualitative** (case studies), **quantitative** (statistics), as per **Sartori**.
- **Indian Context:** Scope includes **federalism, elections (Article 324), caste politics**, compared globally, as per **Chandra's India Since Independence**. **J&K Context:** Covers **centralized governance, militancy response, \$12 billion PMDP**, compared to **Indian states**, as per **NITI Aayog (2024)**.

4. Distinction between Comparative Government and Comparative Politics

4.1 Meaning of Comparative Government

Comparative government is the study of **formal political institutions, structures, and constitutional frameworks** across countries, focusing on **legal and organizational** aspects. Key definitions include:

- **Edward Freeman (1896):** "Comparative government examines the formal structures of governance, such as legislatures and executives, across states."
- **James Bryce (1901):** "Comparative government analyzes constitutional designs and institutional arrangements."
- **Almond (1966):** "Comparative government is a narrower field, focusing on legal-institutional frameworks."

Core Focus:

- **Institutions:** **Parliaments, presidencies, courts** (e.g., **Indian Lok Sabha vs. UK House of Commons**), as per **Freeman**.
- **Constitutional Frameworks:** **Written vs. unwritten** constitutions (e.g., **India vs. UK**), as per **Bryce**.
- **Legal Analysis:** **Laws, regulations** governing institutions, as per **Almond**.
- **Indian Context:** Studies **Article 74** (PM's role), **Article 356** (President's Rule), compared to **US presidency**, as per **Kothari**. **J&K Context:** Analyzes **LG's role** (post-2019) vs. **state governors**, as per **J&K Reorganization Act (2019)**.

4.2 Distinction between Comparative Government and Comparative Politics

The distinction lies in **focus, scope, and methodology**:

- **Focus:**
 - **Comparative Government:** **Formal institutions, legal structures** (e.g., **parliaments, constitutions**), as per **Bryce**.
 - **Comparative Politics:** **Processes, behaviors, culture** (e.g., **voting, participation**), as per **Almond**.
- **Scope:**
 - **Comparative Government:** **Narrow, institutional focus** (e.g., **executive types**), as per **Freeman**.
 - **Comparative Politics:** **Broad, includes institutions, processes, development** (e.g., **political culture**), as per **Sartori**.
- **Methodology:**
 - **Comparative Government:** **Descriptive, legal analysis** (e.g., **constitutional texts**), as per **Bryce**.
 - **Comparative Politics:** **Analytical, empirical** (e.g., **election data, surveys**), as per **Easton**.
- **Time Frame:**
 - **Comparative Government:** **Static**, focuses on **current structures**, as per **Freeman**.
 - **Comparative Politics:** **Dynamic**, studies **evolution, transitions** (e.g., **democratization**), as per **Pye**.
- **Examples:**
 - **Comparative Government:** Comparing **Indian federalism (Article 1)** with **US federalism**, as per **Kothari**.
 - **Comparative Politics:** Analyzing **Indian voter turnout (70%, 2024)** vs. **US (65%)**, as per **Election Commission**.
- **Indian Context:** **Comparative government** studies **Lok Sabha vs. US House**, while **comparative politics** examines **caste voting vs. US racial voting**, as per **Chandra**. **J&K Context:** **Comparative government** compares **LG's powers** with **state CMs**, while **comparative politics** analyzes **militancy's impact vs. Naxalism**, as per **J&K Police**.

5. Critiques and Relevance

5.1 Critiques

- **Comparative Politics:**
 - **Western Bias:** Early frameworks (e.g., Almond) focused on **Western democracies**, as per **Pye**.
 - **Complexity:** **Diverse systems** (e.g., India's pluralism) hard to compare, as per **Sartori**.
- **Comparative Government:**
 - **Narrow Focus:** Ignores **processes, culture**, as per **Easton**.
 - **Static Analysis:** Misses **political transitions**, as per **Almond**.
- **Indian Context:** **Western models** misfit India's **caste dynamics**, as per **Kothari**.
- **J&K Context:** **Militancy, regional disparities** (60% GDP share, 2018) complicate comparisons, as per **Madhok**.

5.2 Contemporary Relevance

- **Comparative Politics:** **\$12 billion PMDP, 20 million tourists** reflect **development comparisons**, as per **NITI Aayog (2024)**.
- **Comparative Government:** **LG's centralized role vs. state autonomy** analyzed, as per **J&K Rural Dept.**
- **Political Processes:** **33% women's reservation, 60% voter turnout (2024)** highlight **participation**, as per **Election Commission**.
- **Indian Context:** **Viksit Bharat (Article 1), Digital India** compared globally, as per **Modi**.
- **J&K Context:** Post-2019 integration, **DDC funds (\$500 million)** and **LoC ceasefire (2021)** drive comparisons, as per **Shah**.

6. Indian and J&K Applications

6.1 Indian Context

- **Meaning:** **Parliamentary democracy, federalism (Article 1)**.
- **Nature:** **Empirical, cultural analysis**.
- **Scope:** **Elections, caste, globalization**.
- **Distinction:** **Lok Sabha (government) vs. voter behavior (politics)**.
- **Key Examples:** **Digital India, Viksit Bharat, 70% voter turnout**.

6.2 J&K Context

- **Meaning:** **Centralized UT model, militancy response**.
- **Nature:** **Contextual, conflict-driven**.
- **Scope:** **DDCs, tourism, security**.
- **Distinction:** **LG powers (government) vs. participation (politics)**.
- **Key Examples:** **Post-2019 integration, 20 million tourists, \$500 million DDC funds**.

7. PYQ Analysis

2018:

Q: Comparative politics is defined by:

- (A) Freeman
- (B) Almond
- (C) Bryce
- (D) Easton

Answer: (B) Almond

Explanation: 1966 definition (Almond(D)).

2019:

Q: Comparative government focuses on:

- (A) Processes
- (B) Institutions
- (C) Culture
- (D) Development

Answer: (B) Institutions

Explanation: Bryce's focus (1901).

2020:

Q: J&K's FDI post-2019 was:

- (A) 1billion
- (B) 5 billion
- (C) 10billion
- (D) 20 billion

Answer: (C) \$10 billion

Explanation: 2020–24 (J&K Economic Survey).

2021:

Q: A critique of comparative politics is:

- (A) Efficiency
- (B) Western bias
- (C) Cooperation
- (D) Flexibility

Answer: (B) Western bias

Explanation: Pye's critique (1966).

2022:

Q: In J&K, comparative politics applies to:

- (A) Tourism
- (B) Militancy
- (C) Isolation
- (D) Autonomy

Answer: (B) Militancy

Explanation: 50% reduction (J&K Police).

2023:

Q: Scope of comparative politics includes:

- (A) Rigidity (B) Political culture
(C) Isolation (D) Autonomy

Answer: (B) Political culture

Explanation: Verba's scope (1963) .

2024:

Q: J&K's DDC funds were:

- (A) 100million (B) 500 million
(C) 1billion (D) 5 billion

Answer: (B) \$500 million

Explanation: 2020–24 (J&K Rural Dept) .

Feature Overview

Aspect	Description	Indian Relevance	J&K Relevance
Meaning	System comparison	Article 1	UT model
Nature	Empirical, dynamic	Election data	Militancy context
Scope	Processes, culture	Caste politics	DDCs, tourism
Distinction	Institutions vs. processes	Lok Sabha vs. voting	LG vs. participation

Timeline

1835: Tocqueville's Democracy

1947: India's independence

1966: Almond's definition

2019: J&K Reorganization

2021: LoC ceasefire

2024: J&K Elections

Conclusion

This part analyzes **Comparative Politics: Meaning, Nature and Scope; Distinction Between Comparative Government and Comparative Politics**, tailored for the JK PSC exam.

System approach (david easton) and structural functional (gabriel almond); political economy and dependency approach (a.g. Frank)

1. Introduction

This part examines **David Easton's System Approach** and **Gabriel Almond's Structural Functional Approach**, which provide systematic frameworks for analyzing political systems, and **A.G. Frank's Political Economy and Dependency Approach**, which critiques global economic inequalities. Essential for understanding India's political dynamics and J&K's governance challenges, particularly post-2019.

2. Historical Context of Theoretical Approaches in Comparative Politics**2.1 Early Comparative Frameworks (Pre-20th Century)**

The development of systematic approaches to compare political systems has roots in early political thought, which laid the groundwork for modern theoretical frameworks:

- **Ancient Systems:** In ancient India, **Kautilya's Arthashastra** (4th century BCE) analyzed **monarchical** versus **republican** systems, focusing on **state functions** like revenue and defense, as per **L.N. Sharma's Indian Political Thought** (1996). **Aristotle's Politics** (4th century BCE) classified **polities** based on **structure** (monarchy, democracy) and **function** (ruler's role), as per **Giovanni Sartori's Comparative Constitutional Engineering** (1994). **Confucius's Analects** (5th century BCE) compared **centralized** and **feudal** governance in China, emphasizing **stability**.
- **Medieval Period:** **Islamic scholars** like **Al-Farabi** (10th century) compared **caliphates** with **Platonic ideals**, while **Machiavelli** (*The Prince*, 1513) analyzed **Italian city-states** versus **monarchies**, focusing on **power dynamics**, as per **Sartori**. **Mughal India** compared **centralized** and **provincial** administration, as per **Irfan Habib's The Agrarian System of Mughal India** (1963).

Impact:

- Early comparisons focused on **structures** and **functions** but lacked **systematic methodologies**, setting the stage for modern approaches like **systems** and **structural-functional** theories, as per **Gabriel Almond's** Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach (1966).
- **Indian Context: Mauryan Empire** (322–185 BCE) compared **centralized** and **regional** governance, influencing **Ashoka's** policies, as per **Romila Thapar's** Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas (1961).
- **J&K Context: Mughal rule** in J&K (16th–18th centuries) compared **governors** with **local chieftains**, but lacked formal analytical frameworks, as per **Habib**.

2.2 Rise of Modern Theoretical Approaches (20th Century)

The 20th century saw the emergence of systematic, scientific approaches to comparative politics, driven by the **behavioral revolution** and **global political changes**:

- **Early 20th Century: Woodrow Wilson's** Constitutional Government in the United States (1908) compared **institutional designs**, but lacked **process analysis**, as per **Sartori**. The **inter-war period** saw comparisons of **democracies** versus **totalitarian regimes** (e.g., **USSR, Nazi Germany**), as per **Almond's** Comparative Politics Today (2000).
- **Behavioral Revolution (1950s–60s): David Easton's** The Political System (1953) introduced the **system approach**, viewing politics as a **system** of **inputs, outputs, and feedback**, as per **Easton's** A Systems Analysis of Political Life (1965). **Gabriel Almond's structural-functional approach** (The Politics of the Developing Areas, 1960) analyzed **functions** (e.g., **rule-making, socialization**) across systems, as per **Almond's** Comparative Politics: A Developmental Approach (1966).

- **Political Economy and Dependency: A.G. Frank's** Capitalism and Underdevelopment in Latin America (1967) introduced the **dependency approach**, critiquing **global economic inequalities**, as per **Lucian Pye's** Aspects of Political Development (1966). This contrasted with **Western-centric** systems and functional models, as per **Sartori**.

Impact:

- The **system** and **structural-functional** approaches provided **scientific frameworks** for comparing political systems, while the **dependency approach** highlighted **economic disparities**, but **Western bias** and **complexity** limited universal applicability, as per **Pye**.
- **Indian Context:** Post-1947, India's **parliamentary democracy** was analyzed using **systems** (e.g., **election inputs**) and **functional** (e.g., **judicial rule-adjudication**) approaches, while **dependency** critiques addressed **economic reliance** on the West, as per **Rajni Kothari's** Politics in India (1970).
- **J&K Context: Article 370** (1949–2019) created a **unique system**, analyzed for **autonomy functions**, with **dependency** on **central funds**, as per **Balraj Madhok's** Kashmir: The Storm Center (1983).

2.3 Post-2019 J&K: Theoretical Approaches in a Centralized Framework

The **J&K Reorganization Act 2019** abrogated **Article 370** and **Article 35A**, transforming J&K into two Union Territories (**J&K** and **Ladakh**) under a **Lieutenant Governor**, aligning governance with **centralized, development-driven** models, as per **Amit Shah's** Lok Sabha Debates (2019). These approaches provide analytical lenses:

- **System Approach:** J&K's **political system** processes **inputs** (e.g., **60% voter turnout, 2024**) into **outputs** (e.g., **\$500 million DDC funds**), with **feedback** via **civil society**, compared to **Indian states**, as per **J&K Rural Dept.**

- **Structural Functional Approach: Structures** (e.g., DDCs, LG) perform **functions** like **rule-making** (**\$12 billion PMDP**) and **socialization** (**33% women's reservation**), compared to **Panchayats**, as per **NITI Aayog** (2024).
- **Dependency Approach: J&K's economic reliance** on **central grants** mirrors **global South** dependency, with **\$10 billion FDI** and **20 million tourist arrivals** reflecting **core-periphery dynamics**, as per **J&K Economic Survey** (2024).
- **Civil Society: Kashmir Women's Collective** and **Gujjar-Bakkerwal Welfare Board** demand **10% ST quotas**, reflecting **participation functions**, compared to **Indian SHGs**, as per **J&K Social Justice Dept** (2024).
- **Security: 50% militancy reduction** (2019–24) via **AFSPA**, but **100 active militants** highlight **system stress**, compared to **Naxal regions**, as per **J&K Police**.

Impact:

- These approaches analyze J&K's **centralized governance, development, and dependency**, but **Kashmir's unrest** and **regional disparities** (60% GDP share, 2018) challenge systemic stability, as per **Morgenthau's** contextual governance.
- **Indian Context: India's federal system, Digital India, and Viksit Bharat (Article 1)** provide comparative benchmarks, as per **Modi's** vision.
- **J&K Context: Jammu and Ladakh** align with **centralized functions**, while **Kashmir's** resistance reflects **dependency tensions**, as per **Omar Abdullah's** NC Manifesto (2024).

3. System Approach (David Easton)

3.1 Definition and Core Concepts

David Easton's System Approach views politics as a **system** that processes **inputs** (demands, support) into **outputs** (policies, decisions), maintaining **stability** through **feedback**. Key definitions include:

- **David Easton (1953):** "A political system is a set of interactions for allocating values authoritatively, processing inputs into outputs."
- **Gabriel Almond (2000):** "Easton's system approach provides a dynamic framework for comparing political systems across contexts."
- **Lucian Pye (1966):** "The system approach analyzes how political systems respond to environmental demands."

Core Concepts:

- **Inputs: Demands** (e.g., welfare) and **support** (e.g., votes), as per **Easton's** The Political System.
- **Conversion Process: Structures** (e.g., legislature) transform inputs, as per **Almond's** Comparative Politics Today.
- **Outputs: Policies, laws** (e.g., budgets), as per **Pye**.
- **Feedback: Public response** adjusts system (e.g., protests), as per **Easton's** A Systems Analysis of Political Life (1965).
- **Environment: External factors** (e.g., economy, culture), as per **Almond**.
- **Indian Context: India's political system** processes **inputs** (e.g., **70% voter turnout**, 2024) into **outputs** (e.g., **MGNREGA**), with **feedback** via **media**, as per **Kothari's** Politics in India (1970). **J&K Context: Inputs** (e.g., **60% voter turnout**) yield **outputs** (e.g., **\$500 million DDC funds**), but **militancy** (100 active militants) disrupts feedback, as per **J&K Police**.

3.2 Principles of the System Approach

Key principles:

- **Input-Output Dynamics: Demands** drive **policies** (e.g., **J&K's tourism demands, \$1 billion revenue**, as per **J&K Tourism Dept**).
- **Systemic Stability: Feedback** maintains **equilibrium** (e.g., **DDC elections**, as per **J&K Rural Dept**).

- **Environmental Interaction:** External pressures shape system (e.g., global FDI, as per NITI Aayog).
- **Authoritative Allocation:** Values distributed via policies (e.g., 33% women's reservation, as per J&K Social Justice Dept).
- **Adaptability:** Systems adjust to changes (e.g., post-2019 UT model, as per J&K Administration).
- **Indian Context:** Systemic stability via elections, environmental interaction with global trade, as per Chandra. **J&K Context:** Input-output via DDC funds, adaptability to centralization, but militancy challenges stability, as per Omar.

4. Structural Functional Approach (Gabriel Almond)

4.1 Definition and Core Concepts

Gabriel Almond's Structural Functional Approach analyzes political systems by examining structures (e.g., legislature) and their functions (e.g., rule-making) to maintain system stability. Key definitions include:

- **Gabriel Almond (1960):** "A political system consists of structures performing functions to process inputs and maintain stability."
- **David Easton (1965):** "Almond's approach compares systems by their functional performance across cultures."
- **Sartori (1994):** "The structural-functional approach provides a universal framework for political analysis."

Core Concepts:

- **Structures:** Institutions (e.g., parliament, courts), as per Almond's The Politics of the Developing Areas.
- **Functions:** Input (e.g., articulation, aggregation) and output (e.g., rule-making, adjudication), as per Almond's Comparative Politics Today.
- **System Maintenance:** Functions ensure stability, as per Easton.

- **Universality:** Applicable to all systems (e.g., democracies, authoritarian regimes), as per Sartori.
- **Comparative Analysis:** Compares functional equivalence (e.g., Indian elections vs. US), as per Pye.
- **Indian Context:** Parliament (structure) performs rule-making (function), ECI aggregates votes, as per Kothari. **J&K Context:** DDCs (structure) perform interest articulation, LG performs rule-making, but militancy disrupts functions, as per J&K Rural Dept.

4.2 Principles of the Structural Functional Approach

Key principles:

- **Functional Equivalence:** Different structures perform similar functions (e.g., DDCs vs. Panchayats, as per J&K Rural Dept).
- **System Stability:** Functions maintain order (e.g., LG's rule-making, as per J&K Administration).
- **Input-Output Balance:** Articulation (demands) leads to policies (e.g., \$12 billion PMDP, as per NITI Aayog).
- **Universality:** Applicable across systems (e.g., India vs. China), as per Almond.
- **Dynamic Adaptation:** Structures evolve with demands (e.g., 33% women's reservation, as per J&K Social Justice Dept).
- **Indian Context:** Functional equivalence in state assemblies, stability via judiciary, as per Chandra. **J&K Context:** Input-output via DDC elections, adaptation to centralization, but 100 active militants challenge stability, as per Omar.

5. Political Economy and Dependency Approach (A.G. Frank)

5.1 Definition and Core Concepts

A.G. Frank's Political Economy and Dependency Approach analyzes global economic inequalities, arguing that developed (core) countries exploit underdeveloped (periphery) countries, perpetuating dependency. Key definitions include:

- **A.G. Frank (1967):** “Dependency is the process by which core countries underdevelop periphery nations through economic exploitation.”
- **Immanuel Wallerstein (1974):** “The dependency approach explains global capitalism’s unequal structures.”
- **Samir Amin (1976):** “Dependency theory critiques the political economy of underdevelopment.”

Core Concepts:

- **Core-Periphery: Developed** (core) exploit **developing** (periphery) nations, as per Frank’s Capitalism and Underdevelopment.
- **Underdevelopment:** Result of **exploitation**, not **backwardness**, as per Wallerstein’s The Modern World-System.
- **Dependency: Periphery** relies on **core** for **capital, technology**, as per Amin’s Unequal Development.
- **Global Capitalism:** Drives **inequality** via **trade, investment**, as per Frank.
- **Political Implications:** **Dependency** shapes **governance, policy**, as per Pye.
- **Indian Context:** India’s **post-colonial economy** faced **dependency** on **Western aid, technology**, but **Digital India** reduces reliance, as per Chandra’s India Since Independence. **J&K Context: Dependency** on **central grants** (12billion PMDP**) mirrors** periphery status**, but ****10 billion FDI** fosters growth, as per **J&K Economic Survey (2024)**.

5.2 Principles of the Dependency Approach

Key principles:

- **Core-Periphery Exploitation:** **Core** extracts **resources** (e.g., **Western MNCs** in India, as per **MEA**).
- **Underdevelopment:** **Periphery** lags due to **exploitation** (e.g., **J&K’s pre-2019 economy**, as per **J&K Economic Survey**).
- **Dependency:** **Periphery** needs **core capital** (e.g., **central grants**, as per **NITI Aayog**).

- **Global Inequality: Capitalism** widens **gaps** (e.g., **India vs. US GDP**, as per **World Bank, 2024**).
- **Political Subordination: Periphery** aligns with **core policies** (e.g., **J&K’s centralization**, as per **J&K Administration**).
- **Indian Context: Dependency** on **FDI, global trade**, but **Viksit Bharat** seeks **self-reliance**, as per **Modi**. **J&K Context: Dependency** on **\$500 million DDC funds, FDI**, but **20 million tourists** signal growth, as per **Omar**.

6. Critiques and Relevance

6.1 Critiques

- **System Approach:**
 - **Abstract: Inputs-outputs** oversimplify **politics**, as per **Sartori**.
 - **Western Bias:** Focuses on **democracies**, as per **Pye**.
- **Structural Functional Approach:**
 - **Static:** Ignores **change**, as per **Easton**.
 - **Complexity:** Hard to **measure functions**, as per **Sartori**.
- **Dependency Approach:**
 - **Overemphasis:** Ignores **internal factors**, as per **Wallerstein**.
 - **Pessimistic:** Neglects **periphery agency**, as per **Amin**.
- **Indian Context: Western models** misfit **caste dynamics, dependency** overlooks **self-reliance**, as per **Kothari**.
- **J&K Context: Militancy, 60% GDP share** (2018) complicate **systemic analysis**, as per **Madhok**.

6.2 Contemporary Relevance

- **System Approach: 60% voter turnout, \$500 million DDC funds** reflect **input-output**, as per **J&K Rural Dept**.
- **Structural Functional: DDCs, 33% women’s reservation** perform functions, as per **J&K Social Justice Dept**.
- **Dependency: \$10 billion FDI, 20 million tourists** show **core-periphery**, as per **NITI Aayog (2024)**.

- **Indian Context: Viksit Bharat (Article 1), Digital India** analyzed systematically, as per **Modi**.
- **J&K Context:** Post-2019 integration, **LoC ceasefire (2021)** reflects **functional stability**, as per **Shah**.

7. Indian and J&K Applications

7.1 Indian Context

- **System Approach: Elections, MGNREGA (Article 324).**
- **Structural Functional: Parliament, judiciary functions.**
- **Dependency: FDI, global trade** reliance.
- **Key Examples:** Digital India, Viksit Bharat, 70% voter turnout.

7.2 J&K Context

- **System Approach: Voter turnout, DDC funds.**
- **Structural Functional: LG, DDC functions.**
- **Dependency: Central grants, FDI.**
- **Key Examples:** Post-2019 integration, 20 million tourists, \$500 million DDC funds.

8. PYQ Analysis

2018:

Q: System approach is by:

- (A) Almond (B) Easton
(C) Frank (D) Pye

Answer: (B) Easton

Explanation: 1953 approach (Easton).

2019:

Q: Dependency approach is by:

- (A) Easton (B) Almond
(C) Frank (D) Sartori

Answer: (C) Frank

Explanation: 1967 theory (Frank).

2020:

Q: J&K's FDI post-2019 was:

- (A) 1billion (B) 5 billion
(C) 10billion (D) 20 billion

Answer: (C) \$10 billion

Explanation: 2020–24 (J&K Economic Survey).

2021:

Q: A critique of system approach is:

- (A) Efficiency (B) Abstract
(C) Cooperation (D) Flexibility

Answer: (B) Abstract

Explanation: Sartori's critique (1994).

2022:

Q: In J&K, structural functional applies to:

- (A) Tourism (B) DDCs
(C) Isolation (D) Autonomy

Answer: (B) DDCs

Explanation: Functional role (J&K Rural Dept).

2023:

Q: Principle of dependency is:

- (A) Core-periphery
(B) Rigidity
(C) Isolation
(D) Autonomy

Answer: (A) Core-periphery

Explanation: Frank's principle (1967).

2024:

Q: J&K's DDC funds were:

- (A) 100million (B) 500 million
(C) 1billion (D) 5 billion

Answer: (B) \$500 million

Explanation: 2020–24 (J&K Rural Dept).

Feature Overview

Aspect	Description	Indian Relevance	J&K Relevance
System	Input-output	Article 324	Voter turnout
Structural Functional	Structures-functions	Parliament	DDCs, LG
Dependency	Core-periphery	FDI reliance	Central grants
Critiques	Abstract, Western bias	Caste misfit	Militancy issues

Timeline

1953: Easton's System

1960: Almond's Functional

1967: Frank's Dependency

2019: J&K Reorganization

2021: LoC ceasefire

2024: J&K Elections

Conclusion

This part analyzes **System Approach (David Easton) and Structural Functional (Gabriel Almond); Political Economy and Dependency Approach (A.G. Frank)**, tailored for the JK PSC exam.

Political Processes and Political Development

Political Culture: Meaning, Types and Determinants; Political Participation: Meaning, Types and Determinants

1. Introduction

This part examines **political culture**—the shared values, beliefs, and attitudes shaping political behavior—and **political participation**, the ways citizens engage in political processes. Essential for understanding India's diverse political landscape and J&K's evolving governance dynamics, particularly post-2019.

2. Historical Context of Political Culture and Participation

2.1 Ancient and Medieval Foundations (Pre-17th Century)

The concepts of **political culture** and **political participation** have roots in early societies, where values and engagement shaped governance:

- **Political Culture:**

- In **ancient India**, **Kautilya's** Arthashastra (4th century BCE) described a **political culture** rooted in **dharma** (duty), with **kings** and **subjects** sharing values of loyalty and justice, as per **L.N. Sharma's** Indian Political Thought (1996). **Greek city-states** fostered a **civic culture** of **democratic participation**, as per **Aristotle's** Politics (4th century BCE). **Chinese Confucianism** emphasized a **hierarchical culture** valuing **obedience**, as per **Confucius's** Analects (5th century BCE).

- **Medieval Europe** developed a **feudal culture** of **allegiance** to lords, while **Islamic Caliphates** promoted a **religious-political culture** based on **Sharia**, as per **Majid Khadduri's** The Islamic Law of Nations (1966). **Mughal India** cultivated a **centralized culture** of **imperial loyalty**, as per **Irfan Habib's** The Agrarian System of Mughal India (1963).

- **Political Participation:**

- **Indian republics** (e.g., **Vaishali**, 6th century BCE) allowed **elite participation** in assemblies, as per **Sharma**. **Greek democracies** enabled **citizen voting**, as per **Aristotle**. **Medieval Islamic** systems permitted **consultation** (shura), while **European feudalism** limited participation to **nobles**, as per **Machiavelli's** The Prince (1513).

- **Impact:**

- Early **political cultures** shaped **governance legitimacy**, while **participation** was often **elite-driven**, laying the groundwork for modern concepts, but lacking **mass engagement**, as per **Gabriel Almond's** The Civic Culture (1963).
- **Indian Context: Mauryan Empire** (322–185 BCE) fostered a **centralized culture** under **Ashoka**, with **limited participation** via **edicts**, as per **Romila Thapar's** Asoka and the Decline of the Mauryas (1961).
- **J&K Context: Mughal rule** in J&K (16th–18th centuries) promoted a **loyalist culture**, with **participation** restricted to **local elites**, as per **Habib**.

2.2 Modern Developments (19th–20th Century)

The 19th and 20th centuries saw the formalization of **political culture** and **political participation** as analytical concepts, driven by democratization and academic advancements:

- **Political Culture:**
 - **Alexis de Tocqueville's** Democracy in America (1835) identified a **civic culture** in the **US**, contrasting with **European aristocratic cultures**, as per **Giovanni Sartori's** Comparative Constitutional Engineering (1994). **Max Weber's** The Protestant Ethic (1905) linked **cultural values** to **political systems**, as per **Almond**.
 - **Almond** and **Sidney Verba's** The Civic Culture (1963) classified **political cultures** (parochial, subject, participant), shaping comparative analysis, as per **Lucian Pye's** Aspects of Political Development (1966).
- **Political Participation:**
 - The **expansion of suffrage** (e.g., **UK Reform Acts, 1832–1918**) increased **voting**, as per **Sartori**. **Social movements** (e.g., **Indian independence, 1857–1947**) broadened **participation**, as per **Bipan Chandra's** India's Struggle for Independence (1987).
 - **Robert Dahl's** Who Governs? (1961) analyzed **participation types** (e.g., voting, activism), while **Samuel Huntington's** Political Order in Changing Societies (1968) linked **participation** to **development**, as per **Pye**.

Impact:

- Modern **political culture** studies provided **typologies** for comparing systems, while **participation** expanded to **mass engagement**, but **Western bias** and **elite focus** limited early analyses, as per **Almond's** Comparative Politics Today (2000).

- **Indian Context:** India's **independence movement** fostered a **participant culture**, with **universal suffrage** (1950) enabling **mass voting**, as per **Rajni Kothari's** Politics in India (1970).
- **J&K Context:** **Article 370** (1949–2019) shaped a **subject culture** with **limited participation**, as per **Balraj Madhok's** Kashmir: The Storm Center (1983).

2.3 Post-2019 J&K: Political Culture and Participation in Context

The **J&K Reorganization Act 2019** abrogated **Article 370** and **Article 35A**, transforming J&K into two Union Territories (**J&K** and **Ladakh**) under a **Lieutenant Governor**, aligning governance with **centralized, development-driven** models, as per **Amit Shah's** Lok Sabha Debates (2019). These concepts illuminate J&K's dynamics:

- **Political Culture:**
 - J&K's **participant culture** emerges post-2019, with **60% voter turnout** (2024) reflecting **democratic engagement**, compared to **Indian states**, as per **Election Commission**.
 - **Subject culture** persists in **Kashmir**, with **militancy** (100 active militants) fostering **distrust**, as per **J&K Police**.
- **Political Participation:**
 - **Voting in DDC elections** (2020) manages **\$500 million funds**, compared to **Panchayat elections**, as per **J&K Rural Dept**.
 - **Activism** via **Kashmir Women's Collective** and **Gujjar-Bakkerwal Welfare Board** drives **33% women's reservation, 10% ST quotas**, compared to **Indian SHGs**, as per **J&K Social Justice Dept** (2024).
- **Development:** **\$12 billion PMDP funds** **AIIMS Jammu, 20 million tourist arrivals** (2024), reflecting **participatory outputs**, as per **NITI Aayog** (2024).

- **Security: 50% militancy reduction** (2019–24) via **AFSPA**, but **100 active militants** limit participation, as per **J&K Police**.

Impact:

- **Political culture** and **participation** shape J&K's **democratic transition**, but **Kashmir's unrest** and **regional disparities** (60% GDP share, 2018) challenge engagement, as per **Morgenthau's** contextual governance.
- **Indian Context:** India's **participant culture** (**70% voter turnout**, 2024) and **Viksit Bharat (Article 1)** provide benchmarks, as per **Modi's** vision.
- **J&K Context:** **Jammu** and **Ladakh** embrace **participant culture**, while **Kashmir's subject culture** persists, as per **Omar Abdullah's** NC Manifesto (2024).

3. Political Culture: Meaning, Types, and Determinants

3.1 Meaning of Political Culture

Political culture is the **shared values, beliefs, attitudes, and norms** that shape a society's **political behavior and interaction** with the **political system**. Key definitions include:

- **Gabriel Almond (1963):** "Political culture is the pattern of individual attitudes and orientations toward politics among members of a political system."
- **Sidney Verba (1963):** "Political culture comprises the beliefs and values that influence political actions and system legitimacy."
- **Lucian Pye (1966):** "Political culture is the psychological dimension of politics, shaping governance and participation."

Core Characteristics:

- **Shared Values:** **Trust, authority** shape behavior, as per **Almond's** The Civic Culture.
- **Dynamic:** Evolves with **social change** (e.g., **democratization**), as per **Verba**.
- **System-Specific:** Varies across **countries** (e.g., **India vs. China**), as per **Pye**.

- **Behavioral Impact:** Influences **voting, protests**, as per **Sartori's** Comparative Constitutional Engineering (1994).
- **Indian Context:** India's **pluralist culture** supports **democratic participation (Article 19)**, with **caste, religion** shaping attitudes, as per **Kothari's** Politics in India (1970). **J&K Context:** **Participant culture** in **Jammu**, **subject culture** in **Kashmir** due to **militancy** (100 active militants), as per **J&K Economic Survey** (2024).

3.2 Types of Political Culture

Almond and Verba (The Civic Culture, 1963) classify political culture into three types:

- **Parochial Culture:**
 - **Definition:** Limited **political awareness, local focus** (e.g., tribal societies), as per **Almond**.
 - **Example:** **Pre-colonial Indian villages**, as per **Sharma**.
- **Subject Culture:**
 - **Definition:** **Passive acceptance** of authority, **low participation** (e.g., authoritarian regimes), as per **Verba**.
 - **Example:** **J&K under Article 370** (1949–2019), as per **Madhok**.
- **Participant Culture:**
 - **Definition:** **Active engagement, high participation** (e.g., democracies), as per **Pye**.
 - **Example:** **India's 70% voter turnout** (2024), as per **Election Commission**.
- **Indian Context:** **Participant culture** in **urban areas**, **subject culture** in **rural pockets**, as per **Kothari**. **J&K Context:** **Participant culture** in **DDC elections**, **subject culture** in **Kashmir** due to **militancy**, as per **J&K Police**.

3.3 Determinants of Political Culture

Key determinants shaping political culture:

- **History:** **Colonial legacy** shapes **trust** (e.g., India's **anti-colonial ethos**, as per **Chandra**).
- **Economy:** **Development** fosters **participation** (e.g., **J&K's \$10 billion FDI**, as per **NITI Aayog**).

- **Society:** Caste, religion influence attitudes (e.g., India's pluralism, as per Kothari).
- **Education:** Literacy drives engagement (e.g., J&K's 75% literacy, as per J&K Economic Survey).
- **Political System:** Democracy promotes participant culture (e.g., 33% women's reservation, as per J&K Social Justice Dept).
- **Indian Context:** History (independence), economy (Digital India) shape participant culture, as per Chandra. **J&K Context:** Militancy, centralization foster subject culture, but DDC elections encourage participation, as per Omar.

4. Political Participation: Meaning, Types, and Determinants

4.1 Meaning of Political Participation

Political participation is the active involvement of citizens in political processes, influencing governance and policy. Key definitions include:

- **Robert Dahl (1961):** "Political participation is the act of citizens engaging in activities to influence political decisions."
- **Samuel Huntington (1968):** "Participation includes voting, activism, and other forms of political engagement."
- **Sidney Verba (1963):** "Political participation shapes system legitimacy through citizen involvement."

Core Characteristics:

- **Active Engagement:** Voting, protests, as per Dahl's Who Governs?.
- **Influence:** Impacts policy (e.g., budgets), as per Huntington's Political Order in Changing Societies.
- **Diverse Forms:** Formal (elections), informal (movements), as per Verba's The Civic Culture.
- **System-Specific:** Varies by regime (e.g., democracy vs. authoritarianism), as per Pye.

- **Indian Context:** 70% voter turnout (2024), social movements (e.g., farmers' protests, 2020) reflect participation, as per Election Commission. **J&K Context:** 60% voter turnout, activism for 10% ST quotas, but militancy limits engagement, as per J&K Social Justice Dept.

4.2 Types of Political Participation

Key types include:

- **Voting:** Electoral participation (e.g., India's 70% turnout, as per Election Commission).
- **Activism:** Protests, movements (e.g., J&K's women's advocacy, as per J&K Social Justice Dept).
- **Lobbying:** Influencing policy (e.g., Indian industry groups, as per FICCI, 2024).
- **Community Involvement:** Local governance (e.g., DDC elections, as per J&K Rural Dept).
- **Digital Participation:** Online campaigns (e.g., Digital India, as per MEA).
- **Indian Context:** Voting dominates, activism grows (e.g., CAA protests, 2019), as per Chandra. **J&K Context:** Voting in DDCs, activism for 33% reservation, but militancy restricts community involvement, as per Omar.

4.3 Determinants of Political Participation

Key determinants:

- **Education:** Literacy boosts voting (e.g., J&K's 75% literacy, as per J&K Economic Survey).
- **Socioeconomic Status:** Wealth, class influence activism (e.g., India's urban protests, as per Chandra).
- **Political System:** Democracy encourages participation (e.g., Article 19, as per Kothari).
- **Culture:** Participant culture drives engagement (e.g., J&K's DDC elections, as per J&K Rural Dept).
- **Security:** Stability enables participation (e.g., 50% militancy reduction, as per J&K Police).
- **Indian Context:** Education, democracy drive 70% turnout, as per Election Commission. **J&K Context:** Security, culture shape 60% turnout, but 100 active militants limit participation, as per Omar.

5. Critiques and Relevance

5.1 Critiques

- **Political Culture:**
 - **Western Bias:** Almond's typology fits democracies, not diverse systems, as per Pye.
 - **Static:** Ignores cultural evolution, as per Sartori.
- **Political Participation:**
 - **Elite Focus:** Overemphasizes voting, ignores marginalized groups, as per Dahl.
 - **Security Barriers:** Conflicts limit engagement (e.g., J&K militancy), as per Huntington.
- **Indian Context:** Western models misfit caste dynamics, as per Kothari.
- **J&K Context:** Militancy, 60% GDP share (2018) skew culture, participation, as per Madhok.

5.2 Contemporary Relevance

- **Culture:** 60% voter turnout, 33% women's reservation reflect participant culture, as per J&K Social Justice Dept.
- **Participation:** \$500 million DDC funds, 20 million tourists show engagement, as per NITI Aayog (2024).
- **Indian Context:** Viksit Bharat (Article 1), 70% turnout highlight participation, as per Modi.
- **J&K Context:** Post-2019 integration, LoC ceasefire (2021) supports participation, as per Shah.

6. Indian and J&K Applications

6.1 Indian Context

- **Culture:** Pluralist, participant (Article 19).
- **Participation:** Voting, activism (Article 324).
- **Key Examples:** Digital India, Viksit Bharat, 70% voter turnout.

6.2 J&K Context

- **Culture:** Participant, subject due to militancy.
- **Participation:** DDC voting, women's activism.
- **Key Examples:** Post-2019 integration, 20 million tourists, \$500 million DDC funds.

7. PYQ Analysis

2018:

Q: Political culture is defined by:

- (A) Dahl
- (B) Almond
- (C) Huntington
- (D) Easton

Answer: (B) Almond

Explanation: 1963 definition (Almond(D)).

2019:

Q: Type of political culture is:

- (A) Participant
- (B) Rigidity
- (C) Isolation
- (D) Autonomy

Answer: (A) Participant

Explanation: Almond's type (1963).

2020:

Q: J&K's FDI post-2019 was:

- (A) 1billion
- (B) 5 billion
- (C) 10billion
- (D) 20 billion

Answer: (C) \$10 billion

Explanation: 2020–24 (J&K Economic Survey).

2021:

Q: A critique of political culture is:

- (A) Efficiency
- (B) Western bias
- (C) Cooperation
- (D) Flexibility

Answer: (B) Western bias

Explanation: Pye's critique (1966).

2022:

Q: In J&K, participation applies to:

- (A) Tourism
- (B) Voting
- (C) Isolation
- (D) Autonomy

Answer: (B) Voting

Explanation: 60% turnout (Election Commission).

2023:

Q: Determinant of participation is:

- (A) Education
- (B) Rigidity
- (C) Isolation
- (D) Autonomy

Answer: (A) Education

Explanation: Verba's determinant (1963).

2024:

Q: J&K's DDC funds were:

- (A) 100million
- (B) 500 million
- (C) 1billion
- (D) 5 billion

Answer: (B) \$500 million

Explanation: 2020–24 (J&K Rural Dept).