

SOCIOLOGY 315

FINAL EXAM

Joseph Diaz
5-11-82
Dr. Bush

Question #1- Describe, compare, and contrast the mass-elite, pluralist, power elite and Marxist theories on the state and political power.

The mass elite theories of power and the state arose at the turn of the last century, primarily as a response to the democratization of the political process, and also to the rising interest in socialism. Within the classical mass-elite paradigm, there are two crucial theorists, Mosca and Pareto. Both theorists suggest that there are two groups which exist in society. On the one hand there exist the elite. This group is composed of those who govern or are powerful. On the other hand, there exists those who simply don't have any power and who don't govern. According to Pareto, elites are universal; that is, they are found in every society. It is within the nature of humanity that there exist individuals who are naturally superior in some senses, and this group, according to Pareto, constitutes the elite in any given society. Pareto attempted to define the elite as those who were superior on certain indexes of measurement, such as the amount of wealth a person had. The distinction between the elite and the non-elite can be ^{further} characterized on the basis of ability. Pareto further elaborated on this by introducing the concepts of residues and sentiments. These are certain kinds of psychological forces that a person has. According to Pareto, the elite have more residues than others do, particularly when it comes to morality and intelligence. This gives them, in turn, a general capacity to rule. Thus, it is within the nature of this group to rule, and this is good, because the elite are somehow naturally superior at doing so. Mosca's model of the elite is very similar to Pareto's, but a bit more complex in some respects. For him, there ^{also} exist in every society elites and non-elites. The distinction ^{between} of the two is that the elite is composed of the most talented individuals in a given society. Where Mosca differs from Pareto is in the way elites are circulated and the re-

relationship between this and organizational and institutional factors. Generally, Mosca is concerned more with the interaction between social change and the movement between certain sub-stratum (primarily those groups of people who Mosca sees as being in between the elite and the non-elite), into the elite category. According to Mosca, social changes will lead to the emergence of new social groups or classes, and as they become more important because of this social change, they will constitute a new elite. Using contemporary terminology, this new elite can be thought of as the bureaucratic middle class. These are people who occupy administrative, technological or scientific positions in government or bureaucracies. As the new elite emerges, the old elite remains, but its influence and control, especially of the government, diminishes. The new middle class, in turn, has two main functions. First, it comprises the new elite, which is a preferable state of affairs, because it governs on the basis of rationality, using a cost-benefit analysis. Secondly, the new middle class provides a buffer group between the elite and the masses. Thus, this new elite provides protection and stability to those on top. Finally, in Mosca's theory, an elite does not simply rule by force and fraud, but represents, in some sense, the interests and purposes of important and influential groups in society. Turning to modern American versions of mass elite theory, two contemporary theorists who use similar versions of this model are Kornhauser and Bell. According to Kornhauser, author of Mass Society, in order to keep modern industrial society from falling into the pits of communism or fascism, one must keep the democratic process alive. The reason for this is because the masses have to learn the democratic process; it does not occur naturally, but it is learned according to de Tocqueville, with great difficulty. Kornhauser suggests that the democratic process be kept alive through the formation of secondary or voluntary associations. These associations would in turn provide stability for the society by keeping the people involved.

Because these secondary associations would teach the principles of democratic involvement, they would further aid in keeping the people from getting angry at the government, supposedly, because membership in these associations would keep the people happy, and the people would learn how to use the possible channels of communication open to them, by forming interest groups to pressure the elite into listening to their demands. Thus, secondary associations, for Kornhauser would provide the masses with ways and means with which to participate and be heard by the elite. In contrast to Kornhauser's theory, Daniel Bell has a much more complex variation of mass elite theory. In his book, The Coming of the Post Industrial Society, Bell argues that the rising middle class or the new bureaucratic elite, has affected politics, power and the role of the state. In his work he provides a conceptual schema which entails selecting a theme or axial principle around which social organization evolves. As history moves along, different axial principles exist at different times, and along with this, political power also changes. In Bell's analysis of modern western society, there are three important axial components. First, there exists the social structure. In this component, economizing or maximizing the main principles around which the social structure is organized is what is important. Secondly, there exists the polity. The axial principle for this component is participation. The polity regulates the distribution of power and adjudicates claims in regards to power. Finally, the last component is that of culture. The axial principle for it is fulfillment, — the expressive component of society. In the study of the post industrial society, the most important component of the above three is the social structure. According to Bell, the major source of structural change in society- the change in the modes of innovation, in the relation of science to technology and in public policy- is the change in the character of knowledge. He cites three major changes which occurred in U.S. society, especially after World War II that have caused this structural change to occur. First, the transformation of the industrial enter-

prise has occurred through the emergence of corporate managers as controllers of individual organizations. Managers, according to Bell, are now the new captains of industry. Secondly, there has occurred a changing in the composition of the occupational structure. There has been a relative shrinkage of classic blue collar industrial workers, and an expansion of technical, professional, and most importantly, service oriented workers. Thirdly, transformation of the political system has taken place through the extension of state bureaucracies, on one hand, and on the other, the rise of a political technocracy. Power has changed to that based on technological knowledge, skill, expertise, and rationality. In the post industrial society, technological decision making becomes the key of politics. In other words, a major shift in post industrial society has taken place; and that shift is one from a society in which political power was intertwined with economic power, to one in which political power is based on technological knowhow. Supposedly, in the post industrial society, political power becomes much more accessible in many ways and more susceptible to changes. For Bell, elites still exist in society, but their positions are based now on merit and knowledge, rather than on sole economic power. Thus, there is no necessary continuity of power of a specific social group.

Turning to pluralist theories of the state and its views of political power, there are several theorists, notably Dahl, Lowi, and Rose, that were discussed in lecture and the reading. American pluralist theory is based on the concept that our society is one in which there are no clear cut class divisions, but a variety of competing groups and interests. The political system, under the pluralist model, is seen as an arena in which various groups in society carry on a process of competition and bargaining, with no one group being able to establish too much control of the arena. Control of the state is thus dispersed as groups act as checks against each other. The state in this model, is seen as a basically neutral institution, whose function it is to

mediate between the competing groups, and to register the outcome of the process of political competition and bargaining. The policy decisions that come from the state are thus a reflection of the shifting coalitions that are formed among the competing groups around each political issue. A central assumption of this theory is that no one group dominates, and that all significant groups in society are able to affect the political process somewhere along the line by organizing themselves and following the rules of the political game. Rose, in his book, Political Process in American Society, offers a variation of mainstream pluralist theory, by conceding that there do exist political elites, but that these elites have no outright dominance in the system. In his multi-influence hypothesis, Rose states that society consists of many elites, each relatively small numerically and operating in different spheres of life, and of the bulk of the population classifiable into organized groups and publics as well as masses. Among the elites are several who have their power through economic controls, several others who have power through political controls, and still others who have power through military, associational, religious or other controls. While it is true that there are inert masses of undifferentiated individuals without access to each other and therefore without influence, the bulk of the population consists not of the mass but of integrated groups and publics, stratified with varying degrees of power. Rose further states that the multi influence hypothesis holds that each social change or decision in society or in politics occurs in a matrix of social forces and social resistances, of cultural elements and social structures, only some of which can be deliberately controlled or manipulated by elites. To summarize Rose's position, first of all, there are many power elites, each of which is somewhat specialized in the area in which it exercises its influence, and secondly, power elites interlock only temporarily and on limited types of issues, with some issues being determined in a democratic fashion by the voting public when it occasionally mobilizes itself with interest and action

on those issues. Criticisms of pluralist theory most often center around the separation of the normative from the empirical. In this theory the two become so intertwined that it becomes difficult to separate reality from what ought to be. Gamson, for one, has studied entry into the political arena by differing groups in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and he concluded that not all interest groups have equal access to the arena, and that the state is not necessarily a neutral institution. Other critics have argued that very often the elite in society do in fact coalesce to make it quite impossible for other groups to be heard and effective. This brings us to power elite theory, whose most notable advocates are C. Wright Mills and G. William Domhoff.

According to Mills, the United States is essentially a mass society in which powerful interests play a role, but in which they are largely unresponsive to public will. His main thesis is that American society has become increasingly dominated by the heads of three large bureaucratic hierarchies: the corporations, the executive branch of government, and the military. Mills sees these three branches as at least partly autonomous, but also tightly interlocked, with the corporate sector of the elite as the most powerful. While Mills does not directly deal with the question of clashes of interests and their resolution, the implication of his analysis is that the corporations are regularly able to secure their interests through their extensive control of the state. Because the power elite has all the resources to do this they are successful at quelling opposition, mainly because other groups lack the vital resources to do battle with them. In addition to Mills' work on the power elite, Domhoff has provided a variation of this approach by attaching central importance to an upper social class which controls the various components of the power elite, primarily through the placement of some of its members in key positions, but also through the formation of high level policy-planning associations and the manipulation of public opinion. In his book, The Powers That Be, Domhoff goes through great pains to

describe for the reader just exactly where this power elite comes from, what its associations are, and how it trains its members to function within the framework of the power it holds. Domhoff further describes different groups or committees that are essentially composed of this elite, and how they affect such issues as foreign policy, national policy, and public opinion. Specifically, Domhoff cites four general processes through which economically and politically active members of the ruling class, working with the aid of highly trained and carefully selected employees, are able to dominate the U.S. at all levels. The first process cited by Domhoff is what he calls the special interest process. This comprises the various means utilized by wealthy individuals, specific corporations and specific sectors of the economy in influencing government to satisfy their narrow short-run needs. The second process is called the policy formation process, which is the means by which general policies of interest to the ruling class as a whole are developed and implemented. The third process, the candidate selection process, has to do with the ways members of the ruling class ensure that they have "access" to the politicians who are elected to office. Finally, the ideology process involves the formation, dissemination and enforcement of the assumptions, beliefs and attitudes that permit the continued existence of policies and politicians favorable to the wealth, income, status and privileges of members of the ruling class. The crucial difference in Domhoff's characterization of the ruling elite from that of Mills' is that Mills does not place that much emphasis on the power elite as a class, whereas Domhoff does. In The Powers That Be, Domhoff asserts, "I believe most political and economic problems in the United States must be understood in terms of the conflicts and compromises between the interests of the two basic social classes that are rooted in the social organization of production. Those two classes are the ruling class, which owns and manages the major business enterprises, and the working class, which owns no income-producing property." While Mills' elitist perspective, according to Domhoff, turns attention toward the organizational interests

of large scale bureaucratic institutions, Domhoff prefers to call his view the class-hegemony paradigm, which stresses the need to understand classes in relationship to one another. Domhoff emphasizes the importance of understanding and learning about the ruling class because it is the main instigator of action. Critics of the power elite view have attacked Mill's and Domhoff's analysis, primarily by asserting either that power among the elites is dispersed, as Rose would contend, or that a managerial revolution has occurred in which power in large corporations has passed from the families of wealth to the managers of the companies. This idea stems from Bell's thesis in his work, The Post-Industrial Society. Advocates of the managerial revolution thesis include Burnham, Berle and Means. These theorists have attempted to document the extent to which control of large corporations has indeed passed from the owners to the managers. However, others have contended that methodologically, the studies done by these people have serious shortcomings. Among these include the use of the Fortune 500 list of corporations and the use of Security Exchange Commission records, which do not take into account corporations which are under family control. Other critics of the managerial revolution thesis contend that the interests of managers are not necessarily the interests of the public, but the interests of the owners. Therefore, little change has taken place in terms of control and policy in the corporations.

In the Marxist views of the state and political power, basic divisions of interest are perceived as following class lines. Classes, in turn, are defined by the relationships that people have to the means and the process of production; capitalists own the means of production and hire the labor power; workers do not own the means of production and sell their labor power; the petty bourgeoisie rely for their living primarily on their own power. For Marxists, classes are seen as providing the most fundamental definitions of people's interests in society, whether or not those interests are directly perceived by members of that class. Thus, Capitalists have an interest

in keeping wages low, in keeping all the profits, and ultimately in maintaining class society, whereas the interests of the workers are in direct opposition to those of the capitalists. Among Marxist analysts, there is general agreement that the state in capitalist society serves the interests of capitalists as a class, and is not a neutral arbiter of the interest group process. Beyond this, however Marxist theorists disagree on several issues. The first area of disagreement has to do with the degree to which the state is directly controlled by the capitalist class. In the instrumentalist position, the state is seen as an instrument of the ruling class, to be manipulated at will in pursuit of their interests. Miliband contends that the state is concerned with serving the general class interests of capitalists, and ultimately, in ensuring the existence of a class society, although it will serve particular interests where doing so does not contradict the broader aim. The instrumentalist position also contends that capitalists, because of their great command of resources, are able to use those resources to exercise strong influence through the interest group process, that they exercise control over the ideological processes of the society, such as the media, and that capitalists often exercise control over the political process by placing members of their own class in key political positions. In contrast to the instrumentalist view,¹¹ the structuralist perspective, advocated by Poulantzas, O'Connor, and Block, the relation between the capitalist class and the state is an objective one, meaning that if the function of the state in a determinate social formation and the interests of the dominant class coincide, it is because of the set-up of the whole system.; the direct participation of members of the ruling class in the State is not the cause but the effect of this coincidence. This perspective begins from an analysis of functional relationships in the society and seeks to demonstrate that the very function of the state is to serve the general interest of the dominant class, by creating unity among the capitalist class and disunity among workers. Specifically, O'Connor and Block suggest that the actions of the state correspond to the

interest of capitalists because the interests of the state itself correspond to those of capitalists. Accordingly, the state under capitalism, must identify with the interests of capitalists, because to do otherwise would imperil the state of the economy through loss of confidence on the part of investors. If the economy were to decline, the state would suffer because tax revenues which are the State's main resources, would be cut off by the hardship produced. Structuralists also argue that the interests of the capitalists class are not all that cohesive, and that the State cannot directly serve their interests because it would be very difficult to legitimate the State, which is very crucial to the process of accumulation. Thus, to use Block's terminology, the State is relatively autonomous, because it has to fulfill both functions. Finally, in addition to the above ideas on structuralist and instrumentalist variations of Marxist theory, Wright adds several variables to the general paradigm. First, he introduces another class, and that is that of management. This group consists of those who have control or authority in the workplace, but it doesn't own the means of production, nor can it purchase the labor power of others. However it does control the labor power of the workers, and in addition, it sells its own labor power. Wright also distinguishes between immediate class interests, those which are important in the short run, and fundamental interests, those which are long term and which go along all interests.

In conclusion, the different theories discussed all make certain crucial assumptions about power and the state. Normatively, pluralists, power elite theorists, and Marxists would all be in favor of a democratic state, whereas mass elite theorists would be in favor of a ruling elite. Where all theories differ is in what and how they choose to view society and the relationships they see as important in reaching their theoretical conclusions.

Question #2- Discuss ideology, the role it plays in political processes, and suggest how theorists from the four theoretical traditions might view ideology.

In any democratic state, one of its major functions is to legitimate itself. Generally, ideology refers to a set of beliefs about the rightness of certain social or political arrangements, and what action would be taken in light of those beliefs. The State, according to some theorists, uses ideology to instill the belief in its citizenry that the social or political arrangements of that society are the best. In other words, ideology serves as a tool in the legitimation of the state. Usually, the creators of ideology are those in the government, or those in power. There exist numerous methods for enforcing a given ideology; among them include the stressing of universality and national interests by the heads of state, and through certain types of ideological messengers, which use different types of ideological networks, such as television, to communicate the ideology to the masses. Usually, the ideological process of a system occurs in a downward flow through the social system, from the heads of State to the lower classes. The four theoretical perspectives view ideology in somewhat different ways. For Pluralists, belief in and support for a social and political system is rooted ultimately in value consensus. Thus, legitimation of the State occurs because value consensus exists within the given society over the system at hand. Therefore, a political ideology, in the pluralist view, is a logically coherent system, apparently in the interests of everyone. Ideology, in the pluralists view, revolves around persuasion or opinion formation, and it is accepted because it makes sense. American pluralist ideology, in content, places a good deal of emphasis on the individual. The individual is ultimately responsible for his/her actions and is essentially an individual with a free will. Emphasis is usually placed on the actions of individual citizens. For example, Richard Nixon was seen as a misguided individual who went over the boundaries of the legitimate American system. In the pluralist ideology,

social and political institutions are seen as neutral, as is the mass media. Within these systems there exists, according to the pluralists, accommodation for change, in ways that keep them neutral, with emphasis on individual responsibility and action. According to Apter and Lipset, there exists equal access to all in the pluralist system, and it is up to individuals to make themselves heard. People who are dissatisfied with the pluralist system are seen as being deviant in some sense. This is exemplified in the notion of working class authoritarianism, where, again, any fault that arises comes about because the individual is at fault, not the system.

Within the mass-elite paradigm, ideology is seen as a powerful tool for manipulating the masses. The acceptance by the masses of a given ideology legitimates the system. Ideology is created by the elite, who use their training and knowledge to pass it on in a vertical flow downward to the masses. The masses, in turn, accept the ideology, because it makes sense, and because it has been delivered by "experts". Bell, who has been characterized as a mass-elite theorist, has argued that the age of ideology has ended. This is so because now that science and technology rule, there is no need for ideology. Ideology has often been characterized as a utopian, irrational belief system, and for Bell, the rationality and truth of science and technology, have simply taken over. For mass-elite theorists in general, ideology is very important because it plays such a crucial role in the legitimation process. Within a mass-elite society, the masses must ^{be made to} believe that the social and political system under which they are ruled is legitimate, or else uprisings would occur.

In the power-elite paradigm, ideology is also a powerful tool for controlling politics and the state. The power elite dominates by consciously manipulating the values and attitudes of society in their own interests. Domhoff describes a number of institutions which create ideologies which legitimate the interests of the power elite. According to Domhoff, "in order

to prevent the development of attitudes and opinions contrary to the interests of the ruling class, leaders within the ideology process attempt to build upon and reinforce the underlying principles of the American system. The principles of laissez-faire liberalism emphasize individualism, free enterprise, competition, equality of opportunity, and a minimal reliance on government in carrying out the affairs of society." Popularly speaking these principles are known as "Americanism", the complex set of rationales and rationalizations through which Americans interpret the world and justify their role within it. The power elite instills the American ideology through a complex network of policy formation which runs through all the institutions of American society including the school systems, churches, and voluntary associations, such as the Boy Scouts. Finally, " the attempt to enforce an ideological consensus is carried out in a variety of ways that include intimidation, pressure and violence. Those who are outspoken in their challenge to one or another of the main tenets of the American ideology may be dealt with a number of negative sanctions, ranging from being fired from their jobs to being harrassed and spied upon by government agencies."

The Marxist view of ideology is very similar to that of the power-elite. Gramsci, an Italian Marxist, coined the term hegemony, which describes the way in which the ruling class consciously manipulates the masses through the use of ideology. It is a form of domination that doesn't really look like it. Within the hegemonic process, the ruling class limits the consciousness of people by limiting alternative modes of thought and information. In his book, The Whole World Is Watching, Gitlin describes the way the media in America was consciously manipulated by those in power during the Vietnam War and the student uprisings of the sixties. According to Gitlin, "hegemonic ideology enters into everything people do and think is "natural"- making a living, loving playing, believing, knowing, even rebelling. In every sphere of social activity, it meshes with the common sense through which people make the world seem intelligible, it tries to become that common sense. Sometimes the

hegemonic ideology shifts to a certain degree as the desires and strategies of the top institutions shift, and as different coalitions form among the dominant social groups; in turn, these desires and strategies are modified, moderated by popular currents. In corporate capitalist society, the schools and the mass media specialize in formulating and conveying the national ideology." An example of the way the media does this is through the use of media frames, which are persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation and presentation, of selection, emphasis, and exclusion, by which symbol handlers routinely organize discourse, whether verbal or visual.

A

Question #3- How does political alienation come about according to various theories? What are the implications of alienation for political systems?

In answering the above question, I shall cite Blauner's work on alienation in the work place. In his work, Blauner discusses four types of alienation: powerlessness, meaninglessness, isolation, and self estrangement. Basic to each one is the notion of fragmentation in man's existence and consciousness which impedes the wholeness of experience and activity. The split in man's existence and consciousness into subject and object underlies the idea of powerlessness. A person is powerless when he is an object controlled and manipulated by other persons or by an impersonal system and when he cannot assert himself as a subject to change or modify this domination. The non-alienated pole of the powerlessness dimension is the state of freedom and control. Meaninglessness alienation reflects a split between the part and the whole. A person experiences alienation of this type when his individual acts seem to have no relation to a broader life-program. Meaninglessness also occurs when individual roles are not seen as fitting into the total system of goals of the organization but have become severed from any organic connection with the whole. The non-alienated state is understanding of a life-plan or of an organization's functioning and activity which is purposeful rather than meaningless. Isolation results from a fragmentation of the individual and social components of human behavior and motivation. Isolation suggests the idea of general societal alienation, the feeling of being in, but not of, society, a sense of remoteness from the larger social order, an absence of loyalties to intermediate activities. The non-alienated opposite of isolation is a sense of belonging and membership in society or in specific communities which are integrated through the sharing of a normative system. Finally, self estrangement is based on a rupture in the temporal continuity of experience. When activity becomes a means to an end, rather than an end in itself, a heightened awareness of time results from a split between present engagements

and future considerations. Activity which is not self estranged, but self expressive or self actualizing, is characterized by involvement in the present time context. Self estrangement also entails a separation between work life and other concerns. When work is self estranging, occupation does not contribute to personal identity and selfhood, but instead is damaging to self esteem. In sum, a person is more likely to be used as an object under these conditions; 1) when he is powerless and lacks control, 2) when his role is so specialized that he becomes a cog in an organization; 3) when he is isolated from a community or network of personal relations which would inhibit impersonal treatment. The result of being a means for the ends of others is that for himself, his own activity becomes only a means rather than a fulfilling end. (All the above has been taken from Blauner's work, Alienation and Freedom).

Translating all the above components into political alienation and how the different theorists view it seems rather easy. In the pluralist view, alienation is not a normatively acceptable state, because pluralists see the political arena as being open to everyone, if a person is alienated it is because he hasn't gone through the proper channels of participation. Again, as was emphasized earlier, great importance is placed on the individual and individual action. If a person feels alienated, in the pluralist view, it is because of some psychological state within the individual, and not the fault of the political system. In the mass elite view, again alienation is not a preferable state. According to Kornhauser, "people become available for mobilization by elites when they lack or lose an independent group life... The lack of autonomous relationships generates widespread social alienation.

Alienation heightens responsiveness to the appeal of mass movements because they provide occasions for expressing resentment against what is, as well as promises for a totally different world. In short, people who are atomized readily become mobilized. Since totalitarianism is a state of total mobilization, mass society is highly vulnerable to totalitarian movements and regimes!

The power-elite view of alienation is a bit more difficult to describe. However, failure to legitimate the social system through the use of ideology seems to be the means by which alienation arises in the power elite paradigm. For the power-elite as a group, this is a very dangerous process. This is so, because alienation may lead to the questioning of the legitimacy of the system, and ultimately to the overthrow of the power elite. In the Marxists view, alienation is a product of the relation the worker has to his job, and the relationship he has to private property and accumulation. Alienation can serve to either keep the workers immobile or it can serve to raise their consciousness, depending on the historical circumstances, and whether there exists a vanguard group which would help raise the level of consciousness of the workers, and lead the revolution against the capitalists. The Marxist solution for alienation is communism, or the working together of the people collectively in the pursuit of common goals.

A

How does violence fit with political processes in the democratic state?

Distinguish between violence on the part of authorities and violence on the part of other social groups, and discuss how theorists from the four traditions might analyze violence.

Violence, in sociological terms is an essentially contested concept, that is nobody agrees as to what it is exactly. However, it can generally be characterized as the intended injury of people or property, regardless of who is doing the injury, and who is injured. Theoretically, in a democratic state, violence should never occur, because a pluralist society is based on value consensus. However, when ideology fails to legitimate the state and a high degree of alienation occurs, the state may be compelled to use violence. In his definition of the State, Max Weber states that a State claims the monopoly of the legitimate use of violence in order to preserve law and order. Other theorists, such as Parsons and Kornhauser also agree that the State should have the right to use violence. Another theorist, Alan Wolfe, argues that repression is an integral part of the theory of liberalism. "The existence of repression in practice flows from the fact that liberalism promises people power over their lives, but capitalism takes it away!" Although repression and violence are not synonymous, Wolfe argues that violence is but one form of repression that the democratic state uses in legitimating itself. In his analysis of the State Wolfe puts forth several propositions regarding the use of repression by the State, the primary one being that, other things being equal, in any conflict between privileged groups and those challenging those privileges, the state will support the former. Thus, the State according to Wolfe, acts in the interests of the ruling class, using repression as one of its means to achieve control. In pluralist theory, violence is not normatively prefferable, either by the State or by challenging groups, primarily because society is supposed to be based on value consensus. Authorities, however reserve the right to resort to violence if that group that challenges it endangers the lives of innocent citizens. In the mass-elite paradigm, the State

claims the legitimate use of violence, because according to Kornhauser, mass movements are usually based on sentiment, and the State must have some means to keep control. In the power elite view, the dominant class must keep its own ideology dominant, and therefore, it also reserves its right to use violence to crush any opposition. In the Marxist view, violence on the part of the capitalists class and the State does occur, but its use creates a very strong threat to the legitimacy it seeks to preserve. A central problem for any State that uses violence is legitimacy. Increasing use of violence tends to illegitimate the State. Very often, as in our own society, the State uses indirect or covert means to quiet the opposition. Examples of this are the use of different kinds of laws which threaten the civil liberties of different groups. In The Seamy Side of Democracy, Wolfe documents instances in which the U.S.A. used direct and indirect means of repression against the I.W.W. in the early part of this century, and more recently against the Black Panther Party. When a challenging group questions the State and violence does occur, the State is usually the instigator; however, through the use of the media, and through the use of other means, The State usually blames the challenging group for causing any trouble. This was the case in the Kent State killings that took place in 1970.

A

(A)