

Global Journal of Arts Humanity and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2583-2034
Abbreviated key title: Glob.J.Arts.Humanit.Soc.Sci
Frequency: Monthly
Published By GSAR Publishers
Journal Homepage Link: <https://gsarpublishers.com/journal-gjahss-home/>

Volume - 6 | Issue - 2 | February 2026 | Total pages 172-177 | DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18693110

Power, Society, Social Life, Social Structure and their Changing ways in Nepal.

By

*¹Dr. Mana Hari Dhakal, *²Amrit Dhakal., *³Ishwori Dhakal

¹Central Dept.Sociology Kathmandu Nepal.

²Management Surkhet Model Collage Surkhet Nepal.

³Engineer BNM Surkhet Nepal.



Abstract

Power is mysterious and come from everywhere. Society, Social Life, Social Structure and their Changing ways in Nepali Context interesting, researchable. Society, Social structure means framework of certain community society. It is sometimes defined simply as patterned of social relations. Social structure identifies certain society's rules attitudes and norms. In society, there are regular and repetitive aspects of the interactions between the members of a given social setting and entity. Even on this descriptive level, the concept is highly abstract. It selects only certain elements from ongoing social activities. The larger the social entity considered, the more abstract the concept tends to be. For this reason, the social structure of a small group is generally more closely related to the daily activities of its individual family members than is the social structure of a larger society. Social life is structured along the dimensions of time period and space. Specific social activities connected with the rhythms of social life the routines of the day, the month, and the year. Specific social activities are also organized at specific places.

Keywords: Society, Social life and Structure, Change, changing, Context.

Article History

Received: 05- 02- 2026

Accepted: 14- 02- 2026

Published: 16- 02- 2026

Corresponding author

Dr. Mana Hari Dhakal

Introduction

Social Structure means framework of society. In social science and sociology, the distinctive, stable arrangement of institutions whereby human beings in a society interact and live together. Social structure is often treated together with the concept of social changing pattern in certain territory which deals with the forces that change the social structure and the organization of society. Although it is generally agreed that the term *social structure* refers to regularities in social life. Studies of social structure attempt to explain such matters as integration and trends in inequality. In the study of these phenomena, sociologists analyze organizations, social categories. This approach, sometimes called formal sociology, does not refer directly to individual behavior or interpersonal interaction. Therefore, the study of social structure is not considered a behavioral science; at this level, the analysis is too abstract. It is a step removed from the consideration of concrete human even though the phenomena studied in social structure result from humans responding to each other and to their environment. Before these different theoretical views can be

discussed, however, some remarks must be made on the general aspects of the social structure of any society. Social life is structured along the dimensions of time and space. Specific social activities take place at specific times, and time is divided into periods that are connected with the rhythms of social life—the routines of the day, the month, and the year. Specific social activities are also organized at specific places; particular places, for instance, are designated for such activities as working, worshipping, eating, and sleeping. Territorial boundaries these places and are defined by rules of property that determine the use and possession of scarce goods. Additionally, in any society there is a more or less regular. Yet another universal structural characteristic of human societies is the regulation of domination. All domination and violence is a potentially disruptive force; at the same time, it is a means of coercion and coordination of activities. Human beings have formed political sector or units, such as nations, within which the use of dominance, violence is strictly regulated and which, at the same time, are organized for the use of violence against outside groups.



Methodology

This article adopts qualitative socio cultural and historical approach and using interdisciplinary secondary sources. Society means special to territorial groups. Descriptive and explorative Specially in the study of larger social groups and inter connecting the problem of power is acute take place at specific times. a group of interdependent plants or animals growing or living together in natural conditions a specified habitat. The subject and power, social structure Power of Karl Marx used construction as a metaphor when he spoke of "the Economic structure of society, the real basis on which is power and relations of power. A formal legal authorized and positional political power superstructure and to which definite forms of social attitude norms and behave of individual as power." Thus, according to Marx, the basic structure of society is economic, or material, and this structure influences the rest of social life, which is defined as nonmaterial, spiritual, or ideological. The term *structure* has been applied to human societies since the 19th century.

Result and Discussion

Debate on Power, Society, Social Life, Social Structure and their Changing ways in Nepal.

Power: Power is force which one is formal and informal. This article Power, society, social life, social structure and changing ways in Nepal are interesting because the causes of its modality and differences between society. Power is everywhere coming from everywhere. The formal is legitimate and authorized but informal power is strong related to informal society. As a starting point, let us take a series of oppositions which have developed over the last few years: opposition to the power of men over women, of parents over children, of psychiatry over the mentally ill, of medicine over the population, of administration over the ways people live (Foucault,1982). It is true that I became quite involved with the question of power. It soon appeared to me that, while the human subject is placed in relations of production and of signification, he is equally placed in power relations which are very complex. Now, it seemed to me that economic history and theory provided a good instrument for relations of production and that linguistics and semiotics offered instruments for studying relations of signification; but for power relations we had no tools of study. We had recourse only to ways of thinking about power based on legal models, that is: What legitimates power? Or, we had recourse to ways of thinking about power based on institutional models, that is: What is the state? Asked Foucault. Power is relations and production. What are the base of power? "Why is the notion of power raised by so many people today? Is it such an important subject? Is it so independent that it can be discussed without taking into account other problems? "As a starting point, let us take a series of oppositions which have developed over the last few years: opposition to the power of men over women, of parents over children, of psychiatry over the mentally ill, of medicine over the population, of administration over the ways people live. It is not enough to say that these are anti-authority struggles; we must try to define more precisely what they have in common.

They are "transversal" struggles; that is, they are not limited to one country of course, they develop more easily and to a greater extent in certain countries, but they are not confined to a particular political or economic form of government. The aim of these struggles is the power effects as such. For example, the medical profession is not criticized primarily because it is a profit-making concern but because it exercises an uncontrolled power over people's bodies, their health, and their life and death.

These are "immediate" struggles for two reasons. In such struggles people criticize instances of power which are the closest to them, those which exercise their action on individuals. They do not look for the "chief enemy" but for the immediate enemy. Nor do they expect to find a solution to their problem at a future date (that is, liberations, revolutions, end of class struggle). In comparison with a theoretical scale of explanations or a revolutionary order which polarizes the historian, they are anarchistic struggles. But these are not their most original points. The following seem to me to be more specific. They are struggles which question the status of the individual: on the one hand, they assert the right to be different, and they underline everything which makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything which separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way. These struggles are not exactly for or against the "individual" but rather they are struggles against the "government of individualization."

They are an opposition to the effects of power which are linked with knowledge, competence, and qualification: struggles against the privileges of knowledge. But they are also an opposition against secrecy, deformation, and mystifying representations imposed on people. There is nothing "scientist" in this (that is, a dogmatic belief in the value of scientific knowledge), but neither is it a skeptical or relativistic refusal of all verified truth. What is questioned is the way in which knowledge circulates and functions, its relations to power. In short, the regime du savoir. Finally, all these present struggles revolve around the question: Who are we? They are a refusal of these abstractions, of economic and ideological state violence, which ignore who we are individually, and also a refusal of a scientific or administrative inquisition which determines who one is. (Foucault,1982).

Social structure: The structure is an external form of units. It is a whole form structure made up of different units. All the objects are organic inorganic, all of which are small units, when there is a function between all those units, that form and structure are working. Appears as a structure. A house is a type of structure in it because of the function between cement, bricks, sand, wood, clay and stone, the house appears as a structure. In the same way, human body, car, motorcycle, society, etc. should be taken as a structure in which the functions are working. No structure can be built without function There is a self-connection between structures and functions. The function among the social units has maintained the structure of the society.

One of the ideas of those who have different views on a structural

functionalist point of view is that if the units are formed together, the function in the middle of the unit can lead to that structure. The structure cannot stand without function. The August Comte, known as the Father of Sociology, has taken society as a collective system. It is clear that the concept of global consensus put forward by August Kamte has a function in various units of society. The idea that the functions of various units strengthens the society. At this time, the function was not as a development approach to structuralism. The overall aspect of social culture cannot be studied without analyzing the impact of the function of the functional relationship. The structural functional concept was developed in North America between 1950 and 60. Talkot Parsons has been instrumental in this. The idea that there would be no dispute over structural functionalism was recognized, but later the thinking changed, as the internal social problems that appeared in the United States after the 1960s. The social dominance of the United States declined, while on the other hand, social awakening began in China, Japan, and Russia. With the development of comparative historical sociology, problems began to arise in the structural function (dhakal,2071).

Malinowski (1884-1942) was an individualist. He analyzed how culture operates at every level, emphasizing the functional. His functional analysis remained important in the twentieth century. Yin's interpretation is based on three things. Health, social, integration and counter-culture are considered to be the main ones. In this way, Radcliff Brown has emphasized the process (Process), function (Function) and structure (Structure).

Herbert Spencer compared social function to a biological system and emphasized that just as the system is alive through the interrelationships between these systems, so too is society alive through the functions of the various units of a social system. There is a function between the units to meet the social needs of society. According to functionalists, social and cultural Emphasis on the interconnections between society and its institutions, rather than between individuals or groups, between parts, wholes, and structures. A perspective on studying the current society in a limited time period. Functional unity is all-pervasive and essential. It is completely unannounced and motionless with the declared task. The biological connectivity of the term power and Social structure are evident in the work of British philosopher Herbert Spencer. He and other social theorists of the 19th and early 20th centuries conceived of society as an organism compare interdependent parts that form a structure similar to the anatomy of a living body. Although social scientists since Spencer and Marx have disagreed on the concept of social structure, their definitions share common elements. In the most general way, social structure is identified by those features of a social entity (a society or a group within a society) that persist over time, are interrelated, and influence both the functioning of the entity as a whole and the activities of its individual members. The origin of contemporary sociological references to social structure can be traced to Durkheim, who argued that parts of society are interdependent and that this interdependency imposes structure on the behavior of social institution and their members. In other words, Durkheim

believed that personal individual human behavior is shaped by external forces. Similarly, American anthropologist George P. Murdock, in his book *Social Structure* (1949), examined kinship systems in preliterate societies and used social structure as a taxonomic device for classifying, comparing, and correlating various aspects of kinship systems. Within the broad framework of these and other general features of human society, there is an enormous variety of social forms between and within societies. Some social scientists use the concept of social structure as a device for creating an order for the various aspects of social life. In other studies, the concept is of greater theoretical importance; it is regarded as an explanatory concept, a key to the understanding of human social life. Several theories have been developed to account for both the similarities and the varieties. In these theories, certain aspects of social life are regarded as basic and, therefore, central components of the social structure. Some of the more prominent of these theories are reviewed here.

A.R. Radcliff Brown a British social anthropologist, gave the concept of social structure a central place in his approach and connected it to the concept of function. In his view, the components of the social structure have indispensable functions for one another the continued existence of the one component is dependent on that of the others and for the society as a whole, which is seen as an integrated, organic entity. His comparative studies of preliterate societies demonstrated that the interdependence of institutions regulated much of social and individual life. Radcliffe-Brown defined social structure empirically as patterned, or "normal," social relations (those aspects of social activities that conform to accepted social rules or norms). These rules bind society's members to socially useful activities. Later sociologists criticized definitions of social structure by scholars such as Spencer and Parsons because they believed the work made improper use of analogy, through its association with functionalism defended the status quo, was notoriously abstract, could not explain conflict and change, and lacked a methodology for empirical confirmation. American sociologist Talcott Parsons elaborated on the work of Durkheim and Radcliffe-Brown by using their insights on social structure to formulate a theory that was valid for large and complex societies. For Parsons, social structure was essentially normative—that is, consisting of "institutional patterns of normative culture." Put differently, social behaviour conforms to attitude norms, values, and rules that direct behaviour in specific situations. These norms vary according to the positions of the individual actors: they define different human, such as various occupational roles or the traditional roles of husband-father and wife-mother. Moreover, these norms vary among different spheres of life and lead to the creation of social institutions—for example, property and social institution like marriage. Norms, roles, and institutions are all components of the social structure on different levels of complexity.

Power and Class, Parsons's work was criticized for several reasons, not least for the comparatively meagre attention he paid to inequalities of power, wealth, and other social rewards. Other

social theorists, including functionalists such as the American sociologist R.K. Merton, gave these “distributional” properties a more central place in their concepts of social structure. For Merton and others, social structure consists not only of normative patterns but also of the inequalities of power, status, and material privileges, which give the members of a society widely different opportunities and alternatives. In complex societies, these inequalities define different strata, or classes, that form the stratification system, or class structure, of the society. Both aspects of the social structure, the normative and the distributive aspect, are strongly interconnected, as may be inferred from the observation that members of different classes often have different and even conflicting norms and values.

This leads to a consideration contrary to structural functionalism: certain norms in a society may be established not because of any general consensus about their individual moral value but because they are forced upon the peoples by those who have both the interest in doing so and the power to carry it out. To take one example, the “norms” of apartheid in like our Country reflected the interests and values of only one section of the population, which had the different types of power to enforce them upon the majority. In theories of class and power, this argument has been generalized: norms, values, and ideas are explained as the result of the inequalities of power between groups with conflicting interests. The most influential theory of this type has been historical materialism or Marxism. The Marxian view is succinctly summarized in Marx’s phrase “The ideas of the ruling class are, in every age, the ruling ideas.” These ideas are regarded as reflections of class interests and are connected to the power structure, which is identified with the class structure. This Marxian model, which was claimed to be particularly valid for capitalist societies, has met with much criticism. One basic problem is its distinction between economic structure and spiritual superstructure, which are identified with social being and consciousness, respectively. This suggests that economic activities and relations are in themselves somehow independent of consciousness, as if they occur independently of social beings.

Nevertheless, the Marxian model became influential even among non-Marxist social scientists. The distinction between material structure and nonmaterial superstructure continues to be reflected in sociological textbooks as the distinction between social structure and culture. Social structure here refers to the ways people are interrelated or interdependent; culture refers to the ideas, knowledge, norms, customs, and capacities that they have learned and share as members of a society.

Structuralism: Structure means framework of certain subjectivity like Social, political, economic, religious and others. Another important theoretical approach to the concept of social structure is structuralism (sometimes called Nepali structuralism), which studies the underlying, unconscious regularities of human being's expression that is, the unobservable structures that have observable effects on behaviour, society, and culture. French anthropologist Claude Levi Strauss derived this theory from structural linguistics, developed by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand. According to Saussure,

any language is structured in the sense that its elements are interrelated in no arbitrary, regular, rule-bound ways; a competent speaker of the language largely follows these rules without being aware of doing so. The task of the theorist is to detect this underlying structure, including the rules of transformation that connect the structure to the various observed expressions.

According to Lévi-Strauss, this same method can be applied to social and cultural life in general. He constructed theories concerning the underlying structure of kinship systems, myths, and customs of cooking and eating. The structural method, in short, purports to detect the common structure of widely different social and cultural forms. This structure does not determine concrete expressions, however; the variety of expressions it generates is potentially unlimited. Moreover, the structures that generate the varieties of social and cultural forms ultimately reflect, according to Lévi-Strauss, basic characteristics of the human mind. Structures such as the human mind, grammar, and language are sometimes called “deep structures” or “substructures.” Since such structures are not readily observable, they must be discerned from intensive interpretive analysis of myths, language, or texts. Then they can be applied to explain the customs or traits of social institutions. The French philosopher Michel Foucault, for example, used this approach in his study of Punishment. His research led him to conclude that the abolition of corporal punishment by liberal states was an illusion, because the state substituted punishment of the “soul” by monitoring and controlling both the behaviour of prisoners and the behaviour of everyone in the society. Structuralism became an intellectual fashion in the 1960s in France, where writers as different as Roland Barthes, Louis Althusser Foucault, and Foucault were regarded as representatives of the new theoretical current. In this broad sense, however, structuralism is not one coherent theoretical perspective. The Marxist structuralism of Althusser, for example, is far removed from the anthropological structuralism of Lévi-Strauss. The structural method, when applied by different scholars, appears to lead to different results.

The onslaught of criticism launched against structural functionalism class theorie, and structuralism indicates the problematic nature of the concept of social structure. Yet the notion of social structure is not easy to dispense with, because it expresses ideas of regularity and interrelatedness in social life. Other terms are often used that have similar, but not identical, meanings, including *social network*, *social figuration*, and *social system*. Starting with his work in general sociological theory in the mid-1970s, British sociologist Anthony Giddens suggested the term structuration to express the view that social life is, to a certain extent, both dynamic and ordered. The critical difference between social structure theory and structuralism is one of approach. Analysis of social structure uses standard empirical or observational methods to arrive at generalizations about society, while structuralism uses subjective, interpretive, phenomenological, and qualitative analysis. Most sociologists prefer the social structure approach and regard structuralism as

philosophical that is, more compatible with the humanities than with the social sciences. Still, a significant number of sociologists insist that structuralism occupies a legitimate place in their discipline.

Changing ways in Nepali society and Culture: Nepalese society and culture both are changing regularly. Those pursuing research in the area of social structure have pursued limited but practical goals. They have focused on the development of theories, laws, generalizations, calculi, and methods that account for structural regularities in society. They have not, however, been concerned with demonstrating the limitless structural regularities in society (such as linguistic routines, the permanence of national boundaries, the stability of religious practices, or the durability of gender, identity, different social seats or racial inequality. In concrete terms, the task of structural analysis is not so much to account for discrimination and poverty, for example, as it is to account for the rates of poverty. Likewise, the analysis focuses on empirical data such as the distribution of cities in the world, the patterns of land use, the shifts in educational achievement, changes in occupational structure, the social manifestation of revolutions, the increase in collaboration between institutions, the existence of networks among groups, the routines of different types of organizations, the cycles of growth or decline in organizations and institutions consequences of individual choices.

Only a few sociologists have developed structural theories that apply to institutions and whole societies an approach known as macrosociology. Gerhard Lenski in power and privilege (1966) classified societies on the basis of their main tools of subsistence and, unlike Marx, demonstrated statistically that variations in the primary tools used in a given society systematically accounted for different types of social stratification systems. An entire specialty in sociology has been built on structural theory developed by Amos Hawley in *Human Ecology* (1986). For Hawley, the explanatory variables are the makeup of the peoples the external environment, the complex of organizations, and technology. Research has revealed that these variables account for differences in the spatial characteristics, rhythm of activities, mobility patterns, and external relations between communities in various parts of the world. Applying this framework to the world ecosystem, Hawley focused on the problem of its expansion and growth. Unlike Marxist world systems theory, which emphasizes political factors, Hawley's work emphasized technology as the critical factor. He argued that the growth and spread of technology leads to population growth, burdens the land, and prompts changes in the organization of institutions. At worst, according to Hawley, the long-term costs of expansion would lead to polarization and inequality, urban decay, environmental destruction, and political instability, which over time must result in a reordering of the ecosystem. These are some examples of ways in which logically drawn abstract generalizations provide insights about society. Such findings are approached through macro sociological or structural theory and are not readily available through the study of individuals or isolated groups. In *Structural Contexts of Opportunities* (1994), Peter M. Blau developed a formal macro

sociological theory concerning the influences of large population structures on social life. He identified how different population groups relate to each other. He found that occupational heterogeneity increases the chance for contact between people in different status groups. For populations with multiple-group affiliations, in-group associations tend to promote intergroup relations.

Conclusion

Power, Social structure and social change are interesting in Nepalese context. Social change is generally regular and continuous upwards and historical power center are going downward day by day. Social change are general concepts used by social scientists, particularly in the fields of sociology. They are often conceived of as polarized concepts, with social structure referring to basic characteristics of social life those demonstrating a lasting and permanent quality and social change reflecting the opposite. However, the relationship between the two concepts is more complicated. Social structure, for example, cannot be conceptualized adequately without some recognition of actual or potential change, just as social change, as a more or less regular process, is structured over time and is inconceivable without the notion of regular and continuity. Both concepts, in the end, can contribute to a fuller understanding of society, its patterns, and patterns of change.

References

1. A.M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (Translated) (1947), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Chapter VIII: The Types of Authority and Imperative Coordination. Pp.324-406 (Also in Max Weber), New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
2. Adrian Leftwich (2000), *States of Development on the Primacy of Politics in Development*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
3. Adrian Leftwich (2000), *States of Development: on the Primacy of Politics in Development* Cambridge: Polity Press.
4. Akhilesh Gupta (1998), *Postcolonial Developments: Agriculture in the Making of Modern India*, Chapter I: Agrarian Populism in the Development of a Modern Nation, Pp. 33-105, Durham: Duke University Press.
5. Anthony M. Orum (1978), *Introduction to Political Sociology: the Social Anatomy of Body Politic*, Chapter 12: Social and Political Movements. Pp. 339-374, New Jersey: Prentice- Hall, 1978.
6. Anthony M. Orum (1978), *Social and Political Movements*, Pp. 339-374, Chapter 12. In *Introduction to Political Sociology: the Social Anatomy of Body Politic*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
7. Arthur Kleinman *The Violence of Everyday Life: The Multiple Forms and Dynamics of Social Violence*, Pp. 226-242.
8. Arturo Escobar (1995) *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World*, Princeton:

- Princeton University Press.
9. Atul Kohi (1997), On Sources of Social and Political Conflicts in Follower Democracies, In Alex Hadenius (ed.), *Democracy's Victory and Crisis*, Cambridge, Pp. 71-81, Chapter 4, i: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
 10. Atul Kohli in Alex hadenius (ed.) (1997), *Democracy's Victory and Crisis*, Chapter 4: On sources of Social and Political Conflicts in Follower Democracies, Pp. 71-81, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 11. Bill Jordan (1985), *The State Authority and Autonomy*. Chapter 10: *The Development of the World Economy*. Pp. 188-218. New York: Basil Blackwell.
 12. Bob Jessop (1990), *The State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in its Place*. Chapter 7: *Hegemony and Hegemonic Project*. Pp. 207-211, Cambridge: Polity Press.
 13. Borgstrom, Bengt-Erik (1980) *The Patron and Panca: Village Values and Panchayat Democracy in Nepal*, New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
 14. Chapter 1, II and 111. In *History of the Ancient World*. F. Korovkin. Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1985.
 15. Charles E. Lindblom (1978, politics and Markets: *The World's. Political and Economic Systems*. Chapter 9: *Politics: The Struggle over Authority*, Pp. 119-130. New Delhi: Ambica Publications, (Printed in India) 1978), (First Published by Basic Books incorporation, 1977).
 16. Craig Baxier, Yogendra K. Malik, Chades H. Kennedy, and Robert C. Oberst, Boulder (1993), *Government and Politics in South Asia* Westview Press.
 17. Dev Raj Dahal, Hari Uprety and Phanindra Subba (2002). *Good Governance and Decentralization in Nepal*. Kathmandu: GDS.
 18. Diane E. Davis (2006), *Undermining the Rule of Law Democratization and the Dark Side of Police Reform in Mexico Latin American Politics and Society* 48(1).
 19. Edward Mansheld D. and Jack Snyder (2001), *Democratic Transitions, Institutional Strength, and War*, *International Organization*. 56(2): 297-337.
 20. Elbert W. Stewart and James A. Glynn (1981), *Introduction to Sociology*, (3rd Edn), Chapter 15: *Political Institutions*. pp: 353380. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Ltd.
 21. Emma Tarlo (2000), *Violence and Subjectivity*, Veena Das et al (eds.). *Body and Space in a Time of Crisis: Sterilization and Resettlement during the Emergency in* Delhi, Pp. 242-270. Berkeley: University of California Press.
 22. Erza F. Vogel (1991), *The Four Little Dragons: The Spread of Industrialization in East Asia*: Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
 23. F. Bailey (1980), *Stratagems and Spoils: A social Anthropology of Politics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
 24. Frank McGlynn and Arthur Tuden, eds (1991), *Anthropological Approaches to Political Behavior*, Introduction, pp. 3-44, Pittsburg: University of Pittsburg Press.
 25. Frederick Barth (1965), *Political Leadership Among Swal Pathans*, London: The Athlone Press. Frederick Barth (1965), *Political Leadership Among Swat Pathans* London: The Athlone Press. Frederick G. Weiss, ed., (1974), *Hegel: The Essential Writings*. Chapter VI: *Objective Spirit: human Conduct and Philosophic Truth*, Pp. 253-313, New York: Harper Troch Books.
 26. Geertz, Clifford (1963), *Agricultural Involution: The Process of Ecological Change in Indonesia*; Berkeley: University of California Press, Pp. 124-143.
 27. Gramsci (1985), *The State Authority and Autonomy*. Chapter 6: Bill Jordan Pp. 119-121, New York: Basil Blackwell.
 28. Harry M. Johnson (1984), *Sociology: A Systematic introduction*, Chapter 12: *Formal Organizations*, pp. 380-322. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Private Ltd.
 29. Harry Magdoff (1982), *Introduction to the Sociology of "Developing Societies"*. Hamza Alavi and Teodor Shanin (eds. Chapter 1: *Imperialism: A Historical survey*, Pp. 11-28, USA: The Macmillan Press.)
 30. I . Schapera, (1956), *Government and Politics in Tribal Societies*. Chapter 1: *The Political Community*, pp. 1-37, London: CA Watts and Co. Ltd. 1956.
 31. IL Gulmann, Mathew c. *The Ramonce of Democracy: Compliant Defiance in Contemporary Mexico* Berkeley: university of California Press pp xv-xxx.
 32. Jagadis Bhagwati (1997), *Democracy's Victory and Crisis*, Alex Hadenius (ed.) Chapter 12: *Globalization Sovereignty and Democracy* Pp. 263-8.. Cambridge University Press. '
 33. Jagadis Bhagwati, In Alex Hadenius (ed.). *Globalization Sovereignty and Democracy*. Pp. 263-381. Chapter 12. *Democracy's Victory and Crisis*.