

ARMIES IN THE PROCESS OF POLITICAL MODERNIZATION

RANA EIJAZ AHMAD*

Abstract. This paper is all about the praetorianism and its implications upon the political and economic systems of the developing world, especially Pakistan. Army has been a source of political modernization in the traditional as well as transitional democracies. But the primary duty of the army is to defend the borders of the country. Unfortunately, Bangladesh, Pakistan and Sri Lanka have been under army rule for many years and remained unpopular. It faced the crises of legitimacy. Therefore, the authority of the army remained in question in these countries. We are going to explain the types of army interventions along with expenditures of army in Pakistan and its impact on its economy. It is mainly based on archival research.

I. INTRODUCTION

The title “Armies in the process of political modernization” is intended to provoke serious consideration of the topic. This paper examines various aspects of the military’s role in the process of political modernization in both developed and developing countries especially Pakistan. It is a comparative analysis that emphasizes the positive roll that militaries play in political modernization even though such activities are mostly out of favour in traditional democracies. The factors that destabilize the political system and prompt the military are examined. The characteristics of armies and the types of intervention are considered.

*The author is Assistant Professor at the Department of Political Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore (Pakistan) and presently Ph.D. scholar at the Department of International Relations, Quaid-i-Azam University, Islamabad (Pakistan).
(E-mail: ranaejaz786@yahoo.com)

The focus of this study revolves around the institution of army and its role in the process of political modernization in traditional as well as transitional societies. The army is a pivotal and indispensable institution for defense and security in all countries. That is why in most countries armies become stronger over time. After the World War II, the military gained an exalted status as a disciplined and professional force.

It earned prestige and importance as the savior of many nations, but the disciplined approach of the military affected different countries in different ways. Societies in a transitional status struggled to develop democratic institutions due to public apathy.

Every political system consists of three types of individuals: participants, subjects, and parochial. Systems rich in participants are typically developed democratic, *e.g.* America, Britain and France. Some political systems are teeming with subjects, *e.g.* China, Russia, and most Middle Eastern countries. Although Pakistan has both participants and subjects, parochial are in abundance. Parochial individuals "have little or no awareness about national politics (including) ... individuals who know about functions of government but unable to influence those functions" (Almond and Verba, 1963). In traditional societies with many parochial, the army plays an important role in political modernization. It provides stability so other institutions can develop in a democratic way.

The political power of the military varies from country to country. Praetorianism is an old saga indeed. However, it exists in modern times as well. Countries in Latin America, Asia, Africa, and Europe have experienced military coups in not too distant times. Details regarding those coups are discussed later in this paper. It is important to understand how the army affects the process of political modernization in different countries given drastically different socio-economic conditions and power sharing arrangements. Armies may camouflage themselves as reformist, as agents to restore democracy, as liberators, as gap fillers, or as nation builders depending upon the situation. Conditions of course vary tremendously in the developed, developing, and under developing worlds. The phenomenon of political modernization can be viewed as a movement from rural to urban, religious to secular, agriculture to industry, authoritarian to democratic, illiterate to literate, and from apathy to participatory.

According to Lerner (1958: 438), "The principal aspects of modernization, urbanization, industrialization, democratization, education, media participation do not occur in haphazard and unrelated fashion."

Although they occur independently as a rule, they nonetheless go together in some historical sense (Lerner, 1958).

Essentially, there are five levels of political modernization: psychological, intellectual, demographic, social, and economic (Huntington, 1968: 32-33).

The psychological level of modernization involves a fundamental transformation in values, attitudes, and expectations. A traditional individual believes in the natural continuity of society and does not intend to change or control it. A modern individual intends to change the society and want to adapt it according to prevailing circumstances. Lerner says that a modern man has a “*mobile personality*” that adjusts society according to his own heart (Huntington, 1968). The intellectual level of modernization disseminates knowledge spreading social capital throughout the precincts. This is of course facilitated by the revolution in mass media and public education. The demographic level of modernization entails better health and increased life expectancy along with greater occupational mobility from periphery to center (Huntington, 1968).

The social level of modernization pertains to mobilizations that lead people to perform different functions in society. The traditional authoritative system based on “*cumulative inequalities*” gives way to democratic values based on “*dispersed inequalities*” (Dahl, 1961: 85-86). The economic level of modernization includes the diversification of production with complex activities replacing simple ones. Market agriculture replaces sustenance agriculture. There is not only more commerce but also more industry (Huntington, 1968).

The aforementioned levels of modernization fit into three broader categories:

1. Social mobilization that is achieved through revolutions in education, communication, and urbanization. According to Karl Deutsch, it is the process by which “major clusters of old social, economic, and psychological commitments are eroded or broken and people become available for new patterns of socialization and behaviours” (Deutsch, 1961).
2. Economic modernization is attained through revolutions in industry that increase economic activity and output. Per capita income grows along with gross national product. The number of doctors and hospitals increase. Caloric intake and life expectancy go up (Huntington, 1968: 34).

Whereas social mobilization focuses on the transforming the ambitions of individuals, groups and societies, economic modernization concentrates on changing their capabilities.

3. Political modernization is realized in three main ways:

First, through national unity and centralization with recognized law making institutions.

Second, through differentiation of functions with specialized structures, *e.g.* legal, military, administrative, and scientific, which although autonomous are subservient to the sovereign.

Third, through participation of the people in politics enhancing their control of government (Huntington, 1968). There is however more to political modernization than rationalization of authority, differentiation of structure, and public participation.

One should consider all of the “political aspects and political effects of social, economic, and cultural modernization” (Huntington, 1968: 35).

“Modernization means that all groups, old as well as new, traditional as well as modern, become increasingly aware of themselves as groups and of their interests and claims in relation to other groups. One of the most striking phenomena of modernization, indeed, is the increased consciousness, coherence, organization and action which it produces in many social forces which existed on a much lower level of conscious identity and organization in traditional society” (Huntington, 1968: 34).

II. AN HISTORICAL ANALYSIS

Given an overall framework of political modernization it is now possible to analyze the role of armies’ role in the process.

The armed forces always played an important role in the political systems of independent nations. But the role of the army in politics took on even more significance after the World War I and World War II. Until 1917, only nineteen of fifty-seven states witnessed military take-overs. But from 1917 to 1955, 13 of 28 newly independent nations experienced military coups (Finer, 1969). There were coups in Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Pakistan, South Korea, South Vietnam, Thailand and Turkey.

Some political writers emphasize the positive role that militaries played in the Third World. Praetorian rule is seen as an engine of socio-economic

development. These authors contend that the armed forces promote political modernization at least as effectively as the civil government (Jackman, 1976). Third World nations exhibit various elements of instability that lead to military intervention.

III. ELEMENTS OF POLITICAL INSTABILITY

Most of the third world countries have pronounced horizontal and vertical cleavages. The horizontal cleavages are linguistic, ethnic, and parochial. The vertical cleavages result from a persistent lacuna that exists between haves and have-nots. The general public is not well connected to the political system. Their dreams are a far cry from their reality of poverty, disease, and humiliation. The over centralization of power is a serious problem in most newly independent nations. And yet there is also a lack of national identity. These nascent states rely on recently adopted democratic institutions that are still meager and fragile. And there is no tradition of democracy to lend support. Radical politics throughout the developing world undermines the legitimacy of government and leads to praetorianism. It does not help that many political leaders educated in the West are unable to bridge the gap between traditional and modern values (Rizvi, 1986: 3-4).

Modernization does not mean just industrialization. It also relates to economic, social, and scientific development. It is the precursor to an egalitarian society where sovereignty lies with the people (Shills, 1962). The modernization also means “the institutionalization of operational, political, and social values” (Rizvi, 1986: 5). It entails the strengthening of national legitimacy and the weakening of primitive loyalty (Rizvi, 1986: 5), towards colonial rulers.

The absence of well organized political parties is oftentimes a problem in developing countries. It represents a vacuum that is frequently filled by authoritarian rulers. So personality cults present serious dilemmas, *e.g.* Jinnah in Pakistan, Gandhi and Nehru in India, Sukarno in Indonesia, Nkrumah in Ghana et cetera. In the words of Dankwart A. Rustow (1968),

“... Disagreement on constitutional procedure, inexperience with government by discussions, a precarious feeling of national identity, lack of technical qualifications among civil servants, a general dearth of educated personnel, atrophy of political parties, diffuseness of economic interest groups—all these reduce governmental capability.”

The military rules many new nations in Asia, Latin America, and Africa owing to the above-mentioned factors. Being well organized the armies have

little difficulty in dominating civil governments. But new nations need law and order to start the process of political modernization and technological advancement.

The armed forces with their esprit de corps, organization, discipline, centralization, hierarchy, and intercommunication are able to operate more effectively than civil governments in the third world (Finer, 1969: 10). Developing countries do not resist the authoritative values of armies in the way that developed countries do.

Liberal democracies like UK, US, the Scandinavian countries, Canada, Holland, and Switzerland shunned praetorian rule. The US was one of the first states to snatch independence from its mother country with armed forces. But those forces remained under civilian control. That was a classic example of military subordination to civil government (Ball, 1971: 221). But an even earlier example was provided by the UK. in the seventeenth century. After Cromwell, Britain successfully reined in the power of the military and established a lasting democracy.

Owing to their lengthy period of independence, the liberal democracies have prevailed over the horizontal and vertical cleavages in their societies. It has become almost impossible for armies to take control. Although general officers are members of the upper class, they share power easily other elites including the political class. This has created a balance in the public sector between civil and military leaders. And that balance has fostered greater harmony in society as a whole (Ball, 1971: 222):

“President Eisenhower, in his farewell message in 1961, warned of a military industrial complex that could dominate the government of the United States. The size of the American Military budget, the complexity of the military machine and the overlap between foreign policy and military strategy has caused fears that armed forces are exercising too great influence on political decision-making. Yet civilian supremacy is a fundamental principle of American government.”

It was a somewhat similar story in Soviet Union. Civilian supremacy was a fundamental doctrine of Soviet politics. Trotsky used the Red Army consolidate the gains from the Bolshevik revolution 1917. There was a period of praetorianism during the Stalinist period. . But Stalin curbed the rule of the military ending it once and for all in 1937-38 (Ball, 1971: 223).

“The chief source of the might of our army and navy lies in the fact that the Communist Party, the guiding and directing force of Soviet

society, is their organizer, leader, and instructor. We must always remember V. I. Lenin's instructions to the effect that the 'policy of the military department, as of all other departments and institutions, are pursued in strict accordance with the general directives given by the party in the person of the Central Committee and under its direct control' (Fainsod, 1967: 485).

There were many other examples of civilian ascendancy over military rule. In Germany, after 1918, the army limited its role unilaterally. Von Seeckt, chief of the army command, recognized the importance of civilian government saying "The army serves the state, and only the state, for it is the state" (Carston, 1966). In 1938, Hitler purged the armed forces of powerful leaders and maintained civilian control (Ball, 1971: 228). Even in non-European countries such as Bolivia and Argentina, military and civilian leaders worked side by side (Ball, 1971: 230).

Sometimes, external military aid to satellite states corrupted the armed forces of those states leading to military coups. During the Cold War, the US provided extensive military assistance to third world countries in order to contain communism. This strengthened not only the armed forces but also anti-radical tendencies (Ball, 1971: 231). The history of military control in various regions of the world showed that "*the lower the level of development, the higher the level of military intervention*" (Blondel, 1969: 426).

IV. CONDITIONS FOR MILITARY INTERVENTIONS

History also shows that there are four common factors that lead to military intervention. First, the professionalism compels the armed forces to intervene in the political process when the affairs of state are beyond civilian control. Second, necessity prompts to the military to take action in domestic affairs when the civilian leadership loses its legitimacy. Third, the army takes action to reduce subculture conflict that results from horizontal and vertical cleavages. Fourth and last, the army interferes in politics to enhance its own interests. As an organized institution, the military is a powerful pressure group (Blondel, 1969: 417-419).

V. TYPES OF MILITARY INTERVENTIONS

There are various types of military interventions but four are paramount.

1. ***Influence***: The military acts as a pressure group, influences law making, and demands allocations for military expenditures.

2. **Blackmail:** The military intervenes in the affairs of civil government with its martial forces. Some types of military intervention are considered normal and other abnormal depending on the type of political system. For example, the resignation of a military leader in liberal democracies is routine but it is usually a matter of much concern in the third world. In the developing countries, it is often the result of blackmail.
3. **Displace:** In third world countries, the military is frequently the power behind the government. Political elites are merely puppets. .
4. **Supplant:** Last but not least, the military replaces civilian authority altogether. One example is France in 1799. Bonaparte assumed all powers of government in a direct military coup. This was a common occurrence in the third world during the twentieth century (Blondel, 1969: 423-425).

But military intervention has taken on yet another dimension in modern times.

According to Lucian Pye's essay, "Armies in the process of political modernization", most newly independent entities were governed by praetorian rulers. And political development was rapid in spite of if not because of military rule especially in the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. But it was impossible to establish causation with correlation alone. Further study seemed warranted.

Colonialism ended after the World War II, There was a golden opportunity for the newly independent nations to embrace democracy. But political elites were generally not up to the task. Therefore the military being a disciplined and organized institution took matters into hand either directly or indirectly.

Pakistan is a good example of such a country. The political elite failed to represent the people. Instead they looked after their own party or personal interests. Their aloofness created a vacuum between the government and the masses. That void was subsequently filled by the military.

The majority of people were too inactive and lethargic. They relied on political demagogues to resolve their problems. These demagogues were in turn more focused on building personal wealth than nation building. This was the point at which the military took over.

The modern army with its technological prowess advanced the cause of rationalism over traditionalism. It was the source of skilled and professional

manpower throughout the developing world (Blondel, 1969: 291-298). In the meantime, the developed world kept its militaries on the cutting edge of technological development.

“Australia, Britain, France and the United States are among countries currently exchanging ideas and working on projects to create the computerized 21st century soldiers ... Civilian developments in high technology are helping military planners to create the sophisticated soldier of the 21st century. Research suggests that future infantry will comprise of small elite force, wearing and linked with micro computers to form a seamless web of battlefield information.” (Young, 2000)

There are several reasons for the dynamism of modern armies. *First*, the armed service in each country competes with other armies around the world unlike the civil service which remains focused on domestic matters. *Second*, the military is a highly efficient and disciplined institution compared to others given its hierarchical organization *Third*, military authority is not only different it is also separate from civilian authority. Armies operate with considerable independence.

Factors such as these contribute to the dynamism of militaries in general.

The army plays a modernizing role in both developed and developing countries. Given military sales worldwide, the army constitutes a veritable industry (Welch, 1967).

VI. THE ARMY'S ROLE IN THE POLITICAL MODERNIZATION OF PAKISTAN

In Southern Asia most countries utilized the military in their political affairs. Pakistan used the army to restore law and order during anti-Ahmedi riots in 1953. During the earthquakes and floods of the 1970s, the army acted speedily and efficiently. In time, the military recognized its own importance. The taste of power acquired during periods of crisis management led the army to gradually supplant the civilian government (Rizvi, 1986: 58-64).

As in other third world countries, the military in Pakistan intervened as a reformer in domestic affairs. Ayyub Khan introduced reforms in areas of family law, the economy, civil service, law, education, and labour (Rizvi, 1986: 84-100). Islamization was the result of reforms by Zia-ul-Haq (Rizvi, 1986: 84-100). As in the third world regimes of Nkrumah, Allende, Mosaddaq, Sukarno, and Sihanouk, Ayub Khan served as the state builder and Zia as the nation builder in Pakistan (Wasim, 1994).

Pakistan experienced all types of military intervention including influence, blackmail, displacement, and supplantation. The recent military coup of General Pervaiz Musharraf was a prime example of supplantation. He exploited a crisis to take over the government. But his goal was to restore democracy, good governance, and eventually civilian rule.

Pakistan was however under the influence if not the rule of non-political elite since the death of Quaid-i-Azam. Every government since 1948 attempted to rule over the people rather than represent them. There was hardly a statement in print or other media to suggest otherwise. Since 1999, President Pervaiz Musharraf advocated democracy but only a little progress was made in this regard.

But the military are not to blame for the lack of political progress. A few influential families are in control both politically and economically. This concentration of power is creating sense of alienation among not only the lower class but also the middle class. Many educated young people now seek greater opportunities abroad. Others remain behind caught up the struggles between various special interest groups. In Pakistan, there is no political party as such. All so-called political parties are interest groups, working for specific interests of a group.

Dynamism in a political system depends on the norms and values of the society. Institutions and structures are the result of public demand. In developing countries, the early political elites imitated the western style ignoring local preferences that could have led to an indigenous system. The unsuitability of western ways ultimately brought about authoritarian rule.

VII. THE ARMY AS A MODERN INSTITUTION

In the third world, the military was the real sovereign in most countries. Armies got the lion's share of the national budgets. In Pakistan, the army accounted for 70 to 80 percent of the national budget since independence.

Both the colonial administration and the newly independent countries placed considerable importance on an organized army. The military was highly respected in the developing countries given its status as a rational rather than a traditional institution.

In Pakistan, the army was revered to such an extent that most civil departments were under its administration including WAPDA, Communication, Education and Planning. The military personnel also enjoyed better benefits than civilians. For example, at every recreational facility, army men were permitted to purchase tickets at a discount rather

than paying full price and at a separate window rather than waiting in line. Civil servants had no comparable incentives.

In civilian hospitals, military men could enter at will, in or out of uniform whereas civilian government personnel could enter army hospitals only after checking in. Such military privileges lead some civilians to question the disparate treatment.

The aspirations of ordinary Pakistanis will remain unfulfilled as the military continued to dominate society.

Former General and later President Pervaiz Musharaf was nonetheless committed to modernize Pakistan through military control of key civil departments, local bodies of government, and any disloyal political demagogues. After joining the Muslim League Quaid group, Sheikh Rasheed's nephew lost not only the support of the military but also membership in his party and credibility among the people before losing a general election in 2008 and 2010.

President Musharaf did a praiseworthy job of making Pakistan a front line state supporting America's war against terrorism. His ban on extremism extended to religious groups as well as student unions. But such measures although necessary undermine the legitimacy of his regime.

Here are some reforms that President Musharaf articulated both in and out of the parliament to promote a more liberal and enlightened Pakistan:

- Increase the proportion of seats for women in parliament.
- Require a higher level of education for members of parliament.
- Ban all religious groups use ethnicity to inflame country.
- Support the construction of Kalabagh dam.
- Stop financial aid to the Mudrassas.
- Engage in bilateral talks with India on the issue of Kashmir.
- Maintain good relations with America and its allies.
- Continue to support the war against terrorism.
- Struggle for real democracy that includes sustainable human development.
- Promote good governance.
- Independence of media along with increase in TV channels.

Above all he is the mentor of media independence in Pakistan. Pervaiz Musharaf's one blunder of dismantling the chief justice Supreme Court of Pakistan, Iftikhar Choudhary was a decisive factor in ending military rule in Pakistan in 2008.

Tables 1 and 2 will show that the military had been in fact the real sovereign.

TABLE 1
Defense Expenditures 1947-77

Year	Defense Expenditures in million Rs.	Percentage of the total government expenditures
1947-48*	236.0	65.16
1948-49	461.5	71.32
1949-50	625.4	73.06
1950-51	649.9	51.32
1951-52	792.4	54.96
1952-53	725.7	56.68
1953-54	633.2	58.7
1954-55	640.5	57.5
1955-56	917.7	64.0
1956-57	800.9	60.1
1957-58	854.2	56.1
1958-59**	996.6	50.9
1959-60	1,043.5	56.51
1960-61	1,112.4	58.73
1961-62	1,108.6	55.80
1962-63	954.3	53.16
1963-64	1,156.5	49.49
1964-65	1,262.3	46.07

Year	Defense Expenditures in million Rs.	Percentage of the total government expenditures
1965-66	2,855.0	53.67
1966-67	2,293.5	60.92
1967-68	2,186.5	53.63
1968-69	2,426.8	55.62
1969-70	2,749.1	53.35
1970-71	3,201.5	55.66
1971-72	3,725.5	59.09
1972-73	4,439.6	59.34
1973-74	4,948.6	42.02
1974-75	6,914.2	42.83
1975-76	8,103.4	46.00
1976-77	8,120.6	44.71

*15th August 1947 to 31st March 1948.

**Covers the period of 15 months from 1st April 1958 to 30th June 1959.

Source: Rizvi (1986), p. 57-58.

Since its independence, Pakistan devoted a significant portion of its total expenditures to defense as indicated in Table 1.

Table 2 shows that Pakistan's annual budget is mainly used by army therefore it undermined the economy of the country relentlessly.

“At the dawn of the 21st century, Pakistan is confronted with multi-faceted problems. Leadership vacuum, institutional crisis, economic debility, ethnic strike, religious and sectarian conflicts, illiteracy, poverty, and corruption have created a vicious circle that, in turn, engenders the crisis of the state. Martial law is no panacea for these multifarious troubles ...”¹

¹Unknown.

TABLE 2
Defense Expenditures 1977-86

Year	Defense Expenditure	Total Expenditure Met from Revenue	Defense expenditure as percentage of total expenditure (in million Rs.)
1977-78	9,674.5	22,781.9	42.46
1978-79	10,167.6	29,851.8	34.06
1979-80	12,654.8	34,845.1	36.31
1980-81	15,300.1	39,215.7	39.01
1981-82	18,630.7	43,102.5	43.22
1982-83	24,565.7	56,183.4	43.72
1983-84	26,750.9	70,211.7	38.10
1984-85	29,191.6	75,209.1	38.81
1985-86	33,063.1	123,449.4	26.78

Note: Since 1986, the percentage of total government expenditure remained roughly constant.

Source: Rizvi (1986), p. 258.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In order to make Pakistan a real democracy, the president should end military control of all civil departments. Civilians have both the specialized knowledge and professional competence that are required. The institution of a merit system would enhance the prospects for both political and economic development. In the process, the President could win legitimacy that was in question despite the referendum held in November 2002.

After Pervaiz Musharaf, it has been written on the wall that military takeover in Pakistan will be disastrous not only for the country but also for the military as an institution. Since it was the first time in the Musharaf era that all security forces got a circular in black and white that all personnel should avoid wandering around in uniform.

The danger inherent in military rule is apparent in places like Burma and Indonesia. The army should cooperate with the civil administration in the times of crisis but then return to the barracks. The basic duty of the military is to defend the country's borders. The basic duty of political elites is to develop more democratic and representative institutions. Liberal democracies cannot permit the armed forces to meddle in domestic political affairs. They cannot allow the army to dominate the institutions of government, *e.g.* the judiciary, the executive, and the legislature. Liberal democracies rely on separation of powers as well as checks and balances to keep the armed forces under the control of civil government. The developing world, including Pakistan, needs these governmental structures and functions to avoid military coups. Democratic institutions and processes are the only way to keep the armed forces at arm's length.

REFERENCES

- Almond, Gabriel A. and Sidney Verba (1963), *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ball, Alan R. (1971), *Modern Politics and Governments*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Blondel, Jean (1969), *An Introduction to Comparative Government*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.
- Carston, F. L. (1966), *The Reichswehr and Politics: 1918-33*. Oxford, 1966). See also Donald Cameron Watt, *Too Serious A Business*. London.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1961), *Who Governs?* New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Deutsch, Karl W. (1961), Social mobilization and political development. *American Political Science Review*, p. 494.
- Fainsod, M. (1967), *How Russia is Ruled*, 2nd edition. Cambridge, Mass.
- Finer, S. E. (1969), *The Man on The Horseback*. London: The Pall Mall Press.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1968), *Political Order in Changing Societies*. London: Yale University Press.
- Jackman, R. W. (1976), Politicians in uniform: Military government and social change in the Third World. *APSR*, Volume 70 No. 4, pp. 1078-1097.
- Lerner, Daniel (1958), *The Passing of Traditional Society*. Glencoe III: Free Press.
- Oxford (1999), *Human Development In South Asia: The Crisis in Governance*. Oxford.
- Rizvi, Hasan Askari (1986), *The Military and Politics in Pakistan: 1947-86*. Lahore: Progressive Publishers.
- Rustow, Dankwart A. (1968), *A World of Nations*. Washington D.C.
- Shills, E. (1962), The military in the political development of the new states. In Johnson, J. J. (ed.), *The Role of Military in Under Developed Countries*. Princeton.
- Wasim, Mohammad (1994), *Politics and the State in Pakistan*. Islamabad: National Institute of Historical and Cultural Research.
- Welch, Claude E. Jr. (1967), *Political modernization: A reader*. In *Comparative Political Change*, State University of New York at Buffalo: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc. Belmont, California.
- Young, Peter Lewis (2000), The new century will have computerized soldiers. *The Dawn*, Wednesday, 5th January.