Southern Political Science Association

Urban Politics in India: Area, Power, and Policy in a Penetrated System. by Rodney W. Jones
Review by: Robert L. Hardgrave, Jr.

The Journal of Politics, Vol. 38, No. 1 (Feb., 1976), pp. 213-214

Published by: [Cambridge University Press](#) on behalf of the [Southern Political Science Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2128991>

Accessed: 05/02/2014 09:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Cambridge University Press and Southern Political Science Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Politics*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

hypothesis is "The flexibility of an image seems to be an inverse function of the level of intensity"; the last, "As stress increases in a crisis situation, performance generally worsens.")

Perhaps because of my already admitted biases about this kind of book, I see no useful relationship between his 48 hypotheses and his Israeli evidence. Nor can I accept as valid a testing of hypotheses apparently based only on "the independent reading of two colleagues" (p. 522). And more important, I do not find that Prof. Brecher has moved us much closer to his stated goal of "predicting behavior by decision-makers in foreign policy" (p. 519).

Yet I recommend this book highly—*not* for its attempts at theory building but rather for its fascinating fund of *facts*.

EDWARD BERNARD GLICK, *Temple University*

Urban Politics in India: Area, Power, and Policy in a Penetrated System. (By RODNEY W. JONES. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974. Pp. xviii, 420. \$20.00.)

In his analysis of Indore, a medium-sized commercial and industrial city in central India, Rodney Jones provides an unusually rich portrait of urban political processes. As is so often the case throughout the world, India's cities are at once both profoundly influential and politically weak. Confronting this paradox, Jones argues that "to determine who exercises power in Indian city politics, one must look outside the framework of municipal politics"—to the concentration of power and authority residing in the state government.

Jones succinctly summarizes his argument as follows: "The dominant structure in Indore politics consists of dual sets of co-optative hierarchies, one representative and embedded in electoral politics and the other bureaucratic and governmental. Decision-making crucial to the city is primarily centralized at the summits of the two vertical structures, usually outside the city at the state level of politics. Within the city, the hierarchies are interlocked with multiple centers, or arenas, of political activity. These dual hierarchies serve to integrate the political system with that of the state. Thus the political weakness of the city "... is but an expression of its dependency on the state-dominated vertical hierarchies.

The urban political system is open and penetrated from above. . . .” (p. 12)

In elucidating the patterns of vertical and horizontal linkages, Jones distinguishes among three levels of analysis of urban politics: the city as an actor in state politics, the politics of the city as a whole, and the politics of urban subsystems. The linkages among and within these levels are explored in a series of case studies of political arenas. In the first of these, an examination of the city arena, Jones sees city-wide political competition as rooted in princely and primordial (largely caste) rivalries and as structured by party and factional competition in elections and by the penetration of representative and bureaucratic hierarchies from the state level. He next examines, in microanalysis, a number of individual political arenas, including that of the municipal government itself, and, with especially revealing insight, the labor arena in city politics.

These case studies are highly detailed, involving a multitude of unfamiliar names such as to boggle the mind. But it would be unfortunate if they served to intimidate or discourage the reader, for in the wedding of theory and data, Jones reveals a high level of theoretical sophistication and an acute sense for what politics is all about.

The features of Indore that stand out in Jones's analysis—"those of external penetration and internal fragmentation and dependency"—are familiar in the larger comparative urban context. The book, well-written and provocative, deserves the close attention of anyone interested in urban politics.

ROBERT L. HARDGRAVE, JR., *University of Texas at Austin*