

## **ELITE THEORIES OF PARETO, MOSCA AND MICHELS**

Doç. Dr. Mustafa Delican

### **I- INTRODUCTION**

Studies on elites have been one of the largest subject in social sciences particularly in sociology and political sciences. This emphasis is mostly due to undeniable effects and roles of elites in societies developed or developing. Interestingly, most of these studies hardly cover the studies of founder of elite theories. Elite theories introduced not only elites, but also new important subjects like power, and rose questions for example on oligarchical tendencies in democracy. Unfortunately, more studies have been done on elitist theories' ideas on political subjects than their ideas on social thoughts.

In this study I will work on the classic elite theories, namely Pareto's Circulation of Elites, Mosca's theories of Ruling Class, and Michels' theory of Iron law of Oligarchy and I will not get into neither the subject of Power Elite nor elites roles in today's societies particularly in developing countries. Therefore, my focus will be on political elites in the writings of Pareto, Mosca, and Michels. First I will summarize their theories and then I will critic and evaluate them by comparing each other in terms of similarities and differences, their contributions on social thoughts, understanding social life, social and political movements, and their direct and indirect effects on democracy.

### **II- PARETO: THE LAW OF CIRCULATION OF ELITES**

Pareto says that people are always governed by elites except short period of time. He rejects a linear progressive evolutionary interpretation of history and social change. For him, "[h]istory of men is the history of the continues replacement of certain elites as one ascends another declines, such is the real phenomenon, though to us it may often appear under another form" (Pareto 1968, p.36).

The notion of elite had been known before pareto. He himself also used Kolabinska's study, who was also one of Pareto's student, " La Circulation des Elites en France" as a reference source. To Pareto elites are those people who posses in marked degree qualities of intelligence, character, capacity, of what ever kind. More precisely if we grade every individual regardless of any ethical judgment, according to their branch activity and occupation in the society, we find at each grade level there will be a certain amount of individuals, that consists of a class. In this class hierarchy, people who are in the class which is on the top of the other classes are called, "elite" (Pareto 1935, p.1421 footnote 2026';1422-23).

Then, Pareto classifies social classes by taking elites as a stickyard. Elites represent the higher stratum, the others, namely non-elites are thought as the lower stratum. He further emphasizes and divides it into subgroups, because for him, there is no one elite stratum. There are various strata in it and all of them constitute the elite stratum. The main strata in elite stratum are (a) governing elite that consists of rest of the individuals who directly or indirectly have a considerable role in government; (b) non-governing elite that consists of rest in the elite stratum; (c) political elite that effectively and particularly, exercise political power. The elite or upper stratum or aristocracy ( Pareto uses these terms interchangeably ) contains a certain number of people, but it cannot be sharply defined because social classes like societies are not homogeneous and they are not entirely distinct to each other even in a caste system and particularly in societies where class circulation is extremely rapid like modern societies ( Pareto, 1935, pp 1419,1423-1424, 1429, 1575; Pareto 1968, p. 78).

Pareto examines structure and change of elites rather than non elites. This is mostly due to availability of historical data according to him. Elites and non-elites are not stable, they are subject to change. New elites rise and takes old elite's place. This change is called the law of circulation of elites by Pareto. He says "elites" or aristocrats do not last. They live or take position in a certain time. "History" , he says, "is a graveyard of aristocracies" ( Pareto 1935, p. 1430). In course of the time, elites undergo a change when elite member's composition change or their descendants do not have qualities to be elite; or, infiltration of extraneous elements from lower classes and another society, or, changes in legal rights in society like extension of right of citizenship that gives an opportunity for non-elites to move up( Pareto 1935, p. 169).

Rising and declining of the elites take place at the same time. Generally there are two signs that show elites are declining: (1) declining elite becomes softer, milder, more humane and less apt to defend its own power; and (2) elites loss its rapacity and greed for the goods of others, but rather tends as much as possible to increase its unlawful appropriations and indulge in major usurpation of the national patrimony ( Pareto 1968, p. 59). In contrast new rising elites are active, stronger and dedicated in character.

The circulation of elites in ruling class is more clear than general circulation of elite. Governing or ruling elite is always in a state of slow and continuous transformation. The transformation is basically based on change in residues of ruling elite. Change in the proportion of Class I ( combinations ) and class II ( Persistence of aggression ) residues leads to replacement of ruling elite. Because relative proportions of class I and class II residues principally determine social equilibrium, and make possible for elite to stay in power. In course of time, ruling class becomes weak in class II residues and loose its strength. In this case, people who are strong in class II residues rise upwards into the governing class

either by gradual infiltrations ( class circulation ) or in sudden spurt through revolution ( Pareto 1935, pp. 1428-29, 1556 ). Ruling class follows various ways to protect itself from the threats of non-elites such as using force; death; capital punishment, financial ruin, exclusion from public offices, exile and ostracism. On the other hand, ruling class recruit the individuals from lower strata in order to fulfill its gap in both Class I and Class II residues and also eliminate the individuals who are potential threat for ruling class itself. Recruitment must be controlled otherwise it can lead corruption of ruling class because when one moves up, he also brings his inclinations, sentiments and attitudes. Another way to control ruled class is device ( Pareto 1935, pp 1426, 1787-97).

Considering means to control the subject classes, Pareto divides political elites into two groups: (1) "foxes" who are strong in Class I residues and (2) "lions" who are strong in Class II residues. While foxes prefer to rule through co-operation, diplomatic intrigue, and deviousness, lions prefer to rule through the use of force ( Powers 1987, p 41).

Foxes and lions live under any type of political structure, their attitudes are not affected or shaped by the form of government. He says "Whatever the form of government, men holding power have as a rule a certain inclination to use that power to keep themselves in the saddle, and, to abuse it to secure personal gains and advantages"( Pareto 1935, p. 1608).

In fact all governments use force but no government can rule by depending solely on force. Theories designed by ruling class and derivations are used to convince the subject classes to obey the government, and, to justify government policies, and, to use visible force like army ,and, invisible force like political machine . In addition to these, sentiments of superiority and inferiority are used to keep ruled class in order. ( Pareto 1935, pp. 686-87, 1526-27, 1534, 1541, 1585).

General condition of society is of particular importance for the ruling class's position. When a governing elite establishes its control over the subject classes by using force and providing great wealth , the ruling class survive sometime without using power, but it also survives by granting its adversaries, in terms of money, dignity and respect. Bargaining, concessions, and deceive are also this kind of policies. Economic prosperity not only keeps the ruling class in power and makes easy to govern society than period of depression, but also affects the type of political regimes. For example in prosperity periods, there is a tendency to shift from oligarchic regimes to democratic regimes ( Pareto 1935, pp. 1431-32, 1636).

On the other hand, general conditions of society shapes the type of circulation of elites: soft and violent. Soft replacement of elites comes through the change of supply to and demand for certain social needs or elements. For example

when there is a war, more soldiers are required. Rising armies and military elites change the balance among the social classes and diminish the power of old elites. It happened in Europe when rising of strong military armies collapsed aristocracies (Pareto 1935, p. 1426). Violent circulation of elites is via revolutions. Accumulations in elite strata and failing to use force by political class lead to revolutions, when elements of superior quality in lower class come to fore and this lower class is willing to use force ( Pareto 1935, p. 141 ).

The battle between ruling class and ruled class is always subject to manipulations. Both sides, old elite and new elites, declare that they are not fighting or working for their interests but for the good of the many. Of course when the victory is achieved, one side loses and other side gains. After this political revalry, who wins , will get the lion's share of the distribution of wealth, power, prestige in the society. The type of policy necessary to get these goals will be employed including force. Elites particularly ruling class, are well aware of heterogeneity of individuals, unequal distribution of material, and non-material assets in the society, and their interests. Further more, in contrast to masses, ruling elite involves more logical actions than illogical , that makes elites more flexible and awake for their own interests.

### III- MOSCA: THE RULING CLASS

Like Pareto, Mosca says that in any type of society at any point of history, there are two class of people- a class that rule and a class that is ruled. The former contains a few number of people and posses all political power and privileges whereas the latter consist of large number of people and is subjected to rule of former and provides essential instrumental for political organization (Mosca 1939, p.50).

For Mosca, two political facts have to be considered in order to analyze the relationship between ruling class and ruled class. The first fact is that there is always one person who is the leader of political organization among the ruling class. This individual is not necessarily the person who holds the highest political position according to law. Even he is not necessarily known by everyone. This person, for example can be prime minister of king or president or the person makes the president to be elected. Under certain conditions, this supreme power can be in hand of more than one person. The second fact is regardless of the type of the political organization , pressures of masses to ruling class and its policies. Therefore, ruling class, or the head of the state, must be sensitive about thought and feelings of the masses to get their support, otherwise he cannot rule. For this reason, at least a large group from the masses is created to support the ruling class and the system (Mosca 1939, pp.50-53).

The logic of ruling class, for Mosca, is simple: the ability to be organized easily and effectively. Minority is always organized; therefore, it has ability to overcome the majority. To Mosca this relation and its outcomes are inevitable.

Formation of the ruling classes has a close relation with the level of civilization and the type of society. Ruling class under every condition try to reproduce itself particularly by domination on political forces like power, wealth and the ruling class tends to be come hereditary. In fact, descents of ruling class members have a high life chances to have the traits necessary to be a ruling class member (Mosca 1939, pp. 60-61). In general, prior to democracy, membership of ruling class was not only de facto but also de jure. In democracy, de jure transfer of political possession to descendants of ruling class members impossible and not legitimized but it is now de facto.

According to Mosca, historically, ruling class try to justify its existence and policies by using some universal moral principles, superiority etc., lately, scientific theory and knowledge like Social Darwinism, division of labor is also employed for the same purposes. Mosca particularly rejects these two theses to use in political purposes. To Mosca, at a certain level of civilization, ruling classes do not justify their power exclusively by de facto possession of it, but try to find a moral and legal basis for it. This legal and moral basis or principles on which the power of the political class rests is called "political formula" by Mosca. The formula has a unique structure in all societies. "[T]he political formula must be based on the special beliefs and the strongest sentiments of the current social group or at least upon the beliefs and sentiments of the particular portion of that group which hold political preeminence"(Mosca 1939, p.71,72).

In fact ruling class like Pareto's elite strata consist of two strata: (a) the highest stratum; and (b) second stratum. The highest stratum is the core of the ruling class but it could not sufficiently lead and direct the society unless the second stratum helps. Second stratum is the larger than the higher stratum in number and has all the capacities of leadership in the country. Even autocratic systems do have it. Not only political but also any type of social organization needs the second stratum in order to be possible (Mosca 1939, p.404, 430).

The members of the ruling class should be recruited almost entirely from the dominant, majority group in the society. If the society has a number of minorities and if this rule is not followed due to weaknesses of dominant group, political system can meet serious political crisis. The same thing occurs when there are considerable differences between in the culture, and in customs of the ruling class and subject classes (Mosca 1939, p.105,106-7).

Weaknesses of dominant group in society and isolation of lower classes from the ruling classes can lead to political upheaval in the country and as a result of this upheaval subject classes' representatives can have places in the ruling class. Because when isolation takes place, another ruling class emerges among the subject classes that often hostile to the old ruling class (Mosca 1939, pp. 107-8). Furthermore, due to reciprocal isolation of classes, the character of upper classes change, they become weak in bold and aggressiveness and richer in "soft"

remissive individuals. On the same track , when there is fragmentation in the society, new groups form and each one of them makes up of its own leaders and followers. Besides these revolutions are another source of replacement of ruling class (Mosca 1939, p.163, 199).

When Mosca compares the political systems, he says that communist and socialist societies would beyond any doubt managed by officials and he sees these regimes as utopia. On democracy, he says, although gradual increase of universal suffrage, actual power has remained partly in wealthiest and the middle classes. At the same time, for Mosca, middle class is necessary for democracy, and when middle class declines, politic regimes in democratic countries turns to a plutocratic dictatorship, or bureaucratic dictatorship. (Mosca 1939, p.391).

According to Mosca, ruling class has a responsive character to social change in the society and there is a close relation between level of civilization and character of ruling classes. According to these two complementary proposition, it can be said that ruling class is subject of social change rather than actor of it. For example, change in division of labor from lower to higher and change in political force from military to wealth have changed the type of state from federal to bureaucratic state (Mosca 1939, p. 81, 83 ). There it seems that Mosca admits a linear social change in history, as opposite to Pareto.

As seen, Mosca's theory is basically based on organized minorities' superiority over unorganized majority. This organized minority consists of ruling class, but for Mosca it is not necessarily mean that always interest of ruling class and subject classes are different. To him ,in contrast they coincide many times. He saw the future of socialist system by saying that it will be governed by officials. This feature of socialist system is well documented by Milovon Dijilas in his work: *New Classes*. But Mosca failed to see that one day, majority will also be able to organize. As C. W. Mills pointed put, democratic western societies have experienced important transformations: (1) from the organized minority and unorganized majority to relatively unorganized minority and organized majority, and (2) from the elite state to an organized state.( Mills 1965, pp. 161-162). Therefore minorities and elites in today's society are less powerful than majorities. Elites have relatively lost their privileges, and more importantly, their monopoly over society .

#### **IV- MICHELS: THE IRON LAW OF OLIGARCHY**

To Michels organizations are the only means for the creation of a collective will and they work under the Iron Law of Oligarchy. He explicitly points out the indispensability of oligarchy from the organizations by saying that "It is organization which gives birth to the domination of the elected over electors, of the mandatanes over the mandators, of the delegates over delegators, who says organization, says oligarchy" ( Michels 1966, p.365).

Oligarchical tendencies in organizations is not related to ideology or ends of the organizations. Of course, it is evident that any organization which is set up for autocratic aims, it is oligarchic by nature. To Michels, regardless of any ideological concerns, all types of organizations have oligarchic tendencies. It was his major question in political parties that "how can oligarchic tendencies be explained in socialist and democratic parties, which they declared war against?" (Michels 1966, pp. 50-51).

When he examines this question throughout in his book: *Political Parties*, he sees organization itself particularly bureaucracy, nature of human being and the phenomenon of leadership as major factors for oligarchical tendencies in organizations. According to Michels' assessments, the crowd is always subject to suggestion and the masses have an apathy for guidance of their need. In contrast the leaders have a natural greed of power ( Michels 1966, pp. 64, 205). To Michels, leadership itself is not compatible with the most essential postulates of democracy, but leadership is a necessary phenomenon in every form of society. He says "At the outset, leaders arise spontaneously, their functions are ACCESSORY and GRATUITOUS. Soon however, they become professional leaders, and in this second stage of development they are stable and irremovable" (Michels 1966, p. 364).

Leaders also have personal qualities that make them successful as a ruling class. These qualities are, the force of will, knowledge, strength of conviction, self sufficiency, goodness of heart and disinterestedness ( Michels 1966, p. 100 ). Furthermore there is a reciprocal relationship between leadership functions and the organizational structure. Majority of leaders abuse organizational opportunities for their personal aims by using their personal qualities and by creating means, organizational process or principles like party discipline.

As for as organization itself is considered as a source of oligarchy, Michels says that it is generally because of "PSYCHOLOGY OF ORGANIZATION ITSELF, that is to say, upon the tactical and technical necessities which result from the consolidation of every disciplined political aggregate." ( Michels 1966, p. 365). Further as a particular type of organization bureaucracy and its features require an oligarchic structure.

At the societal level, although development in the democracy, oligarchy still exists. First of all he says by looking at the state as an organization, which needs a bureaucracy that is the source of enemy of individual freedom, the state represents a single gigantic oligarchy. An attempt to destroy this gigantic oligarchy in fact brings a number of smaller oligarchies in society but does not eliminate it ( Michels 1966, p. 188,191,202). Secondly he agrees with Jean Jack Rousseau on the idea that "it is always against the natural order of things that the majority rule and the minority ruled." ( Michels 1965, p. 106). Along with this idea professional leadership is seen by Michels as an incompatible phenomenon with

democracy, because , although the leaders at once are not more than executive agents off collective will, as soon as they gain the technical specialization, they emancipate themselves form the masses and start to use their power against the majority. ( Michels 1966, p.70). In addition to this, representative political system is not compatible with the ideal democracy, because to Michels, "a mass which delegates its sovereignty, that is to say transfer its sovereignty to the hands of the few individuals, abdicates its sovereign function ( Michels 1966, p. 73).

The third factor is related to level of socio-economic development of societies and experience of democracy in history. To him in this time ideal democracy is impossible due to socio-economic conditions, that further more he says that, " The democracy has an inherent preference for the authoritarian solution of the important questions" ( Michels 1966, p. 51, 342).

As a logical result of his iron law of oligarchy, he admits there are elites in society but not elite circulation in terms of replacing one another. He does not redefine the concept of elite, he took Pareto's theory of circulation of elites and modified it. To Michels, there is a battle between the old and new elites, leaders. The end of this war is not an absolute replacement of the old elites by the new elites, but a reunion of elites, a perennial amalgamation. Complete replacement of elites is rare in history. The old elites attract, absorb and assimilate the new ones, and it is a continuous process (Michels 1966, p. 182, 343; Michels 1949, p. 63). Because for Michels, first " old aristocracy does not disappear, does not become proletarian or impoverished ( at least in absolute sense ), does not make way for new group of rulers , but that always remains at the head of nations, which it led over the course of centuries...[and second]...the old aristocracy be it very old rejuvenated, does not exercise the rule alone but is forced to shave it with some kind of new ruler" ( Michels 1965, p. 75-76).

Aristocracy for Michels is not homogenous stratum. and consists of nobility and ruling class. Nobility represents a small but strong part of aristocracy. In this sense it seems that nobility represents real oligarchical power in the society. To Michels nobility holds itself at the helm and does not even dream of disappearing from the stage of history. Though not coinciding with aristocracy, and not constituting more than a part of it, nobility generally takes hold of it and makes itself its master. It pervades, conquers, and molds, the high middle class according to its own moral and social essence" ( Michels 1949,p. 77, 80 ). In contrast to nobility aristocracy is heterogeneous and a place where lower classes' members can easily rise and members of aristocracy can be subject to downward social mobility. For his time, he describes elements of aristocracy (1) aristocrats by birth (2) aristocracy of government clerks, (3) aristocracy of money (4) aristocracy of knowledge . All this groups also represent ruling class ( Michels 1965, p. 76 ).



Michels does not get in too much special analysis of the relationships between aristocracy, ruling class and majority. I think he doesn't see that there are much differences in oligarchy in organization and oligarchy in society at large.

To me these two must be separated because (1) for individuals society in a sense an unavoidable place to be in contrast to organizations, particularly voluntary organization, (2) while society represent a more natural entity, organizations are more artificial entities and (3) organizations are set to realize certain targets in a certain period of time, in contrast society's targets are relatively unstable, and subject to reconstruction by people. To think of these questions, does not necessarily reject the existence of oligarchical tendencies in societies. In fact as Michels pointed out democracy has a legacy to solve important questions of society, by using oligarchic methods. Furthermore he also points out that at any social organization there is an intermixture of oligarchic and democratic tendencies. He says that "... In modern party life, aristocracy gladly present itself in democratic guise, while the substance of democracy is permeated with aristocratic elements. On the one side we have aristocracy is a democratic form, and on the other hand democracy with an aristocratic context" ( Michels 1966, p.50 ).

#### V- CRITICS AND EVALUATION OF ELITE THEORIES

Elite as a concept has been a key term in social science although many times it has been used without reference to Pareto, Mosca and Michels. Relatively few works have been done on elite theories and their theorists. Further more, even today a few of studies of theoreticians of elites have been translated to English. One of the work of Vilfredo Pareto the transformation of democracy, has recently translated to English in 1984. Therefore I could say that critics and evaluation of elite theories and elitists have deficiencies. In addition in many of books on selection in social sciences have excluded the study of the founders of elite theories, although there are sections on elites in these books. For example in Frank and Lindenfeld ( eds.) Reader in political Sociology ( 1968) and J.S. Finkle and R.W. Gable ( eds.) Political development and social change( 1966) have written about elites, but don't have any text from Pareto, Mosca or Michels. In contrast, in reality, elites roles in societies particularly in developing countries have been a great deal studied and researched. I could think of two reasons for exclusion of these big elitist theorists in the literature. The first reason could be ideological particularly Marxist and Socialist thinkers are inherently against elitists theories and the second reason could be abolition of the meaning of elite concept from elitist theorists definition and reconstruction of the meaning of elite concept.

As far as critics of elite theories are concerned, the emphasis have largely been on the relation between democracy and elite theories. This tendency is mostly by anti-democratic reputation of elitist theorists. In contrast there have been less emphasis on elite theories contribution on understanding on social stratification,

obstacles for social mobility , distribution of power, wealth and status in societies as well as organizations.

Pareto, Mosca and Michels are also labeled as Machiavellians. This label is due to three reasons. (1) All of them are Italians. (2) They basically belong to the same thought of school and (3) to spread negative reputation of Machiavelli to these three thinkers. The question is that why elitists theories were born in Italy at the turn of century. Two answers have been given. First is that Machiavellian tradition in Italy. The second answer finds a direct relationship between elitist theories and backward development of Italy at the turn of century. According to Meisel, "Both [ Mosca and Pareto] reacted to the general consequence of the industrial revolution, but they comprehended it in their own specifically Italian context. Their country was a backward province of world capitalism (Meisel 1965(a), p. 6). On the same line G. Lukacs says that lack of genuine bourgeois democracy in Italy led them to emphasis on political leadership( Bottomore 1964, p. 9-10). These answers without doubt have reality but we have to also consider that, Italy was not an isolated country from the rest of Europe. Further autobiographies of theorists clearly show that they have close relation with other countries physically and academically. Therefore these two reasons are not enough to explain the source of elitism in Italy.

Circulation of elites more specifically, in the realm of politics, ruling class is the main concern of Pareto, Mosca and Michels. All of them analyze the structure of elites, social stratification in society, social mobility upward and downward, relation among the elite strata and relation between elite and non-elite classes; and socio-economic, political and historical conditions' effect on these phenomena and relationship among them. The great emphasis is given to distribution of power , status and wealth , and the battle among the classes to get lions' share in the power, wealth and status in society.

From a larger perspective, it is the socio-economic change and ideology ( or religion as Pareto and Mosca call ) shape new classes. To me even Pareto's residues move in these large perspective. Once new classes are formed they become new social and political forces in society and try to move up into the upper strata. This process is well explained in Pareto's latter work: *The Transformation of Democracy*. He says that as a result of changes in societies in 19<sup>th</sup> century two classes are rising: the class of wealthy speculators and the class of wage earners. At the same time power of two classes is declining: The class of property owner and the military class. In terms of future political structure he says, "... the growing power of wealthy speculators might be viewed as "plutocratic" tendency , while the growing power of wage earners might be viewed as democratic tendency", and, he adds" these two classes can be thought as having in some sense, cooperatively united, or formed a partial ally ( Pareto 1984, p 55 ). Here each class has a special ideological tendency, compatible with his own class interests. These two

tendencies remind us to consider Michels proposition of intermixture of political structure: autocratic tendency and democratic tendency. Mosca also has this dual tendency. He says when authority transmitted from above, aristocratic principles are at work and that when authority is based on a part or all of people, liberal principles are at work. ( Meisel 1965(b), p. 165 ).

In terms of replacement of old elites by new ones, there is a distinction between Pareto and Michels. Michels does not admit replacement of elites, but admits, amalgamation of new and old elites. In fact historically we can see both of them happened. In short term amalgamation of old and new elites, and in long terms replacement of old elites by new ones. This time period depends on changes in society at large. For example, consider socialist revolutions and aftermath of independent movement in developing countries where these two movements took place, old elites were wiped out. This type of changes are rarely in history. In short term, amalgamation of elites takes place and new elites gradually increases its proportion in the elite strata and ruling class. For example as a result of industrialization in Europe, Hughes observes that at the beginning "...upper class oligarchy shared power with the old aristocracy-but with each year that passed the balance seemed to incline more heavily in favor of the former" (Hughes 1965, pp.149-150). It can be concluded that new elites are born as a result of socio-economic , political, and historical changes in society, and then these new elites via upward mobility, and that in the end the new elites take place the highest position in the society. In this process the adaptation ability of old elites determine their fates.

On democracy, Pareto always separate ideal democracy and democracy applied, and prefers to talk about the subjects of democracy rather than democracy itself. Michels is clearly in favor of democracy. Mosca was previously against democracy but after the experience of Fascism in Italy, he changed his mind.

How elitist theories affected democracy ? Two answers have given for this question. On the negative side, it has been said that these anti-democratic theories helped European ruling classes by restoring their self confidence and by increasing their consciousness about their privileges; therefore, elite theories become a vehicle for ruling classes (Hughes 1965 (b), p.149). On the positive side, it has said that elitist theories have helped to enhance democratic theories. Michels himself believed that research on oligarchies necessary for development of democracy by saying that "...a serene and frank examination of oligarchical dangers of democracy will enable us to minimize these dangers,...(Michels 1966, p.370).

It can be said that elitist theories extended and increased awareness of masses and scientist against governments and ruling classes. As a result, many researches have been conducted on application of democracy in organizations.

Researches have shown that oligarchical tendencies are dominant in organizations and can not be eliminated totally. Further more, attempts to reduce oligarchic control in organizations with very few exception have failed. In general, in voluntary organizations, the functional requirements of democracy can not be met most of the time (Lipset, Trow, and Coleman 1956, p.4,6,452).

Is democracy still compatible with elite theories? That has been the question that lead to redefine, reconceptualize the democracy. Here we must pay attention that Pareto, Mosca, and Michels worked J.J. Rousseau's definition of democracy: government by the people, but not government for the people (Burnham 1943, pp.156-7). New democratic theories like political pluralism, theory of the mass society are compatible with elitist theories. Schumpeter was one of the earliest thinker that he redefined democracy considering elitists' arguments. To him democracy defined as "...institutional arrangement for arriving the power to decide by means of competitive struggle for the people's vote" (Bottomore 1964, p.10).

In contrast to compatibility of elitist theories' with democracy, it can not be compatible with Marxism. Michels pointed out that "[t]he law of circulation of elites destroy the thesis of the possibility of a society without social levels...[and]... destroy equally the supposition of a ruling class that remains closed and inaccessible" (Michels 1965, p. 106). In terms of preference of political systems he clearly says that "the defects inherent in democracy are obvious. It is none the less true that as a form of social life we must choose democracy as the least of evils" (Michels 1966, p.370).

## VI- CONCLUSIONS

Elitist theorists not only introduced elites but also contributed on better understanding of social and political life of societies. The key concept is "power" and who has the power she/he is the leader of society. Heredity, wealth, intellect, organizations are the means to get power.

Pareto, Mosca, and Michels agree on that elites, aristocrats come to power and all necessary policies and means are used in order to continue to be ruler and protect their privileges. In contrast to Pareto and Mosca, to Michels an amalgamation occurs among the rising elites and old ones rather than replacement of the old elites by the new.

In terms of methodology, Pareto and Mosca used historical method in their studies, but they took history as true knowledge. That was one of their weaknesses. On the other hand, Michels analysis was based on more concrete data.

Another important commonalties of them is to reject to explain social events by one factor. However, it seems that Psychological factors in Pareto's theory and structural factors in Michels theory are dominant.

Lastly, elite theories contributed development of democracy by showing the differences between theory, constitutional guarantines, and practical application of democracy. That have led to create new and more realistic, viable, and applicable theories on democracy.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bottomore, T.B. 1964. **Elites and Society**. London: C.A. Watt and Co. Ltd.
- Burnham, James. 1943. **The Machiavellians: Defenders of Freedom**. New York: The John Day Co.
- Hughes, H. Stuart. 1965. "Gaetono Mosca and the political lessons of history" pp. 141- 160 in **Pareto and Mosca**. J.H. Meisel (Eds.). Englewood Cliffs. N.J.:Prentice- Hall.
- Lipset, S.M., Trow, M.A., Coleman, J.S.. 1962. **Union Democracy**. Garden City, New York: Anchor Books.
- Meisel, James, H. 1965(a). "Introduction". pp. 1- 44 in **Pareto and Mosca**. J.H. Meisel (Eds.). Englewood Cliffs. N.J.:Prentice-Hall.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1965(b). "Power Structure and Power Flow". pp. 165-169 in **Pareto and Mosca**. J.H. Meisel (Eds.). Englewood Cliffs. N.J.:Prentice-Hall.
- Michels, Robert. [1949] 1965. **First Lectures in Political Sociology**. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- \_\_\_\_\_ [1915] 1966. **Political Parties**. New York: Free.
- Mills, C. Wright. 1965. "Notes on Mosca". pp 161-163 in **Pareto and Mosca**. J.H. Meisel (Eds.). Englewood Cliffs. N.J.:Prentice-Hall.
- Mosca, Gaetono. [1896] 1939. **The Ruling Class**. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Pareto, Vilfredo. [1916] 1935. **The Mind and Society. A Treatise on General Sociology**. New York: Dower.
- \_\_\_\_\_ [1901] 1968. **The Rise and Fall of the Elites: An Application of Theoretical Sociology**. New Jersey: The Bedminister Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ [1921] 1984. **The Transformation of Democracy**. New Brunswick. New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- Powers, Charles, H. 1987. **Vilfredo Pareto**. New Burry Park: Sage Publications.