Disruption and Power: Political Risk, Business Strategy, and Sustainable Growth in the current Tamil Nadu electoral climate

Author

Palaniappan Ramanathan Chettiar (commonly known as Palan)

The author's research spans education, social work, psychology, and management, with a focus on institutional lag and the human–institutional interface in contexts of political disruption across ASEAN and South Asia.

ORCID

0000-0002-1682-232X

Credentials

Ph.D. (Federation University, Australia)
Alumnus, Harvard Business School (USA)

Multidisciplinary Specialisation

Education; Social Work; Psychology; Management

Institutional Affiliations

Pro-Chancellor, University of Cyberjaya (Malaysia)
Professor, Centre for Research & Postgraduate Studies, University of Cyberjaya (Malaysia)
Visiting Professor, Madras School of Social Work (India)
Visiting Professor, Federation University (Australia)

Funding Statement

This research received no external funding.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The author declares no competing interests.

Keywords

Political disruption; Power and legitimacy; Political risk; Business strategy; Institutional lag; Disruptive innovation; Velocity gap; Empathetic leadership; Tamil Nadu; Sustainable growth

Abstract (≈165 words)

Political disruption is increasingly interpreted as electoral volatility or democratic instability. This paper advances a different argument: disruption represents a redistribution of power with direct implications for political risk, business strategy, and sustainable growth. Drawing on Samuel P. Huntington's theory of political order and Clayton Christensen's theory of disruptive innovation, the paper conceptualises disruption as a predictable outcome of institutional lag and neglected constituencies rather than democratic failure (Huntington, 1968; Christensen, 1997).

Using a conceptual, theory-integrative qualitative approach, the analysis examines how disruption reshapes legitimacy, narrative authority, and state–society relations. The framework is applied to the contemporary Tamil Nadu electoral climate, where cultural symbolism, youth mobilisation, and identity narratives intersect with economic governance and business confidence. The paper argues that political risk increasingly emerges from misreading shifts in legitimacy rather than from policy uncertainty alone.

The analysis further demonstrates that empathetic, margin-rooted leadership mediates whether disruption amplifies instability or enables institutional adaptation. Sustainable growth, it concludes, depends on recognising disruption as early feedback on power transitions and aligning business strategy with evolving sources of legitimacy rather than incumbent authority alone.

---

1. Introduction

Political disruption has become a defining feature of governance in the twenty-first century. Electoral volatility, declining trust in institutions, and the rise of non-traditional political actors are now observable across advanced democracies, emerging economies, and hybrid regimes (Mounk, 2018; Diamond, 2019). In business and policy discourse, such disruption is often framed narrowly as instability—something to be managed through regulatory forecasting, electoral analysis, or short-term risk mitigation.

This paper advances a different argument. Political disruption should be understood as a **diagnostic signal of institutional lag and power reallocation**, not as democratic failure. As societies become more educated, digitally connected, and aspirational, political participation and expectations accelerate. When political and economic institutions fail to adapt at a comparable pace, disruption emerges as feedback rather than pathology (Huntington, 1968).

Integrating Samuel P. Huntington's theory of political order with Clayton Christensen's theory of disruptive innovation, the paper explains both **why instability arises** and **where disruption originates** (Huntington, 1968; Christensen, 1997). Huntington highlights the imbalance between participation and institutionalisation; Christensen explains how incumbents overlook emerging needs at the margins. Together, they reveal disruption as predictable rather than anomalous.

The paper applies this framework to the contemporary Tamil Nadu electoral climate, with implications for political risk, business strategy, and sustainable growth. It further argues that leadership—specifically empathetic, margin-rooted leadership—mediates whether disruption results in institutional decay or renewal.

2. Methodology: Conceptual, Theory-Integrative Qualitative Approach

This study adopts a conceptual, theory-integrative qualitative methodology. It does not rely on primary empirical data or statistical testing. Instead, it develops its argument through systematic engagement with established theoretical frameworks, secondary scholarly literature, and illustrative comparative cases.

This approach is appropriate because political disruption, as examined here, is structural and cross-contextual. It transcends individual elections or policy cycles and manifests across diverse political and economic systems. A conceptual methodology enables theoretical integration and explanatory coherence where empirical generalisation is neither feasible nor the objective.

The study integrates insights from political science, innovation theory, governance studies, and development literature. Illustrative cases—including Tamil Nadu, Barack Obama in the United States, and Joko Widodo in Indonesia—are used analytically rather than empirically. They serve to clarify mechanisms of disruption, legitimacy formation, and leadership response, without claiming causal inference.

3. Theoretical Foundations

3.1 Institutional Lag and Political Order (Huntington)

Samuel P. Huntington's *Political Order in Changing Societies* remains foundational for understanding political instability. Huntington argued that stability depends not on participation alone, but on the balance between participation and institutionalisation (Huntington, 1968). When political participation expands faster than institutional capacity, instability becomes likely.

Institutionalisation, for Huntington, involves adaptability, complexity, autonomy, and coherence. Weak institutions may exist formally but lack the capacity to process demands, regulate conflict, or implement decisions with legitimacy. Importantly, Huntington did not oppose participation; he warned against participation without institutions. When institutions fail to adapt to rising participation and complexity, governance capacity erodes and legitimacy weakens (Fukuyama, 2014)

In contemporary contexts, Huntington's insight translates directly into political risk. As participation accelerates through digital connectivity, education, and identity mobilisation, institutions designed for slower, hierarchical governance struggle to adapt. Instability, therefore, is not accidental—it is structural.

3.2 Disruption from the Margins (Christensen)

Clayton Christensen's theory of disruptive innovation explains why incumbents often fail not because they are incompetent, but because they are successful (Christensen, 1997). Organisations optimised for existing stakeholders overserve the centre while neglecting emerging needs at the margins.

Disruption emerges when new entrants serve overlooked constituencies with alternative value propositions. Initially dismissed as inferior or irrelevant, these entrants gain legitimacy over time and eventually redefine performance standards (Christensen, Raynor, & McDonald, 2015).

Applied to politics, this logic explains how disruption originates from constituencies that incumbent political systems fail to recognise—youth, informal workers, aspirational classes, and culturally marginalised groups. Disruption does not destroy power; it **relocates** it.

---

4. Integrated Analytical Framework: Institutional Lag, Disruption, and the Velocity Gap

Integrating Huntington and Christensen yields a unified analytical framework. Huntington explains **why systems become unstable**; Christensen explains **where disruption enters**. Together, they reveal disruption as feedback generated when institutions overserve incumbents while failing to adapt to rising participation and expectations.

This paper extends the framework by introducing the concept of a **velocity gap**—the growing mismatch between the accelerating pace of societal change and the slower speed of institutional adaptation. Digital platforms amplify mobilisation, narrative formation, and emotional resonance, while institutions adapt incrementally through procedure and reform (Castells, 2012).

Within this velocity gap, disruption first appears at the level of legitimacy rather than policy. Speed explains mobilisation; **empathy explains legitimacy**; legitimacy enables institutional adaptation. This hierarchy becomes critical for understanding leadership and political risk.

---

5. Analysis: Tamil Nadu and the Reconfiguration of Power

Tamil Nadu offers a particularly instructive context for analysing disruption and power. The state combines high political mobilisation, strong cultural identity, youth demographics, and deep state involvement in economic life. Elections are not merely contests between parties; they are contests over dignity, aspiration, and distributive legitimacy.

Disruption in Tamil Nadu operates through narrative and cultural channels—cinema, symbolism, welfare discourse, and identity politics. These dynamics reshape power relations that directly affect business confidence, labour relations, and long-term investment decisions. Political risk in this context emerges not only from electoral outcomes but from shifting legitimacy.

However, this reconfiguration of power is complicated by a persistent **'double lag'** at the intersection of caste and digital access. While digital platforms accelerate political messaging, they simultaneously mirror historical socio-economic stratifications. In Tamil Nadu, the **digital divide** remains deeply rooted in **caste-based deprivation**, where Scheduled Castes (SC) and Scheduled Tribes (ST) report significantly lower levels of computer ownership and internet connectivity compared to higher-caste groups (Vaidehi et al., 2021). This 'digital caste gap' suggests that political disruption may be highly visible among the digitally-active youth and urban aspirational classes, yet remain invisible or distorted among rural, marginalized constituencies. The prevailing socio-economic divide serves as the primary source of this wide digital disparity (**Akilan, 2025**), creating a risk for business strategists who may misinterpret

digital 'noise' as a universal shift in legitimacy while overlooking the deep-seated, non-digital grievances of the state's most vulnerable populations (**Venkatachalam, 2023**).

From a Huntingtonian perspective, rising participation has outpaced institutional adaptation. From a Christensenian perspective, incumbents have overserved established coalitions while underserving emerging aspirations. The resulting disruption signals power relocation rather than systemic collapse.

---

6. Comparative Illustrations: Obama, Jokowi, and Vijay

Leadership mediates whether disruption leads to institutional decay or renewal. Comparative illustrations clarify this mechanism.

Barack Obama mobilised disruption through a narrative of hope and inclusion that resonated with minorities and youth. His leadership combined narrative speed with relational empathy, enabling mobilisation to be institutionalised—at least initially—into governance capacity.

Joko Widodo (Jokowi) emerged from outside Indonesia's political elite. His legitimacy was rooted in proximity, humility, and delivery. Empathy grounded in lived experience narrowed the distance between citizens and institutions, stabilising disruption within a complex ASEAN governance context.

In contemporary Tamil Nadu, **Vijay** represents the newest entrant in this pattern. His political emergence illustrates how disruption increasingly crystallises around cultural empathy and symbolic identification before formal institutionalisation. His appeal derives not from bureaucratic authority but from narrative resonance with youth and aspirational groups.

Tamil Nadu's political history offers repeated reminders that disruption from the margins is often misread until it displaces incumbency. Leaders such as **K. Kamaraj, C. N. Annadurai, and later M. G. Ramachandran** did not emerge from the dominant centres of power; they rose by articulating neglected aspirations, dignity, and cultural identity. In neighbouring Andhra Pradesh, **N. T. Rama Rao** followed a similar trajectory. In each case, the prevailing argument against them was strikingly similar: that crowds do not translate into votes. History suggests otherwise. Crowds become votes when disruption rises from the margins and carries legitimacy. They fail only when elites dismiss that legitimacy as spectacle. When empathy, narrative resonance, and organisational adaptation converge, marginal mobilisation becomes electoral and institutional power.

Across these cases, empathy functions as the critical differentiator. Speed mobilises; empathy legitimises; legitimacy enables institutional adaptation. Where empathy is absent, speed intensifies polarisation. Where empathy exists without institutionalisation, disruption remains symbolic.

Empathetic leadership functions as a form of relational power, shaping legitimacy through persuasion and moral authority rather than formal coercion (Nye, 2008).

---

7. Discussion

The analysis reframes political disruption as structural feedback rather than democratic decay. For business strategy, this has significant implications. Political risk increasingly emerges from

misreading shifts in legitimacy and institutional power rather than from policy volatility alone (Acemoglu & Robinson, 2012).

From a developmental perspective, disruption also reflects unmet aspirations for agency, dignity and meaningful participation, reminding us that sustainable growth cannot be separated from the expansion of real human freedoms (Sen,1999).

The strategic Implications for businesses, especially for executives operating in South Asia, and specifically Tamil Nadu suggest that sustainable growth is no longer secured through incumbent protection alone. Business strategy must pivot toward 'empathetic intelligence'—actively monitoring the velocity gap between institutional policy and marginal aspirations to pre-empt disruptive shifts in the operating environment."

Disruption originates from neglected margins and gains force through narrative power. Businesses aligned exclusively with incumbents inherit incumbent risk when legitimacy migrates elsewhere. Sustainable growth therefore depends on institutional adaptation informed by empathetic leadership.

Digital disinformation amplifies disruption by exploiting legitimacy gaps and leadership vacuums but does not generate disruption independently. Its impact is contingent on institutional and leadership capacity.

For regions such as Tamil Nadu and ASEAN more broadly, legitimacy is relational and performance based. Leadership sensitivity to context becomes essential for stabilising disruption and sustaining growth.

---

8. Conclusion

This paper has argued that political disruption should be understood as a redistribution of power rather than democratic failure. By integrating Huntington's theory of institutional lag with Christensen's theory of disruptive innovation, the analysis demonstrates that disruption is a predictable outcome when societal participation and digital aspirations outpace institutional adaptation.

In the specific context of Tamil Nadu, this disruption is complicated by a 'double lag' where the digital divide and caste-class intersections create layers of structural exclusion. These barriers mean that while disruption may manifest through high-velocity digital narratives, the underlying grievances are rooted in long-standing socio-economic marginalization. For sustainable growth to be resilient, it must address these foundational gaps rather than merely responding to surface-level volatility.

Leadership—specifically **empathetic, margin-rooted leadership**—mediates whether this disruption results in decay or renewal. For practitioners, this necessitates a pivot toward **'empathetic intelligence'**: a strategic capability to monitor the velocity gap and align business interests with evolving sources of legitimacy.

As a conceptual study, this paper does not claim empirical generalisability. Future research may extend the framework through comparative empirical analysis across other ASEAN and South Asian political systems. Ultimately, disruption, when interpreted intelligently as a diagnostic signal, serves not as a threat to governance but as a catalyst for long-term institutional and corporate resilience.

References

Acemoglu, D., & Robinson, J. A. (2012). *Why nations fail*. Crown Business.

Akilan, S. T. (2025). A sociological study on digital divide: a comparative analysis between selected urban and rural areas in Tamil Nadu, India. *EPRA International Journal of Sociological Research*, 14(2).

Castells, M. (2012). *Networks of outrage and hope*. Polity Press.

Christensen, C. M. (1997). *The innovator's dilemma*. Harvard Business School Press.

Christensen, C. M., Raynor, M. E., & McDonald, R. (2015). What is disruptive innovation? *Harvard Business Review*, 93(12), 44–53.

Diamond, L. (2019). *Ill winds: Saving democracy from Russian rage, Chinese ambition, and American complacency.* Penguin Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2014). *Political order and political decay: From the industrial revolution to the globalization of democracy.* Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Huntington, S. P. (1968). *Political order in changing societies*. Yale University Press.

Mounk, Y. (2018). *The people vs. democracy: Why our freedom is in danger and how to save it*. Harvard University Press.

Nye, J. S. (2008). *The powers to lead*. Oxford University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.

Vaidehi, R., Reddy, A. B., & Banerjee, S. (2021). Explaining caste-based digital divide in India. *Telematics and Informatics*, 65, 101719.

Venkatachalam, L. (2023). Digital divide and access to online education: New evidence from Tamil Nadu, India. *Journal of Social and Economic Development*, 25(1), 313–333.