

RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY

SECOND YEAR

PAPER-II



BA

**POLITICAL
THEORY**



**INSTITUTE
OF DISTANCE
EDUCATION** **IDE**
Rajiv Gandhi University

www.ide.rgu.ac.in

POLITICAL THEORY

BA

Second Year

Paper - II



RAJIV GANDHI UNIVERSITY
Arunachal Pradesh, INDIA - 791 112

BOARD OF STUDIES

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 1. Prof. P K Panigarhi
Department of Political Science
Rajiv Gandhi University | Chairman |
| 2. Dr. N N Hina
Department of Political Science
Rajiv Gandhi University | Member |
| 3. Dr. T. Mibang
Department of Political Science
Rajiv Gandhi University | Member |
| 4. Prof. Nani Bath
Department of Political Science
Rajiv Gandhi University | Member Secretary |

About the University

Rajiv Gandhi University (formerly Arunachal University) is a premier institution for higher education in the state of Arunachal Pradesh and has completed twenty-five years of its existence. Late Smt. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, laid the foundation stone of the university on 4th February, 1984 at Rono Hills, where the present campus is located.

Ever since its inception, the university has been trying to achieve excellence and fulfill the objectives as envisaged in the University Act. The university received academic recognition under Section 2(f) from the University Grants Commission on 28th March, 1985 and started functioning from 1st April, 1985. It got financial recognition under section 12-B of the UGC on 25th March, 1994. Since then Rajiv Gandhi University, (then Arunachal University) has carved a niche for itself in the educational scenario of the country following its selection as a University with potential for excellence by a high-level expert committee of the University Grants Commission from among universities in India.

The University was converted into a Central University with effect from 9th April, 2007 as per notification of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

The University is located atop Rono Hills on a picturesque tableland of 302 acres overlooking the river Dikrong. It is 6.5 km from the National Highway 52-A and 25 km from Itanagar, the State capital. The campus is linked with the National Highway by the Dikrong bridge.

The teaching and research programmes of the University are designed with a view to play a positive role in the socio-economic and cultural development of the State. The University offers Undergraduate, Post-graduate, M.Phil and Ph.D. programmes. The Department of Education also offers the B.Ed. programme.

There are fifteen colleges affiliated to the University. The University has been extending educational facilities to students from the neighbouring states, particularly Assam. The strength of students in different departments of the University and in affiliated colleges has been steadily increasing.

The faculty members have been actively engaged in research activities with financial support from UGC and other funding agencies. Since inception, a number of proposals on research projects have been sanctioned by various funding agencies to the University. Various departments have organized numerous seminars, workshops and conferences. Many faculty members have participated in national and international conferences and seminars held within the country and abroad. Eminent scholars and distinguished personalities have visited the University and delivered lectures on various disciplines.

The academic year 2000-2001 was a year of consolidation for the University. The switch over from the annual to the semester system took off smoothly and the performance of the students registered a marked improvement. Various syllabi designed by Boards of Post-graduate Studies (BPGS) have been implemented. VSAT facility installed by the ERNET India, New Delhi under the UGC-Infonet program, provides Internet access.

In spite of infrastructural constraints, the University has been maintaining its academic excellence. The University has strictly adhered to the academic calendar, conducted the examinations and declared the results on

Authors:

Dr. Biswaranjan Mohanty, (Units: 1-2, 5.3-5.9, 7-9) © Dr. Biswaranjan Mohanty, 2017

Ms. Swaha Das, Ms. Swati Priyambada Das, Mr. Punyoslaka Priyadarshi Das, (Units: 3.4, 10) © Reserved, 2017

Paulomi M. Jindal, (Unit: 4.0-4.3) © Reserved, 2017

Madhusmita Giri, (Units: 4.4-4.9, 6.3) © Reserved, 2017

Rukmana Meher, (Unit: 6.2.1-6.2.2) © Reserved, 2017

Vikas Publishing House, (Units: 3.0-3.3, 3.5-3.9, 5.0-5.2, 6.0-6.2, 6.4-6.8) © Reserved, 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

*Information contained in this book has been published by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, IDE—Rajiv Gandhi University, the publishers and its Authors shall be in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this book. The Publishers specifically disclaim any implied warranties.

BOARD OF STUDIES

1. Prof. P K Panigarhi Department of Political Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Chairman
2. Dr. N N Hina Department of Political Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Member
3. Dr. T. Mibang Department of Political Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Member
4. Prof. Nani Bath Department of Political Science Rajiv Gandhi University	Member Secretary

Authors:

Dr. Biswaranjan Mohanty, (Units: 1-2, 5.3-5.9, 7-9) © Dr. Biswaranjan Mohanty, 2017

Ms. Swaha Das, Ms. Swati Priyambada Das, Mr. Punyoslaka Priyadarshi Das, (Units: 3.4, 10) © Reserved, 2017

Paulomi M. Jindal, (Unit: 4.0-4.3) © Reserved, 2017

Madhusmita Giri, (Units: 4.4-4.9, 6.3) © Reserved, 2017

Rukmana Meher, (Unit: 6.2.1-6.2.2) © Reserved, 2017

Vikas Publishing House, (Units: 3.0-3.3, 3.5-3.9, 5.0-5.2, 6.0-6.2, 6.4-6.8) © Reserved, 2017

All rights reserved. No part of this publication which is material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or transmitted or utilized or stored in any form or by any means now known or hereinafter invented, electronic, digital or mechanical, including photocopying, scanning, recording or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior written permission from the Publisher.

"Information contained in this book has been published by Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd. and has been obtained by its Authors from sources believed to be reliable and are correct to the best of their knowledge. However, IDE—Rajiv Gandhi University, the publishers and its Authors shall be in no event be liable for any errors, omissions or damages arising out of use of this information and specifically disclaim any implied warranties or merchantability or fitness for any particular use"



Vikas® is the registered trademark of Vikas® Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.

VIKAS® PUBLISHING HOUSE PVT LTD

E-28, Sector-8, Noida - 201301 (UP)

Phone: 0120-4078900 • Fax: 0120-4078999

Regd. Office: 7361, Ravindra Mansion, Ram Nagar, New Delhi-110 055

• Website: www.vikaspublishing.com • Email: helpline@vikaspublishing.com

About the University

Rajiv Gandhi University (formerly Arunachal University) is a premier institution for higher education in the state of Arunachal Pradesh and has completed twenty-five years of its existence. Late Smt. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, laid the foundation stone of the university on 4th February, 1984 at Rono Hills, where the present campus is located.

Ever since its inception, the university has been trying to achieve excellence and fulfill the objectives as envisaged in the University Act. The university received academic recognition under Section 2(f) from the University Grants Commission on 28th March, 1985 and started functioning from 1st April, 1985. It got financial recognition under section 12-B of the UGC on 25th March, 1994. Since then Rajiv Gandhi University, (then Arunachal University) has carved a niche for itself in the educational scenario of the country following its selection as a University with potential for excellence by a high-level expert committee of the University Grants Commission from among universities in India.

The University was converted into a Central University with effect from 9th April, 2007 as per notification of the Ministry of Human Resource Development, Government of India.

The University is located atop Rono Hills on a picturesque tableland of 302 acres overlooking the river Dikrong. It is 6.5 km from the National Highway 52-A and 25 km from Itanagar, the State capital. The campus is linked with the National Highway by the Dikrong bridge.

The teaching and research programmes of the University are designed with a view to play a positive role in the socio-economic and cultural development of the State. The University offers Undergraduate, Post-graduate, M.Phil and Ph.D. programmes. The Department of Education also offers the B.Ed. programme.

There are fifteen colleges affiliated to the University. The University has been extending educational facilities to students from the neighbouring states, particularly Assam. The strength of students in different departments of the University and in affiliated colleges has been steadily increasing.

The faculty members have been actively engaged in research activities with financial support from UGC and other funding agencies. Since inception, a number of proposals on research projects have been sanctioned by various funding agencies to the University. Various departments have organized numerous seminars, workshops and conferences. Many faculty members have participated in national and international conferences and seminars held within the country and abroad. Eminent scholars and distinguished personalities have visited the University and delivered lectures on various disciplines.

The academic year 2000-2001 was a year of consolidation for the University. The switch over from the annual to the semester system took off smoothly and the performance of the students registered a marked improvement. Various syllabi designed by Boards of Post-graduate Studies (BPGS) have been implemented. VSAT facility installed by the ERNET India, New Delhi under the UGC-Infonet program, provides Internet access.

In spite of infrastructural constraints, the University has been maintaining its academic excellence. The University has strictly adhered to the academic calendar, conducted the examinations and declared the results on time. The students from the University have found placements not only in State and Central Government Services, but also in various institutions, industries and organizations. Many students have emerged successful in the National Eligibility Test (NET).

Since inception, the University has made significant progress in teaching, research, innovations in curriculum development and developing infrastructure.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
UNIT 1 INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE	3-16
1.0 Introduction	
1.1 Unit Objectives	
1.2 Meaning and Nature of Political Science	
1.2.1 Politics and Political Theory	
1.3 Scope of Political Science	
1.3.1 Traditional and Contemporary Perspectives	
1.3.2 Interdisciplinary Approach	
1.4 Summary	
1.5 Key Terms	
1.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'	
1.7 Questions and Exercises	
1.8 Further Reading	
UNIT 2 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE	17-33
2.0 Introduction	
2.1 Unit Objectives	
2.2 Historical Approach	
2.3 Philosophical Approach	
2.4 Institutional Approach	
2.5 Behavioural Approach	
2.6 Marxian Approach	
2.7 Summary	
2.8 Key Terms	
2.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'	
2.10 Questions and Exercises	
2.11 Further Reading	
UNIT 3 RELATION BETWEEN POLITICAL THEORY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES	35-47
3.0 Introduction	
3.1 Unit Objectives	
3.2 Political Theory and Geography	
3.3 Political Theory and Economics	
3.3.1 Liberal Perspectives	
3.3.2 Marxist Perspectives	
3.4 Political Theory and Sociology	
3.4.1 Some Early Approaches	
3.4.2 Contemporary Views	
3.5 Summary	
3.6 Key Terms	
3.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'	
3.8 Questions and Exercises	
3.9 Further Reading	

UNIT 4 THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE

49-78

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Historical Developments
 - 4.2.1 Origin of the City-State
- 4.3 Evolutionary Theories
 - 4.3.1 Military Occupation
 - 4.3.2 Military Dictatorship
 - 4.3.3 Modern Multicultural States
 - 4.3.4 Pluralist States and Polyarchies
 - 4.3.5 Polyarchies
- 4.4 Social Contract Theory
- 4.5 Summary
- 4.6 Key Terms
- 4.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.8 Questions and Exercises
- 4.9 Further Reading

UNIT 5 CONCEPTS: RIGHTS, LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

79-99

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Unit Objectives
- 5.2 Rights
 - 5.2.1 The State of Nature and Natural Rights
 - 5.2.2 Rights and Politics
- 5.3 Liberty
 - 5.3.1 Relation between Liberty and Law
- 5.4 Equality
 - 5.4.1 Definitions of Equality
 - 5.4.2 The Marxist View of Equality
- 5.5 Summary
- 5.6 Key Terms
- 5.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.8 Questions and Exercises
- 5.9 Further Reading

UNIT 6 CONCEPTS: LIBERALISM AND MARXISM

101-131

- 6.0 Introduction
- 6.1 Unit Objectives
- 6.2 Liberalism
 - 6.2.1 Growth of Liberal Trend: Laski
 - 6.2.2 Communitarianism
- 6.3 Marxism
 - 6.3.1 Theory of Alienation
 - 6.3.2 Strands of Contemporary Marxism
- 6.4 Summary
- 6.5 Key Terms
- 6.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 6.7 Questions and Exercises
- 6.8 Further Reading

UNIT 7 SOVEREIGNTY

133-145

- 7.0 Introduction
- 7.1 Unit Objectives
- 7.2 Monistic Sovereignty
 - 7.2.1 Austin's Legal Analysis of the State
 - 7.2.2 Criticism of Austin's Theory of Sovereignty
- 7.3 Pluralistic Sovereignty
 - 7.3.1 Evaluation
- 7.4 Summary
- 7.5 Key Terms
- 7.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 7.7 Questions and Exercises
- 7.8 Further Reading

UNIT 8 POWER, AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

147-159

- 8.0 Introduction
- 8.1 Unit Objectives
- 8.2 Power
 - 8.2.1 Empirical Study of Power
- 8.3 Authority
 - 8.3.1 Legitimacy
- 8.4 Summary
- 8.5 Key Terms
- 8.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 8.7 Questions and Exercises
- 8.8 Further Reading

UNIT 9 DEMOCRACY

161-178

- 9.0 Introduction
- 9.1 Unit Objectives
- 9.2 Liberal Approach
 - 9.2.1 Meaning of Democracy
- 9.3 Marxist Approach
- 9.4 Summary
- 9.5 Key Terms
- 9.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 9.7 Questions and Exercises
- 9.8 Further Reading

UNIT 10 POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

179-197

- 10.0 Introduction
- 10.1 Unit Objectives
- 10.2 Political Culture
- 10.3 Political Participation
 - 10.3.1 Political Participation Through Elections in India
 - 10.3.2 Political Participation of Women in India
- 10.4 Summary
- 10.5 Key Terms
- 10.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 10.7 Questions and Exercises
- 10.8 Further Reading

INTRODUCTION

Political theory as a subject teaches us how to live together, collectively. A political theorist attempts to explain or define precisely ideas such as freedom, equality, democracy and justice. Ideas that may have a sound foundation or be backed by reasoned arguments or may even be based on misguided premises.

According to John Dunn (1990) in *Reconceiving the Content and Character of Modern Political Community*, the purpose of political theory is to diagnose practical predicaments and show how best they can be confronted. He also believes that this can be done by developing the following three skills:

1. Ascertaining how one gets to know where one is and understanding why things are the way they are
2. Deliberating about the kind of world one wishes to live in
3. Judging how far, and through what actions, and at what risk, one can hope to move this world as it exists today towards the way one wishes it to be.

Study of political theory helps you to differentiate between legitimate functions of government and the arbitrary use of power. These aspects are discussed in the book entitled *Political Theory*.

This book is divided into ten units. The learning material in this book has been presented in the self-learning format, wherein each unit begins with an Introduction to the topic followed by an outline of the Unit Objectives. The detailed content is then presented in a simple, structured and easy-to-grasp style interspersed with Check Your Progress questions to test the student's understanding. At the end of each unit, a Summary and a list of Key Terms have been provided for recapitulation.

NOTES

UNIT 1 INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

NOTES

Structure

- 1.0 Introduction
- 1.1 Unit Objectives
- 1.2 Meaning and Nature of Political Science
 - 1.2.1 Politics and Political Theory
- 1.3 Scope of Political Science
 - 1.3.1 Traditional and Contemporary Perspectives
 - 1.3.2 Interdisciplinary Approach
- 1.4 Summary
- 1.5 Key Terms
- 1.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 1.7 Questions and Exercises
- 1.8 Further Reading

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Political theory was initially formulated in Greece —the land of enlightenment and knowledge in ancient times. Emphasizing on the contribution of the Greeks to the realm of knowledge, it is often said that 'excepting the blind forces of nature, nothing moves in this world which is not Greek in its origin.' While in the Eastern countries, political philosophy intermingled with religion and mythology, it were the Greeks who for the first time, separated politics from the fetters of religion and superstition by giving it the character of independent science. They differentiated politics from mythology, theology and ethics. For this reason, political theory is described as the invention of the Greeks.

Political theory is a very wide and comprehensive subject. There is no agreement among the political scientists with regard to the scope of political theory. There are various political theories, such as orthodox political theory, liberal political theory and Marxist political theory. Political theory is also closely related to other social sciences.

In this unit, you will learn about the meaning and background of political theory. You will also study various other aspects of political theory mentioned above in more detail.

1.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the meaning of political science
- Understand the nature of political science
- Examine the scope of political science

1.2 MEANING AND NATURE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

NOTES

Some writers treat the history of political ideas as a contribution to political education and attempt to trace the evolution of political science from the time of the Greeks. Others seek to discover the principles of political science that would provide knowledge of political phenomena and a basis for sound political decision. Frederick Pollock, a late nineteenth century writer, presented the history of political theory as the history of the science of politics. In his view, one of its principal functions was that of critical expositions. Its chief purpose was not to revive the corpus of past erudition but to make more vivid the life of today and to help us envisage its problems with a more accurate perspective.

William A. Dunning's three volume study, *A History of Political Theories*, was published between 1902 and 1920. Dunning's contribution did a great deal to establish the tradition of political theory as a distinct discipline. In a way, it shaped the basic concerns and assumptions that would dominate for the next few decades. Dunning's work was indeed the prototype of a genre that promoted the analysis of classic works, explaining them in their historical contexts from Plato to the present. For Dunning and his followers, research in the history of political theory and the practice of empirical political science were complementary efforts. Despite fundamental differences among scholars with regard to what constituted proper historical data, inductive history was seen as a key to a science of politics. The history of political theory was seen to be at the heart of this enterprise.

Dunning, while acknowledging his debt to his predecessors, lamented that inadequate attention had been given to the history of political theories. He described them as the successive transformations through which the political consciousness of men had passed. He argued that these transformations pointed toward a science of political society. He was convinced that an in-depth study would yield both contemplative and manipulative political knowledge. He ended his long study with a consideration of the evolutionary philosophy of Herbert Spencer. He also praised Auguste Comte for having generalized from the past, the elements of progress in civilization and in specifying the method and utility of history.

According to Dunning, political theory consisted not only of political literature but also of operative ideas. He found such ideas implicit in the legal institutions of the state and the political consciousness of a society. He envisaged a pretty definite and clearly discernible relationship between any given author's work and the current institutional development. He emphasized an interpretation of the development of political theory in its relation to political fact. He attempted to demonstrate that modern political institutions and political science in the West were the culmination of an evolutionary process that began with the Ancient Greeks.

Dunning believed that political theory as well as political consciousness began with the Greek masters. They had explored the entire height and depth of human political capacity and were the first to outline the principles, which at all times and circumstances, must determine the general features of political life. Moreover, Greek thought on political authority contained substantially all the solutions ever suggested. Despite some gaps, in its concrete expression, there is an evidence of progress in theory since the time of the classical Greeks. This progress is apparent in areas like the views about slavery,

representative democracy, a clear distinction between state and society and modern concept of sovereignty.

Since the turn of this century, there had been a visible consensus on the role of political theory. It was to develop the concepts and principles of a scientific political science. In this respect, the history of political theories was closely related to political fact. They were not only dependent upon and evoked by objective conditions, but they also reflected the actuating motives of political events and scientific understanding. In his view, the historical method required no defence. Both Dunning and Willoughby stressed the various ways in which political theories and political facts were related and were mutually explanatory.

But in the 1920s, along with Charles Merriam, many writers came to reject the historical method. They saw political science moving into the new stage of empirical science. They welcomed the new emphasis on quantitative techniques and approaches. These had come to be closely identified with sociology and psychology. However, the rejection of the historical method did not amount to a rejection of the history of political theory as irrelevant to the discipline of political science. Like Dunning, Merriam too, in many respects, attempted to establish a close relationship between political ideas and their social ambience. Above all, the history of political theory, more or less, was treated as the history of political science.

In 1924, Raymond G. Gettel attempted to trace the development of political thought in relation to its historical, institutional and intellectual background. Gettel saw no conflict between the two beliefs that political ideas do not embody absolute and demonstrable truths, but are relative to historical circumstances, and that in both ideas and institutions, there was a movement towards democracy. He saw in the history of political theory a scope of practical application. However, he emphasized that it contributed to clarity and precision in political thought. Besides, he underlined its relevance to contemporary politics. He treated it as a basis for rational action in democratic society. He assumed that the theory of politics was the peculiar product of Western thought and that there existed not a single controversy of our day without a pedigree that did not stretch into the distant ages.

Similar themes were evident in the work of C.H. McIlwain. He noted the close tie between political ideas and institutions. The history of political theory served to illumine the development of our ideas about the state and government. He also explained the growth of thought about the basic problems of political obligation.

1.2.1 Politics and Political Theory

Modern writers make a distinction between 'politics' and 'political theory'. Sir Frederick Pollock, for the first time, broke up the subject into two parts such as (i) theoretical politics, and (ii) practical or applied politics. The first portion covers the theory of the state and government, theory of legislation and theory of the state as an artificial person. The subject under the first category deals with the features of the state and the basic principles of the government, and do not study actual working of any particular government. The second part covers the study of the state and actual forms of government, working of government and administration, political actions and elections. Table 1.1 demonstrates the distinction between the types of political theory.

NOTES

Table 1.1 Theoretical and Applied Formulations of Political Theory

Theoretical Formulations of Political Theory	Applied Formulations of Political Theory
(a) It should deal with the theory of the state.	(a) It should deal with the actual forms of government.
(b) It should deal with the various theories of government.	(b) It should deal with the working of the government, administration, etc.
(c) It should deal with theory of legislation.	(c) It should deal with the actual law, their procedure and courts.
(d) It should deal with the theory of the state as an artificial person.	(d) It should deal with the state personified i.e., diplomatic relations during war, peace and other international dealings.

NOTES

Though the terms theoretical and applied formulations of political theory are quite significant, yet a majority of the writers accept political theory as the appropriate title of the subject.

1.3 SCOPE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

The nature and concerns of political theory implies its jurisdiction of subject matter. Political theory is a very wide and comprehensive subject. There is no agreement among the political scientists with regard to the scope of political theory. A conference of political scientists, held under the auspices of the International Political Science Association in Paris in the year 1948, demarcated the scope of political theory into four zones, namely, political institution, political dynamics (parties, public-opinion, etc.) and international relations. But this demarcation of the International Political Science Association rather delimits the scope of political theory within the bounds of four zones. As the importance of political theory is increasing day-by-day, its scope is also increasing and becoming wide. Despite this difficulty, one may make an attempt to define the scope of political theory as follows:

1. A Study of the State and Government

Political theory primarily studies the problems of the state and government. The state is defined as a group of people organized for law within a definite territory. The state possesses four characteristics, viz., population, territory, government and sovereignty. Government is an agent of the state. Political theory studies the activities of the state and explains the aims and objectives of the state and government.

If we carefully study political theory, we come to know that despite the differences found between the state and the government, the scope of one cannot be separated from that of the other. The state is the institution under which the government functions. The state is imaginary and it is the government that gives it a concrete shape. Therefore, one is the complement of the other. The existence of the state is not possible without the government. This is the reason why Laski, Garner, Gettell, Gilchrist and others have included the study of both the state and the government in the scope of Political Theory.

2. A Study of Political Science

Political science is a major branch of political theory. On the basis of the political ideas or thoughts of political thinkers, political science formulates definitions of concepts like democracy, liberty, equality, grounds of political obligations, etc. A student of political theory must start his lessons with political science. Political science explains the

Check Your Progress

1. When was A History of Political Theories published?
2. Which writer for the first time attempted to break up the subject of political theory into two parts?

NOTES

rudimentary concepts of political theory. It also includes the study of political philosophy. Political speculations of political philosophers and some ideologies such as individualism, anarchism, and communism and so on are put together in one volume which is given the title of 'political science'. Here the underlying assumption is that other parts of political theory on governmental organisation, political parties and pressure groups, international relations, etc. are distinct from political theory. The danger of viewing political theory in such a way is that a special meaning is being attached to the word 'theory' and this will rule out the possibility of the existence of any theory in other segments of political science. One should be cautious about it.

3. A Study of Political Institutions

The field of political theory is rather vast. It includes the study of political institutions. This covers a study of constitutions and comparative government. It deals with the nature of different political institutions including government, explains their merits and demerits, their structure and working and arrives at different conclusions by making a comparative study. Besides, the study of public administration and local government may be included in this area. However, the study of public administration has emerged as an independent subject in recent times.

4. A Study of Political Dynamics

The study of political dynamics became significant in the 20th century. It has acquired more significance in the 21st century. It means the current forces at work in government and politics. It covers a wide range and includes the study of political parties, public opinion, pressure groups, lobbies, etc. A scientific study to the working of these political dynamics helps to explain the political behaviour of individuals and different groups.

5. A Study of Adjustment of the Individual with the State

The scope of political theory also includes a study of the nature of relationship between the individual and the state. It examines how man should adjust himself with the society. Man is the root of politics. The process of adjustment of men with the society is an important aspect of political theory. The state guarantees certain rights and liberties to the citizens and at the same time imposes certain reasonable restrictions on them.

6. A Study of International Relations and International Law

Lastly, the scope of political theory includes a study of international relations which has become significant since the first quarter of this century. It covers a wide range of subjects and includes diplomacy, international politics, international law, international organisations like the United Nations, etc. Because of scientific inventions and discoveries, the co-operations and contacts among the different nations of the world have become easier and the whole world turns to be a family. The above contents show the wide range of subjects that come under the fold of political theory.

7. Knowledge of the State

The primary aim of the study of political theory is to inculcate knowledge of the state, its origin, nature, structure and functions. Knowledge about the state is of great significance to modern man. Further, in democratic states, the citizens must possess at least rudimentary knowledge about political theory and its principles. This will make them conscious of the state. They will be able to keep a vigilant eye over the rulers and assert their supremacy over them. They will try to check misuse of power.

NOTES

8. Knowledge of Government and Administration

The administrators, statesmen and diplomats, who conduct the affairs of the state, also require sound knowledge of political theory in order to perform their functions with efficiency. An administrator who has no knowledge of political theory is bound to be a failure. Consequently, all new entrants to the Indian Administrative Service have to undergo a course in political theory at the National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie.

9. Knowledge about the World

Apart from the utilitarian considerations, the acquisition of knowledge of political theory enriches one's mind and widens one's intellectual horizon.⁷ In order to know what is happening in the world around us, at least an elementary knowledge of political science is necessary. In the modern age, an individual cannot lead an isolated life. Each country has to maintain relations with other countries of the world. Those who specialise in the various fields of political science conduct researches to discover hitherto unknown principles underlying political phenomena and make a rich contribution to the realm of knowledge. In the ultimate philosophy, if human life is to enrich knowledge, then political science makes a major contribution to the storehouse of knowledge. Its study helps us a lot in understanding international relations. It explains the governmental system of the other countries. Sidwick observes, 'What, as students of political theory, we are primarily concerned to ascertain is not the structure or functions of the government in any particular historical community, but in the distinctive characteristics of different forms of government in respect of their structure or their functions; not the particular processes of political change in Athens or England but the general laws or tendencies of change exemplified by such particular processes?'

10. Knowledge of Political Dynamics

Political dynamics refers to all the factors that come to bear on political figures, their activities and policy directions. Political theory lays down principles which are to be followed in the conduct of public affairs. One who has no knowledge of politics is at a great disadvantage and in one's own interests and in the larger interest of the society as a whole; it is advisable to have adequate knowledge of political theory. To know the national and international affairs, the condition of the various institutions, the nature and conduct of the government, the programmes and policies of political parties, pressure groups, lobbies and various other matters, a knowledge of political theory is indispensable.

1.3.1 Traditional and Contemporary Perspectives

The disciplines of political theory can be divided into the various categories which have been discussed ahead.

Orthodox Discipline of Political Theory

Orthodox political theory has positive explicit uniqueness. Firstly, it was dominated by philosophy. Great philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle were great because of the comprehensiveness and scope of their thought. The digressions of political theory included description, explanation, prescription and evaluation. Secondly, there was no clear distinction between philosophical, theological and political issues. Political theory was not an autonomous subject as it is today. Thirdly, political theory was concerned with probing into issues, asking important questions and serving as a sort of conscience keeper of politics. Fourthly, classical tradition believed that political theory dealt with the political whole – the theory must be all-comprehensive and all-inclusive.

NOTES

Liberal (Broad-Minded) Political Theory

The long spell of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Cicero and other thinkers of the classical age was broken in a variety of ways after the twin revolutions of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe since the 15th century, coupled with the Industrial Revolution later on. The Renaissance produced a new intellectual climate which gave birth to modern science and modern philosophy and a new political theory known as liberalism. This new political theory found classical expression in the writings of Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Jeremy Bentham, J.S. Mill, Herbert Spencer and a host of other writers. Whereas classical political theory considered the moral development of individual and the evolution of the community as co-terminus, the liberal political theory developed the concept of sovereign individual. The central theme of this political theory was individualism. The liberal theory declared that state is not a natural institution but comes into existence by mutual consent for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the individual rights. The new liberal political theory dismissed the idea of common good and an organic community.

Marxist Political Theory

Marxist political theory focuses social change and revolutionary reconstitution of society. In this context, Marxism consists of three interrelated elements:

- An examination and critique of the present and past societies. This is known as dialectical materialism and historical materialism.
- The notion of an alternative model against a society based upon exploitation and divided among classes. The new society is based on the common ownership of the means of production on which human potential will be allowed to freely develop its manifold facets. Such a society will be classless and stateless.
- Though there was a general agreement that capitalist system was unstable and crisis-ridden but the advent of socialism required a revolutionary action by the proletariat, whose growing impoverishment will lead to revolution, and establishment of a socialist state and society.

The central themes of Marxist political theory are modes of production, class division, class, struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination. Marxism also examined the nature of rights, liberty, equality, justice and democracy but came to the conclusion that in a class divided society, they are the prerogatives of the propertied class. Real liberty and equality can be achieved only in a classless and stateless society. Thus, Marxist political theory preoccupied itself with the establishment of a socialist state through revolutionary action.

Marxism as the economic, social and political theory and practice originating in the works of Marx and Engels, has been enriched by a number of revolutionaries, philosophers, academicians and politicians. It has also been subject to a variety of interpretations. In the twentieth century, the prominent contributions to Marxist thought have been made by Lenin, Bukharin, Stalin, Rose Luxemburg, Gramsci, Lukacs, Austro-Marxists, the Frankfurt school, Herbert Marcuse, the New Left theorists, Euro-communists, Mao Tse Tung and various other people. Up to the First World War, Marxism was highly deterministic and represented a philosophy of socio-political changes which culminated in the Russian revolution. However, during the inter-war period and the post-second world war, Marxism developed more as a critique of present socio-economic and cultural conditions than a philosophy of revolutionary action. Known as contemporary

NOTES

Marxism, it has been more concerned with the problems of superstructure, culture, art aesthetics, ideology, alienation etc. other than the above mentioned disciplines of political theories there are some other disciplines also which explain political theory in detail and these disciplines are empirical- scientific discipline of political theory and the contemporary discipline of political theory.

Empirical Enquiry

There is another kind of political theory developed in America popularly known as the empirical enquiry in political theory. The study of political theory through scientific method (instead of philosophical) and based upon facts (rather than on values) has long history but the credit for making significant development in this connection goes to the American social scientist. In the early twentieth century, Max Weber, Graham Wallas and Bentley gave an empirical dimension to the study of political theory and advocated that its study should be based upon 'facts' only. Another writer, George Catlin emphasized that the study of political theory should be integrated with other social sciences such as sociology, psychology, anthropology etc. However, it was during the inter-war period and after the Second World War that a new theory was developed by the political scientists of Chicago University (known as the Chicago School) such as Charles Merriam, Harold Lasswell, Gosnell, and others like David Easton, Stuart Rice, V.O. Key and David Apter. The new political theory shifted emphasis from the study of political ideals, values and institutions to the examination of politics in the context of individual and group behaviour.

Broadly speaking, political theory contains the topics dealing with both empirical facts and value preferences. Questions of facts are concerned with those dealing with value preferences and are concerned with what should be. The contents of political theory fall in either of those two broad categories. Recently, dissatisfaction with the contents of the subject and its long indulgence in value judgements has led to interesting controversies about the scope of political theory and the proper methods for its study. Especially in the United States of America, efforts are being made to develop a kind of empirically oriented and value-free scientific politics which seeks to be at par with the natural sciences. There are some difficulties in the development of scientific politics.

Empirical-scientific theory is different from the classical tradition in many respects. First, the scientific theory believes that the political theory should order, explain and predict the phenomena and not evaluate it. Nor is it concerned with the creation of grand political utopia. What is worth nothing is that the relation with philosophy is completely severed. Political theory is meaningful to the point or degree it is verifiable. Second, the study of political theory should be value free. It should concern itself with 'facts' only.

The task of empirical enquiry is to analyse the present political phenomena and not evaluate of what is happening and what should happen. The concern of political theory should not be with 'who rules, who should rule or why?' but with only 'who does rule and how'. It should focus attention on the study of political behaviour of man, group and institutions irrespective of their good or bad character. Third, practical theory is not only concerned with the study of the state but also with the political process. Fourth, scientific theory does not believe in critical function, that is, it should not question the basis of the state but should be concerned with maintaining the *status quo*, stability, equilibrium and harmony in the society. Fifth, it should develop many new concepts borrowed from other social sciences such as power elite, decision-making, policy-making, functioning of structures, political system, political culture etc.

NOTES

Due to too much stress science, value-free politics, methods and its failure to study the pressing social and political issues, empirical political theory began to attract critics after 1960s. The 'Behavioural Revolution' announced by David Easton laid less emphasis on scientific method and technique and showed greater concern for the public responsibilities of political theory. The debates in 1970s resulted in the frank admission that there are segments of human life relating to values or purposes embodied in any political structure that were either ignored or overlooked by the behavioural studies. The core issues of political theory such as liberty, equality, justice were taken up once again by John Rawls, Robert Nozic, Habermas and others which signalled once again the revival of normative political theory. This new revival is termed as contemporary political theory.

1.3.2 Interdisciplinary Approach

Paul Janet writes, 'the concerns of political theory is closely connected with political economy or the science of wealth; with law either natural or positive, which occupies itself principally with the relation of citizens one to another; with history, which furnishes the facts of which it has need; with philosophy and especially with moral which give to it a part of its concerns.' This statement indicates that political theory is related to other social sciences. Man is a social and political animal. His life has many aspects and concerns, political, social, religious, economic and ethical. Many social sciences like political science, sociology, economics, philosophy and history, etc. deal with the different aspects of human life. As all these subjects deal with the different aspects of human life, they are called social sciences. 'Man is a social being', says Professor Bluntschli, 'and his various social activities may be studied separately. His political life is only one part of his total social life. But as every human being lives within a State, the science of the State is necessarily connected with other sciences.' It is necessary to examine the concern of political theory with other social sciences.

1. Political Theory and History

The relationship/concerns between political theory and History are very close. The two are complementary to each other. The intimacy between political theory and History is well brought-out in the following couplet of Seeley, an eminent English historian who wrote - 'History without Political Science has not fruit, Political Science without History has no root.' The affinity between History and Political Science is so close that Freedom goes to the extent of saying that 'history is past politics and politics is present history.' Willoughby writes, 'History gives us the third dimension of political theory.' History provides the necessary raw-materials for political theory. Gilchrist says, 'In the Treatise of Political Theory', 'we must trace the history of various institutions, not for the sake of history but to enable us to form conclusions of our science. In so much as history not merely records events but analyses causes and points out tendencies. It overlaps political theory. Political theory, however, goes further. It uses historical facts to discover general laws and principles; it selects, analyses and systematizes the facts of history in order to extract the permanent principles of political life. Political theory, further, is teleological, that is to say, it deals with the state as it ought to be, whereas history deals with what it has been.' The political scientist goes back to the past in order to explore the future. 'So conceived history', writes Burns, 'will be made something more than the luxury of a scholar. It will be the inspiration of honest politician; it will be the real basis for criticism of the present and modification of the future'.

NOTES

2. Political Theory and Sociology

Both political theory and sociology deal with human activities. But there is difference in their respective spheres. Sociology is a broad and comprehensive term. It is a parent science of all social sciences. It is defined as 'a science of society viewed as an aggregate of individuals'. The term 'political theory' is narrower than sociology. Sociology denotes the study of society in all its manifestations, whereas political theory is confined to mostly the study of the state and government. In other words, while sociology deals with man in all his social relations, political theory is concerned with man in his political relation alone.

3. Political Theory and Economics

Political theory and economics are both social sciences, and hence they are closely connected. In the past, economics which was regarded as a branch of political theory was called political economy. Today the two subjects have been separated and given different areas, but the areas are closely related. In the promotion of the welfare of the people, both the subjects go hand in hand. In a way, they can be regarded as the two sides of the same coin. Thus, political set-up and economic life are inter-connected. That is why often it is said that political democracy without economic democracy is meaningless. In present-day India, the students of political theory and economics are vitally concerned with matters like Five Year Plans and community development projects.

4. Political Theory and Philosophy

Political theory is also related to philosophy. Philosophy is defined as the science of ethics or the science of moral order. It aims at achieving some ideals. Political theory is not completely devoid of morality or ideals. In political theory there are certain ideals which the state and the citizens should follow. Political theory is not completely devoid of morality or ideals. In political theory there are certain ideals which the state and the citizens should follow. Political philosophy deals with various ideals. Plato, the earliest writer on political theory, was also a great philosopher. In his book, *The Republic*, he visualized an ideal state.

5. Political Theory and Psychology

Psychology is the science which deals with the behaviour of man. 'Psychology', says Woodworth, 'is the science of the activities of individual in relation to the environments.' It is defined as a science of mind or a science of conscious experience. It is the 'science of social consciousness and deals with the rational and irrational aspects of human life.' As political science deals with the political side of human life, it has to be taken for granted that it is closely related to psychology which deals with all the aspects of human behaviour.

Political Theory and Other Social Sciences

As time moves on, more and more subjects are closely connected with political theory. Anthropology, for example, which studies man, seems to be related to the study of political theory. There are two main divisions of anthropology, namely, physical and social. Physical anthropology throws light on the conditions of primitive individuals and their environment. It helps political theory in studying the origin and development of various political institutions. Social or cultural anthropology deals with the existence, growth and interpretation of customs, traditions, superstitions and religious beliefs, etc.

which also interact with the political factors in a society. Political theory is also related to geography which is defined as the 'science of the earth's surface, form physical features, natural and political divisions, climate, production, population, etc. A statistician collects and classifies numerical facts in a systematic manner. The data collected by the statisticians are helpful to the politicians and administrators. The behavioural approach is much benefited by the statistical method. With the help of this method, it is now possible to study the voting behaviour, social conditions, social legislation, etc.

There is an intimate affinity between political theory and jurisprudence. Jurisprudence is defined as the 'science of law'. As political theory is defined as the science of the state and government which are controlled and regulated through law, its relation cannot be separated from jurisprudence.

In recent times, public administration is going to assume the status of a separate academic discipline in modern states. According to L.D. White, public administration 'consists of all those operations having for their purposes the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy as declared by competent authority'.

1.4 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Some writers treat the history of political ideas as a contribution to political education and attempt to trace the evolution of political science from the time of the Greeks. Others seek to discover the principles of political science that would provide knowledge of political phenomena and a basis for sound political decision.
- Frederick Pollock, a late nineteenth century writer, presented the history of political theory as the history of the science of politics. In his view, one of its principal functions was that of critical expositions.
- William A. Dunning's three volume study, *A History of Political Theories*, was published between 1902 and 1920. Dunning's contribution did a great deal to establish the tradition of political theory as a distinct discipline.
- Dunning's work was indeed the prototype of a genre that promoted the analysis of classic works, explaining them in their historical contexts from Plato to the present.
- According to Dunning, political theory consisted not only of political literature but also of the operative ideas. He found such ideas implicit in the legal institutions of the state and the political consciousness of a society.
- In 1924, Raymond G. Gettel attempted to trace the development of political thought in relation to its historical, institutional and intellectual background.
- Modern writers make a distinction between 'politics' and 'political theory'. Sir Frederick Pollock, for the first time, broke up the subject into two parts such as (i) theoretical politics, and (ii) practical or applied politics.
- The nature and concerns of political theory implies its jurisdiction of subject matter. Political theory is a very wide and comprehensive subject. There is no agreement among the political scientists with regard to the scope of political theory.
- Political theory primarily studies the problems of the state and government. The state is defined as a group of people organized for law within a definite territory.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

3. Define the state.
4. What is the primary aim of the study of political theory?
5. Define public administration, according to L.D. White.

NOTES

- Political science is a major branch of political theory. On the basis of the political ideas or thoughts of political thinkers, political science formulates definitions of concepts like democracy, liberty, equality, grounds of political obligations, etc.
- The field of political theory is rather vast. It includes the study of political institutions. This covers a study of constitutions and comparative government.
- The study of political dynamics became significant in the 20th century. It has acquired more significance in the 21st century. It means the current forces at work in government and politics.
- The scope of political theory also includes a study of the nature of relationship between the individual and the state. It examines how man should adjust himself with the society.
- Lastly, the scope of political theory includes a study of international relations which has become significant since the first quarter of this century. It covers a wide range of subjects and includes diplomacy, international politics, international law, international organisations like the United Nations, etc.
- The primary aim of the study of political theory is to inculcate knowledge of the state, its origin, nature, structure and functions.
- Orthodox political theory has positive explicit uniqueness. Firstly, it was dominated by philosophy. Great philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle were great because of the comprehensiveness and scope of their thought.
- The long spell of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Cicero and other thinkers of the classical age was broken in a variety of ways after the twin revolutions of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe since the 15th century, coupled with the Industrial Revolution later on.
- The central themes of Marxist political theory are modes of production, class division, class, struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination.
- Marxism as the economic, social and political theory and practice originating in the works of Marx and Engels, has been enriched by a number of revolutionaries, philosophers, academicians and politicians.
- There is another kind of political theory developed in America popularly known as the empirical enquiry in political theory. The study of political theory through scientific method (instead of philosophical) and based upon facts (rather than on values) has long history but the credit for making significant development in this connection goes to the American social scientist.
- Paul Janet writes, 'the concerns of political theory is closely connected with political economy or the science of wealth; with law either natural or positive, which occupies itself principally with the relation of citizens one to another; with history, which furnishes the facts of which it has need; with philosophy and especially with moral which give to it a part of its concerns.'
- The relationship/concerns between political theory and History are very close. The two are complementary to each other.
- Sociology is a broad and comprehensive term. It is a parent science of all social sciences. It is defined as 'a science of society viewed as an aggregate of individuals'. The term 'political theory' is narrower than sociology.

NOTES

- As time moves on, more and more subjects are closely connected with political theory. Anthropology, for example, which studies man, seems to be related to the study of political theory.

1.5 KEY TERMS

- **Political dynamics:** It refers to all the factors that come to bear on political figures, their activities and policy directions.
- **Orthodox political theory:** It is a type of political theory dominated by philosophy and in which there is no clear direction between philosophical, theological and political issues.
- **Liberal political theory:** It refers to a political theory founded on the natural goodness of humans and the autonomy of individuals and favouring civil and political literature.
- **Legislation:** Legislation (or 'statutory law') is law which has been promulgated (or 'enacted') by a legislature or other governing body or the process of making it.
- **Anarchism:** Anarchism is a political philosophy that advocates self-governed societies based on voluntary institutions. These are often described as stateless societies, although several authors have defined them more specifically as institutions based on non-hierarchical free associations.
- **Status quo:** Status quo means the existing state of affairs, particularly with regards to social or political issues.

1.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. *A History of Political Theories*, was published between 1902 and 1920.
2. Sir Frederick Pollock for the first time attempted to break up the subject of political theory into two parts.
3. The state is defined as a group of people organized for law within a definite territory.
4. The primary aim of the study of political theory is to inculcate knowledge of the state, its origin, nature, structure and functions.
5. According to L.D. White, public administration 'consists of all those operations having for their purposes the fulfilment or enforcement of public policy as declared by competent authority'.

1.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on the meaning and nature of political science.
2. What are the traditional perspectives on the discipline of political theory?
3. What do you understand by empirical enquiry in political theory?
4. State the relationship between political theory and history.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Discuss the relationship between politics and political theory.
2. Explain the scope of political science in detail.
3. What are the contemporary perspectives of political theory? Explain in detail.
4. What is the interdisciplinary approach of political theory?

1.8 FURTHER READING

- Baylis John and Steve Smith (eds). 2005. *The Globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bottomore Tom (ed.). 2000. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, New Delhi: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lenin V.I. 1973. *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

NOTES

UNIT 2 APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

NOTES

Structure

- 2.0 Introduction
- 2.1 Unit Objectives
- 2.2 Historical Approach
- 2.3 Philosophical Approach
- 2.4 Institutional Approach
- 2.5 Behavioural Approach
- 2.6 Marxian Approach
- 2.7 Summary
- 2.8 Key Terms
- 2.9 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 2.10 Questions and Exercises
- 2.11 Further Reading

2.0 INTRODUCTION

The term 'political theory,' also known as 'a theory of politics', is well known to us. It can simply be defined as an orientation that characterizes the thinking of a group or nation. Totalism, anarchism, autocracy, moderatism, collectivism, communism, democracy, elitism, fascism, federalism, monarchism, socialism and republicanism, all fall under the ambit of political theory.

However, it is necessary to understand the relation of political science with other social sciences. In addition, in order to better understand the political philosophers and their theories and doctrines, it is essential to comprehend the various methods or approaches of political science, i.e., historical approach, philosophical approach and behaviouralism. This unit deals with all these features of political theory.

2.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Analyse the historical approach to political theory
- Examine the philosophical approach to political theory
- Discuss the institutional approach to political theory
- Explain the behavioural approach to political theory
- Describe the Marxian approach to political theory

2.2 HISTORICAL APPROACH

Paul Janet, a French scholar of philosophy, politics and ethics, writes: 'The concerns of political theory are closely connected with political economy or the science of wealth;

NOTES

with law either natural or positive, which occupies itself principally with the relation of citizens one to another; with history, which furnishes the facts of which it has need; with philosophy and especially with moral which give to it a part of its concerns.' This statement indicates that political theory is related to other social sciences. Man is a social and political animal. His life has many aspects and concerns—political, social, religious, economic and ethical.

Many social sciences like political science, sociology, economics, philosophy, history, etc., deal with the different aspects of human life. As all these subjects deal with the different aspects of human life, they are called social sciences. 'Man is a social being', says Professor Bluntschli, professor of law at Heidelberg, 'and his various social activities may be studied separately. His political life is only one part of his total social life. But as every human being lives within a State, the science of the State is necessarily connected with other sciences.'

The relationship/concerns between political theory and history are very close. The two are complementary to each other. The intimacy between political theory and history is brought out in the following couplet of Seeley, an eminent English historian, who wrote – 'History without Political Science has not fruit, Political Science without History has no root.' The affinity between history and political science is so close that Freedom goes to the extent of saying that 'history is past politics and politics is present history.' Willoughby writes, 'History gives us the third dimension of political theory.' History provides the necessary raw materials for political theory. Gilchrist in the *Treatise of Political Theory*, says 'we must trace the history of various institutions, not for the sake of history but to enable us to form conclusions of our science. In so much as history not merely records events but analyses causes and points out tendencies. It overlaps political theory. Political theory, however, goes further. It uses historical facts to discover general laws and principles; it selects, analyses and systematizes the facts of history in order to extract the permanent principles of political life.

Political theory, further, is teleological, that is to say, it deals with the state as it ought to be; whereas, history deals with what it has been.' The political scientist goes back to the past in order to explore the future. 'So conceived history', writes Burns, an English philosopher, 'will be made something more than the luxury of a scholar. It will be the inspiration of honest politician; it will be the real basis for criticism of the present and modification of the future'.

The historical approach is a very popular method using which a social science can be studied. Political theory is also studied through this method. Every political idea or institution has its birth, growth and decay. Historically one can study the origin, growth and decay of an institution. It is through the study of the past history of political institutions that the political scientists try to understand the present political situations. Political scientists cannot neglect the past. The past has its influence over the present and the future. The aim of study of political theory is not to repeat the mistakes of the past. Only the study of history will enable men to avoid the mistakes of the past. Thus, historical method is a very popular method in the study of political theory.

The common method of studying political phenomena is historical. Montesquieu, Burke, Seeley, Maine, Freeman and Laski are some of the eminent exponents of this method. Professor Gilchrist has very aptly observed, 'The source of the experiment of political science is history; they rest on observation and experience.' The study of political science, according to Laski, 'must be an effort to codify the results of experience in the

history of states.' It is correct to say that history serves as a guide to the present and future. History provides the best kind of laboratory for political science. It is the storehouse of events pertaining to human life. This is the reason why one should seek the aid of history, when one studies the origin, development and the present nature of such important political institutions as the state and the government. The chief method of experimentation in political science, writes Professor Gilchrist, 'is the historical method.' To understand political institutions properly, one must study their origin, a growth and development. History not only explains institution, but also helps us to make certain deductions for future guidance. It is the pivot around which both the inductive and deductive processes of political science work. Sir Frederic Pollock supports this method. 'The historical method', says Sir Frederic Pollock, 'seeks an explanation of what institutions are and are tending to be more in the knowledge of what they have been and how they have been and how they come to, what they are, than in the analysis of them as they stand.'

2.3 PHILOSOPHICAL APPROACH

Political theory is also related to philosophy. Philosophy is defined as the science of ethics or the science of moral order. It aims at achieving some ideals. Political theory is not completely devoid of morality or ideals. In political theory, there are certain ideals, which the state and the citizens should follow. Political philosophy deals with various ideals. Plato, the earliest writer on political theory, was also a great philosopher. In his book, *The Republic*, he visualized an ideal state.

This approach is known as deductive or philosophical approach. Rousseau and Hegel used this method in their studies. This method implies that principles should be deduced from a series of general truths or assumptions. It admits 'an abstract ideal and draws deductions from it concerning the nature functions and aims of the state.' A certain view of human nature is taken for granted and deduction about the nature of political institutions are made. This approach is not strictly realistic because a political philosopher may lose sight of actual facts and may roam in darkness, *The Republic* by Plato and *Utopia* of Moore are the products of philosophical imagination. Philosophy deals with ideals and aspirations of a society. An accurate knowledge of the political life of people can, as a matter of fact, be acquired with the help of a combination of the actuals and ideals in life.

Broadly speaking, political theory consists of political science and political philosophy. These two branches of political theory taken together perform three functions which are recognized as the functions of political theory: (a) description (b) criticism and (c) reconstruction. Political science mainly relies on empirical method, that is, the knowledge based on our practical experience which is supposed to be most reliable. Hence, it specializes in description. Political philosophy being concerned with value-judgment specializes in 'criticism' and 'reconstruction'.

Advocates of positivism, new-positivism (logical positivism) and behaviouralism wish to confine political theory to the sphere of political science. They argue that the question of value-judgment should be dropped from the purview of political theory all together. However, since the advent of post behaviouralism (1969) and the consequent revival of political philosophy in the 1970s and 1980s, there has been a renewed emphasis on values in the realm of political theory. It is now argued that value-judgment serves as an essential guide to social policy. Indifference to value-judgment will leave society in

NOTES

Check Your Progress

1. Mention some of the eminent exponents of the historical method of studying political phenomena.
2. Who wrote the *Treatise of Political Theory*?

NOTES

the dark. The emerging concerns of environmentalism, feminism, human rights and social justice for the subaltern groups, etc., have called for exploring the new horizons of value-judgment. Thus, all the functions of political theory have now become very important and urgent in the present day world where most of our problems are assuming a global dimensions and there being recognized as the problems of humanity as such.

According to George H. Sabine who authored, *What is Political Theory?* (1939), every political theory could be scrutinized from two points of view: as social philosophy and as ideology. As ideology, theories were psychological phenomena, precluding truth or falsity. Theories were beliefs, 'events in peoples mind and factors in their conduct', irrespective of their validity or verifiability.

Theories played an influential role in history, and therefore the task of a historian was to ascertain the extent to which the theories help in shaping the course of history. A theory had to be examined for its meaning, rather than for its impact on human actions. Viewed from this perspective, a theory comprised two kind of propositions: factual and moral. Sabine focused on factual rather than moral statements, for the latter precluded description of truth or falsity. He says the moral element characterized political theory which was why it was primarily a moral enterprise.

Political theory is closely related to moral philosophy. Both are normative and evaluative and, although not all political values have moral origins ('tradition', which Burke valued, and 'efficiency' seem to be non-moral), they rely on moral language, since a value is something we would consider good, and would prefer to have more, rather than less, of. Although an ideal such as democracy is primarily political, it's supporting values, freedom and equality, are as pervasive in moral as in political philosophizing. This shared area of concern and similarity of language is appropriate, since both moral and political philosophy attempt to define the 'Good Life', the first on an individual level, the second for the community at large. So the importation of moral terms into political theory is both permissible and necessary.

Is there a necessary connection between political theory and ideology? Ideology, as will be argued, is crucial in forming the political theorist's own view of the world. It would be convenient if we could distinguish clearly between ideology and theory—if we could label theory 'ideological' whenever values and prescriptive or persuasive elements are visible. But many ideological influences affect theory invisibly, pre-selecting which data the theory will explain, and dictating its conceptual vocabulary from the start. Likewise, much theory contains ideological bias without having ideology's express aim of persuasion. All political theory and theorizing is susceptible to greater or lesser ideological bias, and that a necessary task for commentators and students is to identify and evaluate that bias, and, of course, their own bias.

Political theory is an umbrella term. It comprehends the persuasive and normative doctrines called ideologies; it also embraces the analytical activity known as political philosophy, which styles itself 'value-free'. Rather than propounding grandiose theses about the nature of political society and the 'Good Life', this examines the units of which political theory, including ideology, is composed, the concepts. Hence, it is sometimes called 'conceptual analysis'. It has been held that its main endeavour is to 'clear up confusions' which result from non-clarity or inconsistency in the use of concepts such as freedom and equality by providing a clear and coherent account of their proper use. This activity often employs the methods established by the school of philosophy called 'linguistic analysis', which flourished for several decades after World War II but has more recently been generally rejected as too narrow and barren. A more normative and engaged kind

of philosophy is now favoured. The other task of political philosophy is said to provide generally acceptable definitions of central political terms. These self-ascribed functions also rest on the conviction that even value-laden concepts are capable of a constant and definite meaning.

Political theory is a personal endeavour to understand and experience as the present political reality and also to evolve a mechanism in order to transcend the present imperfect society leading to perfection and a more just order. This includes a study of the evolution, nature, composition, need and purpose of the governmental apparatus, and also an understanding of human perception and nature, and its relationship with the larger community. The golden age of political theory was from Plato (428/27–347 BC) to Hegel (1770–1831 AD). Political theory is one of the core ideas of political science. Political theory as an academic discipline has emerged recently. Before its emergence, those engaged in enterprise were known as philosophers or scientists.

The term political science, political theory and political philosophy are not exactly identical and a distinction can be made among them. This differentiation were emerged because of the rise of modern science that brought about a general shift in intellectual perceptions. While political science tries to provide plausible generalization and laws about politics and political behaviour, political theory reflects upon political phenomena and actual political behaviour by subjecting them to philosophical or ethical criteria. It considers the question of the best political order, which is the part of a larger and more fundamental question, namely the ideal form of life that an individual should lead in a larger community.

But it should be kept in mind that there is no tension between political theory and political science as they differ in terms of their boundaries and jurisdiction but not in their aim. Political theory supplies idea, concepts and theories for purpose of analysis, descriptions, explanation and criticism, which in turn are incorporated in political science. Political theory helps in explaining the history of political thought, use of technique of analysis, conceptual clarification and formal model building, and thereby can be termed as theoretical political science. In a nutshell, it can be said that political theory is theoretical, scientific as well as philosophical and at the same time dynamic with a clear objective of attaining a better social order. It is a unique synthesis of the elements of 'theory', 'science', 'philosophy', 'ideology' and 'thought'.

2.4 INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

To study the concepts of state, government and law, Plato and Aristotle adopted the deductive and inductive approaches respectively. Plato laid emphasis on universal values and reasoning. He had his own concept of the ideal state which was the embodiment of morality, justice and truth. He drew his conclusions on the basis of the first major premise. In other words, Plato proceeded from the universal to the particular which is the main characteristic of the deductive approach. Aristotle, on the other hand, used the inductive approach in the study of political theory. He preferred to proceed from a particular to a general conclusion. First of all, he observed, analysed and compared different constitutions of city-states and then drew the model of an ideal constitution. In this case, the general conclusion was established from particular facts. This is the inductive approach.

Aristotle was the first political philosopher who adopted this approach in the study of political science. Since the early days, both deductive and inductive approaches are being popularly used in the field of the study of political theory. Besides these two

NOTES

Check Your Progress

3. State the definition of philosophy.
4. Who wrote *The Republic*?

NOTES

approaches, the other approaches used for the study of political theory are historical, comparative, philosophical, observational, experimental, psychological, statistical, sociological and juridical methods. These are known as the traditional approaches used for the study of political theory.

In the deductive approach, one proceeds from a more general proposition to an equally general or less general proposition. The deductive approach is concerned with implication, and here, one may proceed from the general to the particular. All valid reasoning and universal truth are arrived at by deductive method. Here, the conclusion only makes explicit what is implied by the premise and one does not bother about the material truth or falsity of the premise or the conclusion. In the deductive approach, the formal truth is accepted and it is applied to different political situations. Political action is considered as right or wrong on the basis of the general conclusion. This approach puts emphasis on universal values and reasoning.

When one proceeds from a particular to a general conclusion or from a less general proposition to a more general proposition, the approach is called inductive. Here, a scholar arrives at a conclusion by a process known as generalization from the particular fact observed within the range of his experience. The inductive approach is defined as 'the legitimate derivation of universal laws from individual cases'. In political science, the inductive approach is used to draw general principles from particular experiences. One examines here various facts, experiences and findings. Political science is such a vast subject that the problems of various individuals, groups and the states may be studied and certain generalizations can be made.

The inductive approach is scientific and rational as it establishes a general truth of principle by observation, experimentation or reasoning from particular examples. Its findings are mostly correct and it takes reality into consideration. While the deductive method is said to be dogmatic, the inductive approach is pragmatic.

The inductive approach takes into consideration various complex factors in actual life. While advocating empirical investigation, it studies different factors or variables causing such complexities. Its approach is dynamic as it takes changing factors into consideration. In the modern age, Bacon is a great advocate of the inductive approach. The inductive method of study of political theory has given rise to the behavioural approach in recent times. According to the behavioural approach, the unit of analysis is the individual person in a political situation. A behaviouralist studies the behaviour of persons whose interactions influence group actions and he arrives at conclusions on the basis of actual findings. The inductive approach also suffers from some defects. It is a difficult method because collection of data is time taking. It is also expensive. Lot of time and money are wasted in observation and collection of data. There are certain limitations while applying the inductive method in the study of political phenomena. The primary limitation is that the subject of study, that is, human beings, are unpredictable.

The long spell of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Cicero and other thinkers of the classical age was broken in a variety of ways after the twin revolutions of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe since the fifteenth century, coupled with the Industrial Revolution later on. The Renaissance produced a new intellectual climate which gave birth to modern science and modern philosophy and a new political theory known as liberalism. This new political theory found classical expression in the writings of Grotius, Hobbes, Locke, Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine, Jeremy Bentham, J.S. Mill, Herbert Spencer and a host of other writers. While classical political theory considered the moral

NOTES

development of individual and the evolution of the community as co-terminus, the liberal political theory developed the concept of sovereign individual. The central theme of this political theory was individualism. The liberal theory declared that state is not a natural institution but comes into existence by mutual consent for the sole purpose of preserving and protecting the individual rights. The new liberal political theory dismissed the idea of common good and an organic community.

Recently, the idea of power has become very important in the realm of political theory. Earlier, politics was defined as the study of state and government. Today, it is defined as the study of power. The significance of power was highlighted by Machiavelli in the Medieval Age, and later by Hobbes and Nietzsche. In the modern times, Max Weber, Catlin, Merriam, Lasswell, Kaplan, Treitschke and Morgenthau have brought out the importance of this concept. The 'Power Theory State' was first advocated in Germany in the nineteenth century by historians like Heinrich Von Treitschke and philosophers like Friedrich Nietzsche. Power is the primary objective of foreign policy.

The state plays an important role in social life. Thus, a group or class (or even, in some cases, an individual) that can control the various agencies of the State is potentially very influential in terms of politics, economy and ideology.

2.5 BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

A new trend in the study of political theory was clearly visible in the twentieth century, particularly since the end of World War II. This was due to the increasing attention given to the study of political behaviour of important persons, exercising political power, and the ordinary people. This new movement was started by a group of political scientists, mostly in the USA, who strongly expressed their dissatisfaction with the traditional approaches to political theory. The underlying principle of behavioural method in political theory is its central focus on 'political behaviour'. As Heinz Eulau, the William Bennett Munro professor of political science, emeritus, Stanford University, observes, 'The study of political behaviour is concerned with the acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of man in political contexts.'

Behaviouralism refers to an approach in international relations, which seeks to provide an objective and quantified description to explain and predict international political behaviour. Behavioural approaches have been regarded as the turning point in the history of political science, particularly international relations.

Behaviouralists questioned the methodologies that were used to describe international relations, particularly by the American scholars in the second half of the 20th century. In the first half of the 20th century, international relations were more of a subject than a discipline, where the non-academic commentators had contributed as much as academicians.

Behaviouralists want international relations to follow the process of scientific analysis as they believe that international relations, as a social science, are not fundamentally different from the natural science. That is why they seek to adopt the same analytical method (including the quantitative methods) in studying international relations. They also favour interdisciplinary studies among the social sciences. This has led to the belief that international relations are also amenable to scientific research.

Behaviouralists ask the most fundamental question of how to look at politics in order to study it scientifically. The answer that they have found is to focus on human

Check Your Progress

5. Who was the first political philosopher who adopted the inductive approach in the study of political science?
6. What do you understand by the inductive approach?

NOTES

behaviour as it involves politics and government by investigating the acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of people in their political context.

The key element of the behavioural approaches, which also forms the basic unit of analysis, is the individual person. It analyses politics from the aspect of the people and their political behaviour at different levels of analysis. Thus, the focus of the study of the political behaviour is the role of people in different social structures.

The theories that constitute the behavioural approach of studying international relations are the system theory, input-output theory, game theory and decision-making theory.

1. System theory

The system theory approach of international relations is engaged in developing theories of the international system. It was introduced in the late 1950s with the basic assumptions that international relations follows an order or a system. It is the most prolific and promising school. Its main exponents are Morton Kaplan, K. Boulding, Kenneth Waltz, Mclelland, etc. The most prominent of the system theory approach are scholars such as Karl W. Deutsch and Raymond Aron.

The system is a set of interacting variables or a collection of functionally interdependent parts. In other words, a system is 'a set of variables in interaction which makes a unified whole affecting each other's actions.' Generally speaking, a system may be either natural such as the solar system or mechanical such as a clock, computer or a car, or social such as a family. Stanley Hoffmann, the Paul and Catherine Buttenwieser University professor at Harvard, has defined it as: 'A system connotes relationships between units or its various components.'

The system theory approach conceives nations to be in contact in a complicated framework of relationships that result from the process of interaction. They emphasize the significance of the interaction of behaviour of states, since each nation is involved to some degree in participation in the international environment. That is why it is possible to find out that there are certain regular modes of behaviour, which could be generalized within the structure of the political organization.

According to Raymond Aron, a French philosopher, the period of the post-World War has witnessed, for the first time, the emergence of the global system. Within this system, there are small systems or subsystems, which affect the working of the larger system. The mutual relationship between the two systems is called as feedback, which can be both negative as well as positive. The nation's behaviour is thus what Mc Clelland, an American psychological theorist, calls as a 'two-way activity of taking from and giving to the international environment'.

Characteristics of the system approach

The system approach, developed under the general system theory, seeks to analyse the international relations as a system of interactions, which are independent and interrelated. It views the international relation as a pattern of behaviour of the international actors. Therefore, in order to develop a scientific study of politics, it has to be treated as a system of action. The process of exchange in politics is fairly continuous, regular and patterned, and can be studied as a system of behaviour.

The system consists of a set of units in interactions and is possible to conceive relations among nation as constituting a kind of system. That is why the system consists

of a known set of variables such as the political machinery, attitudes, interests and activities along with the values as a parameter to study. The system approach in international relations is based upon the following main assumptions:

- **International system is not an international political system:** The concept of system is used in the context of international politics; it is taken to mean the international political system. The international system is not international political system as it does not allocate authoritative values over them.
- **International and national actors:** The international actors are basically the national actors who act in the international environment.
- **Classification of national and supra-national actors:** The international actors can be classified into the following two types:
 - o The national actors who act in the international environment
 - o The supra-national actors, such as UN, regional organizations and other international agencies

The supra-national actors can be further classified as bloc actors and universal actors. From these fundamental assumptions, the system theory assumes that the international system is constituted by a set of interaction among the actors or entities such as national interests. There is a continuous process of interactions among the actors and entities, which occur at a regular interval in the international environment. These mutual exchanges occur due to the participation in the international environment, which occur in a certain identifiable pattern and describable patterns, as an interaction among nations. The concept of system can enrich the understanding of the phenomena, which will help in theory building of international relations. That is why the system distinguishes the units or actors, structural processes and the context, i.e., the environment as major elements in every system.

Morton Kaplan's models of international system

Professor Morton Kaplan is considered as one of the most influential thinkers associated with developing systems theories of international relations. He presented a number of real and hypothetical models of global political organizations. His six well-known models are as follows:

- Balance of power system
- Loose bipolar system
- Tight bipolar system
- Universal actor system
- Hierarchical system
- Unit Veto system

The first two models are historical realities, while the remaining four are hypothetical models. Although Kaplan did not say that his six systems were likely to emerge in that order, it was expected that the Super Power being very powerful, the non-aligned countries would lose their status and become parts of one or the other power blocs, leading to a tight bipolar world. Each of these models is briefly discussed as follows:

- **Balance of power system:** This model refers to the balance of power system that operated in the 18th and the 19th century Europe. It is a popular model in which the power relations among the five or six major powers constitute a

NOTES

NOTES

balance and there is no authoritative international organization that is present in the system. The system has six fundamental rules, which can be mentioned as follows:

- o Each actor seeks to increase its capabilities through negotiations and not resort to war.
- o Each actor is prepared to fight rather than pass on an opportunity to increase capabilities to protect the national interest.
- o No actor is to be eliminated in the system. The actor should terminate war before the opponent is eliminated.
- o An actor or a group of actors acts to oppose any other group or single actor that tends to assume unduly powerful position and predominance with respect to the rest of the system.
- o Attempts are made to check the actors who try to follow supranational organizing principles.
- o The defeated or constrained essential actors are permitted to re-enter the system as acceptable role partners. Actors act to bring some previously inessential actor within the essential actor classification and treat all essential actors as acceptable role partners.

These six rules keep intact the 'balance' in relations. The failure to keep up these rules disturbs the system and leads to an end of the balance. The end of the balance of the power system leads to the end of the system. In the early years of the 20th century, these rules were not followed and lead to the breakdown of the balance of power system. It resulted in the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. The breakdown of the balance of power system led to the bipolar system. It manifested in two forms—the loose bipolar and the tight bipolar system.

- **Loose bipolar system:** The loose bipolar system comes into existence when the two powerful nations are successful in organizing the other nations into their two respective competing blocs or groups. However, the organization of the bloc is loose and internal differences prevail among the members of each bloc. In other words, the loose bipolar system is constituted by two major power blocs-actors, non-member bloc actors such as the group of non-aligned countries and the universal actors and strives to use its universal actor for increasing its relative capabilities and seeks to eliminate or weaken their rival blocs. The non-bloc actor tends to support the universal actor for reducing the dangers of war between the rival blocs. The blocs attempt to extend membership and tolerate the status of the non-bloc actors.
- **Tight bipolar system:** The loose bipolar system transforms into a tight bipolar system when the two major powers lead their respective blocs of allied powers. Each bloc is dominated by the major power. In such a situation, the international organization is very weak and there are no neutral blocs or nations. The tight bipolar system is characterized during the peak of the Cold War between the erstwhile USSR and USA.
- **Universal actor system:** The fourth model is the universal actor system in which the nations get organized in a federal system. The world gets transformed into a Federal World State based upon the principles of mutual

toleration and universal rule of law. This system works through a universal actor (for example, international organizations like the NATO). The universal actor is powerful enough to check war and preserve peace or balance in international relations.

- **Hierarchical system:** The hierarchical system comes into existence when a single powerful superpower can bring either all the nations under its control, either through a conquest or a treaty. The states or territorial units are then transformed into functional units, with the superpower becoming the universal actor and absorbing all the other nations. If the system comes into existence through conquest, then it is a directive system but, if it evolves through a democratic means, then it becomes a non-directive system.
- **Unit veto system:** The sixth model of Kaplan is the unit veto system. It involves the conception of a situation of multi-polarity in which each state is equally powerful as it possesses weapons such as nuclear weapons that can destroy the other state. It becomes stable when each state can resist and retaliate threats from every other state.

Later, Morton Kaplan incorporated insights from his research such as mixed empirical models like very loose bipolar system, détente system, unstable bloc system and incomplete nuclear diffusion system. He described his six models as theory sketches rather than theory per se and stresses on the fact that they are essentially heuristic models. Nevertheless, Kaplan's theory provides 'initial' or 'introduction theory'.

The belief that the international system is the result of interaction is closely connected with the idea of transformation. For the interaction of state behaviour is always subject to change under the impact of new factors. Numerous efforts have been made to study the transformation process and this idea has found echo in the 18th century in both the American as well as the French revolution and later in the 19th century in the writings of Utopian Socialists and Marxists.

However, in the 20th century, these ideas have been found to be inappropriate, as Spengler, Toynbee and Sorokin have rejected the concern with material welfare, which has been prominent in both the liberal as well as the socialist thought on international transformation. Toynbee has suggested a new creative ideal which is based on revitalization of Christianity than Sorokin wants the end of 'the sensate period' and offers a philosophy of altruism.

2. Input-output theory

David Easton developed the system theory as a conceptual framework for analysing politics through the interactions of the system and the role that they play in the system. It seeks to analyse the factor for the different process as well as their operations and find the causal factor for its causal actions in the political system of a country. This model has proved useful for both empirical as well as practical purposes, benefitting both the advanced as well as the third world countries.

The Input-Output Theory was conceived as ideas in a number of important works during the 1950s and 1960s, including *The Political System* (1953), *A Framework for Political Analysis* (1965), and *A Systems Analysis of Political Life* (1965). Easton presented an outline of the conceptual framework of systems analysis and is also known as the 'flow model'. The model uses the 'system' as the broad unit of analysis.

NOTES

NOTES

Easton analyses the system through the political interaction of different units, on the basis of the following four major premises:

- System
- Environment
- Response
- Feedback

3. Game Theory

The game theory is another approach used in the study of international relations. It was initially influenced by mathematics and economics. It attempts to apply the different models of game to international politics, especially in highly competitive situations when outcomes of the actions are difficult to anticipate. This has led the scholars to create the game theory for a more scientific study of the calculation of probabilities in an uncertain situation. Hence, the game theory is a method of analysis which will select the best course of action.

The game theory has been developed mainly by the economist Oscar Morgenstern and the mathematician John von Neumann in their publication of *The Theory of Games and Economic Behaviour* and has been advocated by the influential theorists like Martin Shubnik, Morton Kaplan, Thomas Schelling, D. Luce, H. Raiffa and Karl Deutsh. They were the first ones to recognize the importance of the game theory. Although it was in the field of economics that has been used as a model of studying the economic behaviour, of late the game theory has also been applied in many other fields with suitable modifications.

Meaning of the Game Theory

The game theory postulates that by assigning individual participants roles to play in real or imaginative international crises, decision making can be simulated in such a way that it can take into account the wide range of variables in the international process, which is in search of solutions. It involves the application of the art of model building to international politics.

Assumptions of the Game Theory

The game theory assumes that the political process is the confrontation like a chess game or contest between two merchants or brokers or the manoeuvres of rival political candidates or the counter actions of opposed diplomats. In other words, the game theory is similar to those in the games and what the game offers.

That is why the game theory tries to determine the nature of the system of powers in the international politics. As the power relations are partly competitive and partly cooperative, they can be analysed as game among players. The nations are players which are competing for the fulfilment of their respective national interests and are like players of a game. Therefore, the theory seeks to:

- Isolate the variables
- Examine the modes of their interactions
- Infer relationships among the variables
- Construct hypothesis

NOTES

The game theory as an approach seeks to perform two task, namely to formulate the principles which could specify what is rational behaviour in certain situations and to formulate on the basis of the principles the general characteristics of the behaviour.

4. Decision-Making theory

The decision-making theory has been emphasized in the study of international politics during the 1950s by Richard Synder, H.W. Bruck and Burton Sapin, who had undertaken a theoretical exploration of the behaviour of actors in international relations. In the Sixties, writers such as William Riker, James Robinson, Herbert Simon and J.W Burton contributed to the Decision-making Theory and enriched them. The well-known scholars who have made an analysis of the decision-making process include Garham Allison in *The Essence of Decision, 1971*, Ole Holsti, James Rosenau, J. Wilbenfield and Michael Breacher in *India and World Politics*.

Focus of Decision-Making theory

The decision-making approach seeks to study the functioning of states in general and the actual decision makers of the state in particular. It is done through the following processes:

- Identification of the decision makers
- Analysis of the decision-making process
- Search of appropriate and precise methods for comprehending the process as well as international politics

The decision-making approach advocates the use of models for appropriately analysing decisions. Graham T. Allison describes these models as follows:

- The rational actor model seeks to assess the policy process on the basis of the ex-post factor reviews of the credibility of the policies pursued.
- The organizational process model is concerned with tapping the administrative and organizational behaviours with the specific aim of comprehending and analysing government decisions.
- The government politics model stresses the problems and significance of securing international bureaucratic consensus as an instrument of evolving policy.

The basic inquiry in the decision-making analysis is on how and why the national actors behave. They focus on the study of the processes foreign policy formulation. The decision-making theory approaches used by the decision makers and the state is defined as decisional units. The action of the state is seen through the action of the decision-makers and proceeds with the assumption that the key to political action lies in the way in which decision-makers define their situation.

Snyder's Decision-Making framework

According to Snyder, there are two fundamental purposes of decision-making approach:

- To help identify and isolate the 'crucial structures' in the political realm where action is initiated and carries out and decisions are made
- To help analyse systematically the decision-making behaviour which 'leads to action as well as sustain them'

Post-behavioural approach

Post-behaviouralism was a reform movement in behaviouralism. Post behaviouralists wanted to have a federation of social scientists to identify major issues of the day to lay down objectives to study alternative solutions to the problems faced by the society and follow those rigorously in the political sphere.

They believed in action-oriented research related to social conditions. They believed in 'relevance' and 'action'. David Easton, a Canadian political scientist, has given seven major traits of post-behaviouralism. According to him: 'Insofar as research in political science was concerned, substance must precede techniques. It was more important to be relevant rather than to develop sophisticated tools of investigation.' They said that it was always better to be vague than be non-relevant and precise. Then another feature was that they believed was that behavioural science concealed an ideology of empirical conservatism.

2.6 MARXIAN APPROACH

Marxist political theory focuses on social change and revolutionary reconstitution of society. In this context, Marxism consists of three interrelated elements:

- An examination and critique of the present and past societies. This is known as dialectical materialism and historical materialism.
- The notion of an alternative model against a society based upon exploitation and divided among classes. The new society is based on the common ownership of the means of production on which human potential will be allowed to freely develop its manifold facets. Such a society will be classless and stateless.
- Though there was a general agreement that capitalist system was unstable and crisis-ridden, the advent of socialism required a revolutionary action by the proletariat, whose growing impoverishment will lead to revolution, and establishment of a socialist state and society.

The central themes of Marxist political theory are modes of production, class division, class, struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination. Marxism also examine the nature of rights, liberty, equality, justice and democracy but came to the conclusion that in a class divided society, they are the prerogatives of the propertied class. Real liberty and equality can be achieved only in a classless and stateless society. Thus, Marxist political theory preoccupied itself with the establishment of a socialist state through revolutionary action.

Marxism as the economic, social and political theory has been enriched by a number of revolutionaries, philosophers, academicians and politicians. It has also been subject to a variety of interpretations. In the twentieth century, the prominent contributions to Marxist thought were made by Lenin, Bukharin, Stalin, Rosa Luxemburg, Gramsci, Lukacs, Austro-Marxists, the Frankfurt school, Herbert Marcuse, the New Left theorists, Euro-communists, Mao Tse Tung and various other people. Up to the First World War, Marxism was highly deterministic and represented a philosophy of socio-political changes which culminated in the Russian revolution. However, during the inter-War period and the post-Second World War, Marxism developed more as a critique of present socio-economic and cultural conditions than a philosophy of revolutionary action. Known as contemporary Marxism, it has been more concerned with the problems of superstructure, culture, art aesthetics, ideology, alienation, etc.

Check Your Progress

7. What do you understand by behaviourism?
8. What is the system approach?

NOTES

Other than the aforementioned perspectives of political theories, there are some other perspectives also which explain political theory in detail, such as the empirical-scientific perspective of political theory and the contemporary perspective of political theory.

2.7 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Many social sciences like political science, sociology, economics, philosophy, history, etc., deal with the different aspects of human life.
- The historical approach is a very popular method using which a social science can be studied. Political theory is also studied through this method. Every political idea or institution has its birth, growth and decay.
- The common method of studying political phenomena is historical. Montesquieu, Burke, Seeley, Maine, Freeman and Laski are some of the eminent exponents of this method.
- The study of political science, according to Laski, 'must be an effort to codify the results of experience in the history of states.'
- Political theory is also related to philosophy. Philosophy is defined as the science of ethics or the science of moral order. It aims at achieving some ideals.
- Broadly speaking, political theory consists of political science and political philosophy. These two branches of political theory taken together perform three functions which are recognized as the functions of political theory: (a) description (b) criticism and (c) reconstruction.
- The term political science, political theory and political philosophy are not exactly identical and a distinction can be made among them.
- To study the concepts of state, government and law, Plato and Aristotle adopted the deductive and inductive approaches respectively.
- The long spell of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, Cicero and other thinkers of the classical age was broken in a variety of ways after the twin revolutions of Renaissance and Reformation in Europe since the fifteenth century, coupled with the Industrial Revolution later on.
- A new trend in the study of political theory was clearly visible in the twentieth century, particularly since the end of World War II. This was due to the increasing attention given to the study of political behaviour of important persons, exercising political power, and the ordinary people.
- Behaviouralism refers to an approach in international relations, which seeks to provide an objective and quantified description to explain and predict international political behaviour.
- Behaviouralists questioned the methodologies that were used to describe international relations, particularly by the American scholars in the second half of the 20th century.
- The theories that constitute the behavioural approach of studying international relations are the system theory, input-output theory, game theory and decision-making theory.

Check Your Progress

9. What do Marxist political theory focuses on?
10. Mention the central themes of Marxist political theory.

NOTES

- The belief that the international system is the result of interaction is closely connected with the idea of transformation. For the interaction of state behaviour is always subject to change under the impact of new factors.
- Post-behaviouralism was a reform movement in behaviouralism. Post-behaviouralists wanted to have a federation of social scientists to identify major issues of the day to lay down objectives to study alternative solutions to the problems faced by the society and follow those rigorously in the political sphere.
- Marxist political theory focuses on social change and revolutionary reconstitution of society.
- The central themes of Marxist political theory are modes of production, class division, class, struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination.
- Marxism as the economic, social and political theory has been enriched by a number of revolutionaries, philosophers, academicians and politicians.

2.8 KEY TERMS

- **Federal system:** A federal system of government is characterized by the constitutionally-mandated division of political authority between the national government and sub-national territories, such as states or provinces.
- **Marxism:** Marxism is a method of socioeconomic analysis that analyses class relations and societal conflict using a materialist interpretation of historical development and a dialectical view of social transformation.
- **Revolutionary:** A revolutionary is a person who either actively participates in, or advocates revolution.

2.9 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Montesquieu, Burke, Seeley, Maine, Freeman and Laski are some of the eminent exponents of historical method of studying political phenomena.
2. Gilchrist wrote the *Treatise of Political Theory*.
3. Philosophy is defined as the science of ethics or the science of moral order.
4. *The Republic* was written by Plato.
5. Aristotle was the first political philosopher who adopted the inductive approach in the study of political science.
6. When one proceeds from a particular to a general conclusion or from a less general proposition to a more general proposition, the approach is called inductive.
7. Behaviouralism refers to an approach in international relations, which seeks to provide an objective and quantified description to explain and predict international political behaviour.
8. The system approach, developed under the general system theory, seeks to analyse the international relations as a system of interactions, which are independent and interrelated.

NOTES

9. Marxist political theory focuses on social change and revolutionary reconstitution of society.
10. The central themes of Marxist political theory are modes of production, class division, class, struggle, property relations, revolution and state as an instrument of class domination.

2.10 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is the historical approach to study political science?
2. Write a short note on political theory.
3. What is Aristotle's contribution towards the study of political science?
4. What do you understand by behavioralism?

Long-Answer Questions

1. What are the different approaches to study political science? Discuss in detail.
2. What is the difference between deductive and inductive approach to study political science?
3. Explain the theories that constitute the behavioural approach of studying international relations.
4. Discuss Morton Kaplan's models of international system in detail.

2.11 FURTHER READING

- Baylis John and Steve Smith (eds). 2005. *The Globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bottomore Tom (ed.).2000. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, New Delhi: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lenin V.I. 1973. *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

UNIT 3 RELATION BETWEEN POLITICAL THEORY AND OTHER SOCIAL SCIENCES

Structure

- 3.0 Introduction
- 3.1 Unit Objectives
- 3.2 Political Theory and Geography
- 3.3 Political Theory and Economics
 - 3.3.1 Liberal Perspectives
 - 3.3.2 Marxist Perspectives
- 3.4 Political Theory and Sociology
 - 3.4.1 Some Early Approaches
 - 3.4.2 Contemporary Views
- 3.5 Summary
- 3.6 Key Terms
- 3.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 3.8 Questions and Exercises
- 3.9 Further Reading

3.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit will discuss the relation between political theory and other social sciences like economics, sociology and geography.

Political economy usually refers to the interplay between economics and politics and how economic theory comes to influence political ideology. This relationship between the politics and the economy of a nation may not be apparent to most. However, the linkages between the two have been studied by scholars for many years. Today, the field of Political economy has come to encompass the disciplines of law, economics, political science, history, anthropology, etc. Such a wide variety of disciplines allows a student of political economy to get a comprehensive understanding of the socio-economic conditions in a country.

In India, where the vast majority of the people are poor and illiterate and thus open to exploitation by a variety of social and political forces, the field of political economy becomes even more relevant.

3.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the relationship between political theory and geography
- Discuss the influence of economics on political theory
- Describe the difference between political theory and sociology

NOTES

3.2 POLITICAL THEORY AND GEOGRAPHY

Some writers believe that national life of the people, character and their political institutions are greatly influenced by the physical and geographical conditions. The first modern writer who dwelt upon the relationship between geography and political science was Bodin. Rousseau also tried to create a relationship between various forms of government and the climatic conditions of a particular nation. According to Rousseau, cold climates are conducive to barbarism, warm climates to despotism and moderate climates to a good polity. Another French scholar, Montesquieu also put emphasis on the influence of physical environments on the forms of liberty of the people and the government.

In his *History of Civilisation*, the English historian Henry Thomas Buckle maintained that 'the actions of men, and therefore of societies, are determined by reciprocal interaction between the mind and the external phenomena.' He believed that the actions of the societies and the individuals are influenced by the physical environments, particularly food, soil, climate and the 'general aspects of the nature.' He did not believe in the idea which was generally accepted that the free will of man determines the action of the society and the individual.

However, it is important to note that geographical location is an important factor in moulding the destiny of every state. Geographical location also influences the national and international policies as well as the political institutions. Consequently, a new discipline of geo-politics has been developed that would fathom the impact of geographical factors on the political life of the nation, particularly in relation to its foreign policy.

The geographical location of some countries, for example, Germany which is located in the centre of the Europe and without natural boundaries makes it a great military power. 'Our historical-political destiny', wrote Professor Hintze, 'lies in our geographical location'. The geographical conditions of a particular nation always influence the national policies in considerable measure. The character of the political institutions are also influenced by geographical location.

Bryce has aptly said that 'in any country, physical conditions and inherited institutions so affect the political institutions of a nation as to give its government distinctive character.' The obvious reference is to Great Britain and Switzerland.

3.3 POLITICAL THEORY AND ECONOMICS

Political economy refers to a specific approach to study social and political events where economics and politics are not seen as separate domains. It is based on the belief that the two disciplines have an intimate relationship and the hypothesis that this relationship unfolds in diverse ways. These assumptions constitute important explanatory and analytical frameworks within which social and political phenomena can be studied. The phrase *économie politique* (in English, political economy) was first used in 1615 by the French scholar Antoine de Montchrétien in his book *Traité de l'économie politique (A Treatise on Political Economy)*.

Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Marx were some of the exponents of the political economy approach. In contemporary scholarship, the term 'political economy' indicates the amalgamation of two different disciplines—political science and economics. However, it must be noted that the evolution of economics and politics as separate disciplines of study itself is a modern phenomenon. The distinction between the subject

Check Your Progress

1. Who was the first modern writer who dwelt upon the relationship between geography and political science?
2. Who has written *History of Civilisation*?

matter of political science and economics was unknown until the Renaissance and Industrial Revolution in Europe. The ancient Indian scholar Kautilya described statecraft in his famous work *Arthashastra* (Economics).

On the other hand, Aristotle considered economic questions in his book *Politics*. Among classical political economists, Adam Smith considered political economy as 'a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator'. Karl Marx often referred to the 'critique of political economy' in his writings; however, it was Friedrich Engels, the co-author of *The Communist Manifesto* along with Karl Marx, who defined the term 'political economy'. According to Engels, studies of 'the laws governing the production and exchange of the material means of subsistence' are part of the political economy. Similarly, the Russian economist I. I. Rubin, who authored *Essays on Marx's Theory of Value*, stated that 'Political economy deals with human working activity, not from the standpoint of its technical methods and instruments of labour, but from the standpoint of its social form. It deals with production relations which are established among people in the process of production'.

Thus, the political economy approach provides an economic interpretation of political consequences. It seeks to study the social relations that evolve between people in the process of production, distribution, exchange and consumption. This approach assumes that political systems are merely expressions of the economic requirements of the society and social groups and that the changes in the economic system automatically lead to changes in the political system. This approach can be divided in two major perspectives—Liberal and Marxist.

3.3.1 Liberal Perspectives

The liberal perspective emerged as a critique of the comprehensive political control and regulation of economic affairs which had dominated European nation building in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, i.e., the Mercantilist school of thought. Liberals rejected theories and policies which subordinated economics to politics. They wanted a free market which was not limited by any monopoly or an economy that was not disassociated from the interest of the poor and of the community as a whole. The core ideas of the Liberal perspective stresses on the fact that the individual, being a rational individual actor, will find his or her way to progress through the process of free trade as there will be mutual exchange of goods and services. They say that the market being the main source of progress, cooperation and prosperity should not have any political interference or state regulation as they are uneconomical and retrogressive and lead to conflict.

Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Paul Samuelson, J.M Keynes, etc. are often regarded as leading exponents of the liberal perspective of the political economy approach. Adam Smith, the author of *Wealth of Nations*, believed that the market tended to expand spontaneously for the satisfaction of human needs – provided that the government did not interfere. He advocated the 'Laissez faire' policy where free individuals were best equipped to make social choices. David Ricardo argued that free trade benefited all the participants as it led to specialization which increased efficiency and thus productivity. It was through this rationale that Ricardo developed 'the law of comparative advantage'. Paul Samuelson summarized the argument by stating that trade will be mutually profitable when the region which has a comparative advantage of specializing the product, specializes and makes the region more efficient. There has been a recurring debate among economic liberals about the extent to which political interference by governments may be necessary.

NOTES

NOTES

The different views of how much the state should interfere have led to the development of the different strands of economic liberalism, namely- classical Laissez Faire doctrine, Keynesian concept and Neo-liberal perspective.

Classical Laissez Faire Doctrine: The Laissez faire doctrine was introduced in the eighteenth century, though the origin of the term remains unclear. According to popular belief, the term entered common vocabulary when Jean-Baptiste Colbert, who controlled the finances in the regime of Louis XIV of France questioned industrialists as to what the government could do to help them. The reply of the industrialists was 'laissez-nous faire' which can be roughly translated as 'let us be' or 'leave us be'. Later, physiocrats, a group of French economists of the eighteenth century, popularized the term. Adam Smith, a British economist, became a major proponent of the theory. The early economic liberals called for the Laissez faire doctrine, i.e., the freedom of the market from all kinds of political restriction and regulation. They advocated for minimal interference of the government in a market economy although Laissez faire doctrine did not necessarily oppose the state's provision for a few basic public goods which was necessary for the market to function properly. The rationale of the doctrine is that if everyone is left to their own economic devices instead of being controlled by the state, then the result would be a harmonious and more equal society of ever-increasing prosperity.

Keynesian Concept: Keynesian concept is based on the idea that the market may not work according to the belief of efficiency and mutual gain and lead to instances of market failure. John Maynard Keynes, the leading economist of the early twentieth century, argued that the market economy was a great benefit to people but it also entailed potential evils of 'risk, uncertainty and ignorance.' Therefore, the market had to be improved through the political management of the state. In other words, the state should play a positive role in providing directions for the economy so that any market failure in the state can be averted and help to improve the situation if it occurs. The Keynesian view became popular in the decades after the Second World War as the state took up the responsibility of building the war torn economy through public planning of the state.

Neo-liberal Perspective: In the latter part of the twentieth century, especially since the late 1980s, occurrence of globalization, privatization and liberalization has brought back the classical laissez faire doctrine in the form of neo-liberalism. It describes the political economy approach from the perspective of the market to economic as well as social policy, which is based on neo classical theories of economics. It stresses on the efficiency of private enterprise and the need to liberalize trade through open markets, in order to maximize the role of the private sector and determine the political and economic priorities of the state. Economic liberals argue that the market economy, being an autonomous sphere of society, operates according to its own economic laws. The market maximizes benefits for rational self-seeking individuals, households and companies that participate in the market exchange. The economy is a sphere of cooperation for mutual benefit among the states as well as individuals. Thus, the economy should be based on free trade.

3.3.2 Marxist Perspectives

The Marxist perspective of political economy believes that economics forms the base of society and the political system. Marxist scholars hold that except in primitive communism every other society has been divided along the classes of 'haves' and 'haves-not'. For Marxists, human history is a history of class struggle. They see the capitalist state as a

NOTES

tool to legitimize human exploitation and class inequality. The Marxist school of political economy has been led by Karl Marx, followed by other thinkers such as Engels, V.I. Lenin, Rosa Luxemburg, Trotsky, Kautsky, Bukharin and so on. There have been various stances in the Marxist perspectives which you will study in subsequent units. However, we can identify some common features of the Marxist perspective as follows:

- States are driven by the ruling class and are not autonomous. Capitalist states are primarily driven by the interest of their respective bourgeoisie and the conflict between states should be essentially seen in its economic context of competition between capitalist classes of different states. In other words, class conflict is more fundamental than conflict between states.
- The economic system of capitalism is expansive. As there is a never ending search for markets and profits, capitalism has expanded across the globe; first in the form of imperialism and colonization and in the contemporary world after the colonies have gained independence, it is led by the giant transnational corporations in the form of economic globalization. That is why class conflict is not confined to states, but rather cuts across state borders.
- According to V.I. Lenin, the process of capitalist expansion must always be unequal or uneven. He alluded to how Britain was ahead of Germany during the eighteenth and nineteenth century, while in the twentieth century, Germany wanted a revision of the international spheres of influence which led to war between Germany and England. This is the 'law of uneven development' which leads to disparities and cause conflict under the capitalist conditions.

3.4 POLITICAL THEORY AND SOCIOLOGY

Political sociology lies at the intersection of the disciplines of political science and sociology. Giovanni Sartori, an acclaimed Italian political scientist, had suggested that there was an ambiguity in the term 'political sociology' because it could be construed as a synonym for 'sociology of politics'. Due to this ambiguity, it became difficult to be precise concerning the objects of study and the approaches of inquiry within the field of Political Sociology. Therefore, there arose the need for clarification.

For Sartori, such a clarification would be possible only 'when the sociological and 'politicological' approaches are combined at their point of intersection.' This point of intersection is a site of interdisciplinary studies. However, to understand the dynamics of such a site, one must delineate the contours of the two parent disciplines—political science and sociology. Although the discipline of political science traces its history back to Aristotle, it evolved into an academic field of study in the United States of America. According to Lipset, one of the earliest usages of the term 'political science' occurred with the founding of the Faculty of Political Science at Columbia University, New York in the late 19th century. A few years later, in 1903, the American Political Science Association was founded, and, not much later, the first issue of the *American Political Science Review* was published, which is now more than a century old.

Gradually as the 20th century unfolded, political science acquired many a focus. It included a historical study of political thought, an analytic and comparative study of distinct polities as well as a normative approach to politics. Notwithstanding such a broad scope, if one were to narrow down the object of study of the discipline of political science to a single theme, it would be the State. If political science is largely focussed on

Check Your Progress

3. Define political economy.
4. What is the main idea of Keynesian concept?
5. What is the Marxist perspective of political economy?

NOTES

the study of the State, sociology may be understood as the study of society. The latter discipline was the consequence of the Enlightenment—an intellectual epoch in the history of Europe that awarded primacy to the critical application of human reason as opposed to blindly following the dictates of human and divine authorities.

Political sociology seeks to understand the process of interaction between government and society, decision-making authorities and conflicting social forces and interests. It is the study of interactions and linkages between politics and society; between the political system and its social, economic and cultural environment. It is concerned with problems regarding the management of conflict, the articulation of interest and issues, and political integration and organization. The focal point in all these concerns is the independence of the interplay of sociocultural, economic and political elements.

The perspective of political sociology is distinguished from that of intuitionism and behaviouralism. The institutionalists have been concerned primarily with institutional types of political organization, and their study has been characterized by legality and formality. The behaviouralists have focussed on the individual actor in the political arena; and their central concern has been the psychological trait, namely, motives, attitudes, perception and the role of individuals. The task of political sociologists is to study the political process as a continuum of interactions between society and its decision-makers, and between the decision-making institutions and social forces.

Political sociology provides a new vista in political analysis. Yet it is closely linked with the issues which have been raised in political philosophy. Political philosophy, as we know, has a rich and long tradition of political thought that began with the ancient Indian and Greek philosophers, and that has amply followed since Machiavelli, who made a bold departure from Greek idealism and medieval scholasticism. It was Karl Marx, however, who brought into sharp focus issues concerning the nature of political power and its relationship with social or economic the foundation for the sociology of politics. Marx was, however, neither the first nor the only thinker to conceive of government as an organ of the dominant economic class. The Arabian scholar Ibn Khaldun and several European predecessors of Marx had argued that ideology and power were superstructures of economy.

The early origins of sociology are often traced to Auguste Comte's six-volume work *Cours de Philosophie Positive* (1830–42). This work offered an encyclopaedic treatment of sciences. It expounded positivism, and initiated the use of the term sociology to signify a certain method of studying human societies. Comte proposed a historical law of social development, and according to this scheme, human societies pass from an initial stage of interpreting phenomena theologically to an intermediate stage of metaphysical interpretation before arriving at the final stage of positivist interpretation. This idea of a historical development of human societies obeying laws of nature was adopted by Karl Marx.

The work of Marx, which emphasized the role of capitalist mode of production, and Marxism in general were important stimuli for the development of sociology. The early Marxist contribution to sociology included the works of Karl Kautsky on the French Revolution; Mehring's analysis of art, literature and intellectual history; and Grunberg's early studies on agrarian history and labour movements. It is important to note that Marxist studies of society also developed independent of universities as it was intimately related to political movements and party organizations.

In the decades following the death of Marx, sociology was gaining ground as an academic discipline, and the critics of Marxism had an important role to play in its

development. The most notable critics were Max Weber and Emile Durkheim. Weber's work on capitalism, the State, and methodological writings were largely directed against historical materialism. In the later works of Durkheim, an attempt was made to distinguish the social functions of religion from the explanation provided by historical materialism.

Given the inevitability of political role in society, a body of thinkers from Aristotle to Tocqueville has rightly emphasized the point that instead of deploring the evils of human nature or social circumstances, it is more prudent and worthwhile to accept the 'given' and improve it for the good of man and society. It is wiser to face it and to manage it so as to achieve reconciliation and accommodation. Conflict, though apparently an evil, is a condition of freedom, as it prevents the concentration of power. This kind of political realism recognizes the necessity and utility of the political management of conflict through compromise and adjustment among various social forces and interests. Political sociology aims at understanding the sources and the social bases of conflict, as well as the process of management of conflict.

The broad aim of political sociology is to study and examine the interactions between social and political structures. The determination of the boundaries of what is social and political, however, raises some questions. The relevant question in delineating the scope of political sociology is that of the kinds of groups which form part of the study of the discipline of political sociology. Some scholars believe that politics depends on some settled order created by the State. Hence, the State is political, and is the subject matter of political sociology, and not the groups.

There is another school according to which politics is present in almost all social relations. Individuals and small groups try to enforce their preferences on their parent organizations, family, club, or college, and thus indulge in the exercise of 'power'. Sheldon, S. Wolin takes quite a reasonable view of the word 'political', which according to him, means the following three things:

- A form of activity that centres around the quest for competitive advantage between groups, individuals, or societies.
- A form of activity conditioned by the fact that it occurs within a situation of change and relative scarcity.
- A form of activity in which the pursuit of advantage produces consequences of such a magnitude that they affect, in a significant way, the whole society or a substantial portion of it.

Two groups of scholars have discussed the scope of political sociology in two different ways. According to Greer and Orleans, political sociology is concerned with the structure of the State; the nature and condition of legitimacy; and nature of the monopoly of force and its use by the State; and the nature of the sub-units and their relation with the State. They treat political sociology in terms of consensus and legitimacy, participation and representation, and the relationship between economic development and political change. By implication, whatever is related to the State is alone held as the subject matter of political sociology. Andreu Effrat takes a broader view of the picture and suggests that political sociology is concerned with the causes, patterns and consequences of the distribution and process of power and authority 'in all social systems'. Among social systems, he includes small groups and families, educational and religious groups, as well as governmental and political institutions.

Lipset and Benedix suggest a more representative catalogue of topics when they describe the main areas of interest to political sociologists, as voting behaviour,

NOTES

NOTES

concentration of economic power and political decision-making; ideologies of political movement and interest groups; political parties, voluntary associations, the problems of oligarchy and psychological correlates of political behaviour; and the problem of bureaucracy. To Dowse and Hughes, one area of substantive concern for the political sociologist is the problem of social order and political obedience.

Richard G Braugart has pointed out that political sociologists are concerned with the dynamic association among and between: (a) the social origin of politics, (b) the structure of political process, and (c) the effects of politics on the surrounding society and culture. Political sociology should include four areas that are as follows:

- Political structures (social class/caste, elite, interest groups, bureaucracy, political parties and factions).
- Political life (electoral process, political communication, opinion formation, etc.).
- Political leadership (bases, types and operation of community power structure).
- Political development (concept and indices of its measurement, its social bases and prerequisites and its relationship to social change and modernization).

To illustrate, it can be pointed out that on one hand, sociologists focus their attention on the sub-areas of the social system, and political scientists concentrate on the study of law, local, state and national governments, comparative government, political systems, public administration and international relations. On the other hand, political sociologists ought to be concerned with topics of social stratification and political power: socio-economic systems and political regimes, interest groups, political parties, bureaucracy, political socialization, electoral behaviour, social movements and political mobilization. A significant concern of political sociology is the analysis of socio-political factors in economic development.

There are four main areas of research that are important in present-day political sociology. They are as follows:

- The socio-political formation of the modern state.
- How social inequality between groups (class, race, gender, etc.) influences politics.
- How public personalities, social movements and trends outside of the formal institutions of political power affect politics.
- Power relationships within and between social groups (e.g., families, workplaces, bureaucracy, media, etc.). Contemporary theorists include Robert A. Dahl, Seymour Martin Lipset, Theda Skocpol, Luc Boltanski and Nicos Poulantzas.

This introductory purview of the disciplines of political science and sociology should allow us to now characterize the field of political sociology. The latter may be understood as the study of the varied and multiple relationships between the State and society. In this sense, political sociology evolved into an interdisciplinary field lying between the academic disciplines of political science and sociology.

3.4.1 Some Early Approaches

Modern political sociology has existed for more than a century. According to Ronald Chilcote, the early political sociologists were interested in studying political and social life by incorporating data based on empirical research and an examination of informal

institutions and processes. Some of them went beyond the Marxist conception, wherein employers and the propertied class wield political power. Gaetano Mosca in his *Elementi di Scienza Politica* (1896) distinguished between elites and masses. Mosca's elites comprised of civil servants, managers and intellectuals. These elites formed the political class in parliamentary democracies. However, this class underwent transformation through recruitment of members from the lower strata and new social groups leading to a phenomenon known as the circulation of elites. Vilfredo Pareto sought to differentiate between governing and non-governing elites in his work *Cours d'Economie Politique* (1896-1897).

Max Weber in his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1921) examined the entrepreneurial drives of individuals in capitalist economies. In his other works, he also analysed the impact of science, technology and the bureaucracy in the evolution of Western civilization. The works of these early political sociologists influenced the studies of American political scientists of the 20th century.

The historical context

In the previous section, we took a cursory look at the evolution of political sociology during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Now let us take a look at the historical contexts from which political sociology experienced an evolution as important field of interdisciplinary scholarship. Peter Wagner has sketched a history of political sociology within the larger process of modernity. This sketch is relevant in so far as it allows us to locate the work of political sociologists within intellectual and political contexts. Wagner's scheme comprises three phases:

- Classical sociology and the first crisis of modernity
- Organized modernity and the consolidation of sociology
- The second crisis of modernity and the renewed debate on the possibility of sociology

Let us look at the first phase, which outlines the political context of those writings that is now known as 'classical sociology'. In the century after the American and French revolutions, intellectual debates were determined by theories based on the philosophy of liberalism. Nonetheless, towards the end of the 19th century, scholars began to realize the inadequacies of liberal theories. These inadequacies contributed to the first crisis of modernity. What were these inadequacies?

Although in theory, liberalism sought to establish principles liberty, equality and democracy, the reality was different in practice. Women, workers and non-European peoples were not actually 'free and equal citizens'. In fact, many intellectuals of the first half of the 19th century did not even advocate a totally inclusive liberal society. The ideas of liberalism were restricted largely to male property owners, who were believed to be reasonable and free. Thus, market relations were restricted to economic ties between these individuals.

As this century was drawing to a close, there occurred a gradual erosion of the elements that constituted this society. Migration, growth of industrial cities, struggles for suffrage and the increased strength of the workers' movements altered the social structure, and consequently, the traditional social identities as well. The ideology of socialism, trade unions and labour parties strengthened the new collective identity of the working class. The works of Durkheim, Weber and Pareto were produced within this context of changing social identities and politics.

NOTES

NOTES

Wagner's sketch highlights certain currents that created discontinuities within the sociological tradition in Europe and the United States following the disillusionment of intellectuals with liberalism. The following points are to be considered:

- The rise of the 'philosophy of the deed', which emphasized a strong man and his willpower to rejuvenate the nation.
- The growth of empirical social research towards acquiring strategically useful knowledge about a certain populace.
- The political philosophy of John Dewey, which was linked to the social theory of George Herbert Mead, and the empirical sociology of the Chicago School also reinforced the belief in the human ability to create and recreate one's own life, both individually and collectively.
- American sociology witnessed a shift of hegemony from the Chicago School to the Columbia School, and the focus shifted to social policy research in the 1960s.

According to Peter Wagner, 'the social sciences in general, and sociology in particular, were consolidated and modernized in the decades following World War II.' The goal of the modernizing paradigm was to explain how traditional societies could be modernized, while maintaining societal coherence the same time. This process was called development and its goal is the establishment of a modern society. The works of Talcott Parsons, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba are prime examples of the modernization paradigm.

Parsons appropriated elements from classical European intellectual heritage to create a theory of modern societies, which were represented as systems. Each social system, according to this theory, was comprised of subsystems. To maintain stability of the system, Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba argued that restricted political participation and exclusion of social actors voluntarily or otherwise was a legitimate objective for the sake of societal coherence. They recognized that liberal ideals such as liberty and autonomy were not always conducive for stability and coherence of societies.

The work of these systems theorists occurred during a phase described by Peter Wagner as 'organized modernity'. This phase was marked by an unprecedented growth of production and consumption accompanied by a relative stability of authoritative practices. This meant that this period saw limited restrictions to political liberties when compared to other epochs. The presence of economic growth, political stability and nominal liberty was treated as the final goal of all social change. Thus, modernization was defined as the process leading to the achievement of this goal. These circumstances would later provide the ground for an increased faith in those ideologies that proclaimed the 'end of history'.

As organized modernity placed restrictions on human freedom created by the boundaries of convention, certain intellectuals directed their efforts at creating ambivalence in the social structure instead of seeking a well-ordered society. Order, for them, meant placing limitations on human endeavour. So, they worked towards de-conventionalization. This questioning of the goal of a regimented society created a crisis, which Wagner denominates as the second crisis of modernity. This second crisis provided the context for the emergence of the post-modern sociological discourse.

3.4.2 Contemporary Views

Political sociology came into its own especially since the decade of the 1960s with the publication of a few notable books that have turned out to be classics in the field. Lipset's *Political Man* (1960) that highlighted the social bases of politics; Domhoff's *Who Rules America?* (1967) that renewed interest in the power of capitalism; and, Petras and Zeitlin's *Latin America: Reform or Revolution* (1967), which focussed on the role of labour movements are some such examples. *Bringing the State Back* in 1985 brought the state and the institutional apparatus back into the research agenda of political sociology. Briefly put, a new kind of political sociology was coming into being in the last quarter of the 20th century.

This 'new political sociology' was a result of empirical and theoretical changes. The most important empirical change has been the decentring of the State as the principal object of politics. This was a consequence of the globalization, the increased power of transnational actors, and the consequent reduction in the autonomy of the State. Another empirical change is the rise of social movements within States and across the globe. Certain social movements like environmental, feminist, gay and transgender movements have radically altered identities, and hence the politics of individuals, groups and States. The theoretical conclusions derived from the work of a variety of scholars across disciplines, but particularly those in the fields of culture studies, epistemology, hermeneutics and philosophy, since the 1960s have altered the traditional theoretical landscape.

3.5 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- Some writers believe that national life of the people, character and their political institutions are greatly influenced by the physical and geographical conditions. The first modern writer who dwelt upon the relationship between geography and political science was Bodin.
- Rousseau also tried to create a relationship between various forms of government and the climatic conditions of a particular nation. According to Rousseau, cold climates are conducive to barbarism, warm climates to despotism and moderate climates to a good polity.
- In his *History of Civilisation*, Buckle maintained that 'the actions of men, and therefore of societies, are determined by reciprocal interaction between the mind and the external phenomena.'
- The geographical conditions of a particular nation always influence the national policies in considerable measure. The character of the political institutions are also influenced by geographical location.
- Political economy refers to a specific approach to study social and political events where economics and politics are not seen as separate domains.
- Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Marx were some of the exponents of the political economy approach. In contemporary scholarship, the term 'political economy' indicates the amalgamation of two different disciplines- political science and economics.

NOTES

Check Your Progress

6. What is the purpose of political sociology?
7. Who wrote *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*?

NOTES

- Aristotle considered economic questions in his book *Politics*. Among classical political economists, Adam Smith considered political economy as 'a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator'.
- Karl Marx often referred to the 'critique of political economy' in his writings; however, it was Friedrich Engels, the co-author of *The Communist Manifesto* along with Karl Marx, who defined the term 'political economy'.
- The liberal perspective emerged as a critique of the comprehensive political control and regulation of economic affairs which had dominated European nation building in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, i.e., the Mercantilist school of thought.
- Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Paul Samuelson, J.M Keynes, etc. are often regarded as leading exponents of the liberal perspective of the political economy approach.
- 'Laissez faire' policy where free individuals were best equipped to make social choices. David Ricardo argued that free trade benefited all the participants as it led to specialization which increased efficiency and thus productivity.
- Keynesian concept is based on the idea that the market may not work according to the belief of efficiency and mutual gain and lead to instances of market failure.
- The Marxist perspective of political economy believes that economics forms the base of society and the political system.
- Political sociology lies at the intersection of the disciplines of political science and sociology. Giovanni Sartori, an acclaimed Italian political scientist, had suggested that there was an ambiguity in the term 'political sociology' because it could be construed as a synonym for 'sociology of politics'.
- Richard G. Braugart has pointed out that political sociologists are concerned with the dynamic association among and between: (a) the social origin of politics, (b) the structure of political process, and (c) the effects of politics on the surrounding society and culture.

3.6 KEY TERMS

- **Laissez-faire:** It refers to the abstention by governments from interfering in the workings of the free market.
- **Epoch:** It means the beginning of a period in the history of someone or something.
- **Neo-liberalism:** *Neoliberalism* (neo-liberalism) refers primarily to the 20th century resurgence of 19th century ideas associated with laissez-faire economic liberalism.

3.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The first modern writer who dwelt upon the relationship between geography and political science was Bodin.
2. *History of Civilisation* is written by Henry Thomas Buckle.
3. Political economy refers to a specific approach to study social and political events where economics and politics are not seen as separate domains.

NOTES

4. Keynesian concept is based on the idea that the market may not work according to the belief of efficiency and mutual gain and lead to instances of market failure.
5. The Marxist perspective of political economy believes that economics forms the base of society and the political system.
6. Political sociology seeks to understand the process of interaction between government and society, decision-making authorities and conflicting social forces and interests.
7. Max Weber wrote *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

3.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on the relationship between political theory and geography of a nation.
2. What are the contributions of Karl Marx towards the development of political theory?
3. What do you understand by classical laissez faire doctrine of political theory?
4. Explain the concept of political sociology.

Long-Answer Questions

1. 'In contemporary scholarship, the term 'political economy' indicates the amalgamation of two different disciplines- political science and economics.' Comment on the statement with reference to the text.
2. Write a detailed note on the liberal perspective of political economy.
3. What are the common features of Marxist perspective?
4. What are the different meanings of the term 'political', according to Sheldon, S. Wolin?

3.9 FURTHER READING

- Baylis John and Steve Smith (eds). 2005. *The Globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bottomore Tom (ed.). 2000. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, New Delhi: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lenin V.I. 1973. *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

UNIT 4 THEORIES OF THE ORIGIN OF THE STATE

NOTES

Structure

- 4.0 Introduction
- 4.1 Unit Objectives
- 4.2 Historical Developments
 - 4.2.1 Origin of the City-State
- 4.3 Evolutionary Theories
 - 4.3.1 Military Occupation
 - 4.3.2 Military Dictatorship
 - 4.3.3 Modern Multicultural States
 - 4.3.4 Pluralist States and Polyarchies
 - 4.3.5 Polyarchies
- 4.4 Social Contract Theory
- 4.5 Summary
- 4.6 Key Terms
- 4.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 4.8 Questions and Exercises
- 4.9 Further Reading

4.0 INTRODUCTION

The importance of the state in political science is well-known. It is often said that political science begins and ends with the state. This unit deals with the theories on the origin of the state. The unit will first begin by examining the origins of the city-state in ancient times. It will go on to discuss the evolutionary theories of the state. The final section will examine the most critical theories on the origin of the state, that is, the social contract theory of John Locke, Thomas Hobbes and Jean Jacques Rousseau.

4.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand various theories for the origin of state
- Discuss historical developments that led to development of the state
- Describe the modern multi-cultural state

4.2 HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS

The term 'state' originates from the Latin words *stare* which means 'to stand' and *status* that means 'a standing or condition'. The term 'state' was used for the first time by the famous Italian philosopher Machiavelli in his book *El Principe*. He used the term to mean a community with a definite territory under a common ruler.

NOTES

The meaning of the term 'state', however, has transformed through the years to mean government, nation or society. Following are some of the definitions given by famous political philosophers:

- **Aristotle:** 'A union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self-sufficing life, by which we mean a happy and honourable life.'
- **MacIver:** 'The state is an association, which acting through law was promulgated by government endowed to this end with coercive power, maintains within a community, territorially demarcated the universal external conditions of social order.'
- **Woodrow Wilson:** 'A people organized for law within a definite territory.'
- **Schulz:** 'The state is the union of a living people in a collective personality under a supreme power and a definite constitution for the realization of all common purposes, especially the establishment of the legal order.'
- **Bluntschli:** 'The state is a combination or association of persons in the form of a government and governed, on a definite territory, united together into a moral, organized masculine personality.'
- **Oppenheimer:** 'State exists when a people is settled in a country under its own sovereign government.'

From these definitions it becomes clear that when a group of people are permanently settled on a definite geographical area and form a government of their own, free from any kind of external control, then that group of people constitute a state. Thus, in the formation of states, people, territory, government and sovereignty play vital roles. These four elements are discussed in detail.

1. Population

In the formation of state, population is considered to be the most vital element. According to the various definitions just mentioned, it becomes clear that there will be no state in an unpopulated region. For instance, Antarctica is a territory, but without population; hence, it cannot be considered as a state. The residents of a state may be either its citizens or aliens. While fixing the number of people needed to constitute a state, various thinkers have given different opinions.

According to the ancient Greek philosopher Plato, an ideal state should comprise 5040 free citizens. Aristotle, a student of Plato and another remarkable Greek philosopher has maintained that the state should neither be too large nor too small. It should be large enough to manage itself and small enough to sustain itself. If the population is too large it will be unwieldy and uncontrollable, and if the population is too small, it will neither be self-sufficient nor large enough to be well governed. According to the 18th century French philosopher, Rousseau, there should be a proportion between the population of the state and the area of its territory. He fixed the population at 10,000 and the size of the territory to be adequate enough to nourish the inhabitants.

2. Territory

The second important element in formation of a state is territory. The importance of territory would become clearer with the example of the Jews. The Jews did not form a state until they settled in Palestine. Thus, territory is considered to be an integral part of a state. According to Bluntschli, 'As the state has its personal basis in the people, so it

has its material basis in land. The people do not become a state until they have acquired a territory'. It is not essential or important that the state's territory should either be compact or contiguous. It may consist of far-flung areas.

Philosophers have not stressed on any definite size for a territory. The territorial expansion of a state should be commensurate to its population. Some political philosophers believed that territory was not an important element for state formation. According to them, the population of a state was more important. According to 20th century political philosopher, Hall, 'Abstractly, there is no reason why even a wandering tribe or society should not feel itself bound as stringently as a settled community by definite rules of conduct towards other communities.' According to Seeley, 'What holds a state together is not territory, but the principal government'.

3. Government

The third important element of a state is its government. For the formation of sovereign will, every state requires a government. It is the duty of governments to formulate laws and enforce order to maintain peace and harmony in the state. In the absence of a government, there will be lawlessness and chaos in a state. Government plays a crucial role in state administration, regulating all its policies and procedures and performing its common functions.

4. Sovereignty

The supreme and independent authority over a definite territory with a defined population controlled by a valid government is termed as sovereignty. In the absence of sovereignty, a politically organized community cannot be considered a state. It is sovereignty which differentiates a state from other organizations and communities.

In a state, sovereignty has two aspects—internal and external. The internal aspect of sovereignty pronounces that the state has supreme power over all its subjects. The famous 16th century jurist and philosopher, Jean Bodin maintains 'Sovereignty means the supreme power over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law'. The external aspect of sovereignty ascertains that the state is independent and free from 'the control of any outside authority'. A good example of the importance of sovereignty is seen in India. Prior to 15 August 1947, even though the three other elements were present, India was not considered a state, because it had no sovereignty.

Besides these four elements, the famous thinker Burgess considers exclusiveness, comprehensiveness and permanence as important elements of a state. According to some other political philosophers, international recognition should be considered as one of the elements of the state. Most philosophers and thinkers were restrained in attaching undue importance to international recognition as they felt that only a newly formed state needs to be recognized internationally.

History is replete with evidence that the early nomads generally divided themselves into smaller groups due to excessive economic disparity and decline. The smaller groups of people established their own independent city-state. As their size grew in terms of population and economic activities, they again split and created similar types of city-states in their neighbouring territory. Thus, we find that the city-state is different from tribal state. They are different in terms of size, patriotism, exclusiveness and obsession for independence. Thus city-states are the smaller, independent units formed out of a large tribal settlement. In a political system, a city-state is considered to be an independent

NOTES

NOTES

city which has its own sovereignty within a definite territory. As far as the origin of city-states is concerned, there is no single, common theory. Some philosophers maintain that the term city-state has its origin in 19th century England. Others maintain that the term was first given to a political form of grouping practiced in the ancient Greek civilization.

4.2.1 Origin of the City-State

The political fluidity and ethnic complexity of the eastern Mediterranean region had been considerably increased by the dramatic downfall of the Minoan Empire in the middle of the second millennium BC. Migrants from the north were drawn into the political and economic vacuum created by the demise of thalassocracy that for long had controlled the seas between the coasts of Egypt and Greece.

During this period, the eastern Mediterranean region was dominated by feuding tribal states that wanted to dominate the land between the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf. It was here that the first imperial state was established. Among the migrants who moved to eastern Mediterranean were the Philistines. They eventually settled along the strip stretching between modern Tel Aviv and Gaza. They were the first to have founded the recognizable city-state as their basic form of political organization. The success of the first true city-state led to the development of several other city-states across other ancient civilizations.

Greek City-States

The Greek city-states may be taken as models of ideal city-states in the ancient world. A Greek city-state, known as a polis, was an administrative centre of a limited territory. The political experiments carried on in these states became the stepping stones for future civilizations. Political philosophers have laid major emphasis on the study of the political systems of these city-states. The main features of these Greek city-states were as follows:

- These were independent and self-governed. In fact, the emergence of city-states was a big experiment in self-governance.
- These led to the development of self-sufficiency and regionalism.
- These were typical examples of direct democracy.
- The emergence of city-states led to the direct participation of citizens in the functions of civil and military life.

Thus, original city-states were small in size. When the Greeks settled down in Europe, they were divided into clans and tribes. These clans and tribes settled on small pieces of land near water bodies that helped them in becoming a seafaring nation. With the passage of time, they organized themselves politically and consolidated into independent states. The city-states had independent jurisdiction over their small population. People were proud of their culture, civilization and independence and did not take kindly to outsiders. The citizens of the city-states were highly attached to their state and were conscious of their duties and responsibilities towards it. They would go to any extent for defending their independence. In a city-state, every citizen was a warrior, judge and member of the ruling assembly.

Each city-state had its own walled town, own Gods, own traditions, customs and their own government. Athens, Sparta, Corinth, Argos and Thebes were a few famous ancient city-states in Greece. Though the city-states experimented with various forms

NOTES

of government, monarchy was the order of the day. They started with monarchy which gave way to aristocracy, which, in turn, gave way to polity. The city-states finally adopted democracy as the form of government. However, since every member of society was a part of the active political system, democracy turned into mobocracy, a government controlled by a mob. When democracy failed to survive the test of time, the city-states went back to monarchy again. In spite of a high degree of political excellence achieved by the Greek city-states, these also suffered many drawbacks.

The citizens did not think about expanding their territory because they had a deep conviction that small states were happy and efficient. The size of these city-states was deliberately small with a small number of people so that people could directly participate in government functions. Members of the city-states were concerned for its development and took active interest in formulating developmental policies and rules. In the Greek city-states, slavery was at its peak. The Greeks considered slaves to be an important part of their civilized society.

The city-states lacked certain qualities like patience, discipline, tolerance and humanity. They were arrogant, ego-centric and pleasure-loving. These attitudes led to constant in-fighting between sections of society. The ancient Greek philosophers and thinkers were concerned with this lack of humane virtues in the citizens. They warned the citizens that such indiscipline would soon lead to their downfall once a united force attacked them. With the rise of the Romans and Macedonians in the Ancient Age, the city-state system disintegrated.

Imperial State

An imperial state existed as part of an empire. An empire was deemed to be a group of countries under the direct or indirect control of a foreign power or government, which shaped their political, economic and cultural development. Here, the entire population did not have right of voting but only some special officials were chosen for adult suffrage in the state. Rulers held various important privileges and rights. They were allowed to formulate laws for their states without imperial interventions. They were also permitted to exercise certain regal powers, including the power to gather taxes, a monopoly over gold and silver mines and the power to issue money. In addition, they were permitted to formulate treaties and enter into alliances with other imperial states and with foreign nations. Thus, we can say that an imperial state was an autonomous state with the supreme authority vested in a foreign power. Their imperialistic power exerted control and influence over foreign entities either through military force or through political policies and economic pressure. Imperialists believed that their political, cultural and economic superiority justified control over other states, and such control was for the greater good of mankind. An imperial state was either ecclesiastic or secular. An ecclesiastic state is led by religious leaders like the Archbishop, Bishop, etc., while the secular state was led by imperial princes like the Grand Duke, Duke, Counts, etc.

Theocratic State

Theocracy may be described as the 'rule of the deity'. The word 'theocracy' has been derived from the Greek word *theokratia* composed of two smaller words, *theos* which may be defined as 'god' and *kratein* which means 'to rule'. Thus, theocracy is a form of government in which all political authorities and responsibilities are vested in the hands of religious leaders or a theologically trained elite group. In other words, a theocratic state is one where priestly order directly administers the state according to what it

NOTES

believes are divine law. In such a state, the religious and political orders are identical. The main objective of a theocracy is to uphold divine law through its policies and practices. It recognizes no legal separation of Church and state. Flavius Josephus, a Jewish historian, was the first to coin the term 'theocracy' while explaining the organization and political system of the Jewish commonwealth between the period c. 37-100 CE. Josephus discussed theocracy vis-à-vis other forms of government like monarchy, oligarchy and republic. According to him, 'Our legislature had no regard to any of these forms, but he ordained our government to be what, by a strained expression, may be termed a theocracy, by ascribing the authority and power to God, and by persuading all the people to have a regard to him, as the author of all good things.'

According to the Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles, 'Theocracy is a system of government by sacerdotal order, claiming divine commission. It is a state in which priests exercise political power, or more precisely, a state ruled by ministers.' The concept of the theocratic state is found to be present since historical times. It existed in ancient Egypt where the king represented a deity. Indian American civilizations, such as the Toltec, Natchez, Maya and Aztecs were prominent examples of Theocratic States. Examples of theocratic states were also found in Muslim empires and in Europe.

There are two forms of theocratic states; in the first, power was shared by secular government leaders devoted to the principles of the dominant religion. English politics, for example, was determined by the Anglican Church. When Puritans migrated to New England, a theocratic government was founded during the 1630s. In fact, for the Puritans, theocracy was considered the best form of government in a Christian commonwealth because only such states could acknowledge Christ as the sole ruler of the people. They believe that their aim is not to vest their ministers with political powers; but that they should govern according to God's word and will.

The other form of theocratic state is one where power is shared by a secular ruler, such as king, or by a religious leader, such as Pope or an Ayatollah. In modern times, the Islamic Republic of Iran, as Ayatollah Khomeini aspired to run it, or the State of Afghanistan run by the Taliban (1996-2001) provide the best example of a theocratic state. The imams and other political leaders are the central legal authority in such states with all powers vested in them. Such fundamentalist regimes help in developing society as per the Islamic religion or sharia.

If the Indian State was to be run by an elite class of Brahmins in accordance with the Dharmashastras, then India would also be a theocratic state. Such a theocratic state must be distinguished from a state that establishes the practice of a particular religion. In such a state, the religion is granted formal or legal recognition. In fact, there is an official alliance between the state and the religion. However, a priestly order does not directly govern such states. In case it does, religious institutions are distinct from political institutions. The two institutions perform different functions. For instance, the Church or the religious order is meant to help people follow the path of humanity.

The political order exists in order to maintain peace and order, primarily in temporal matters. This disconnection between religious and political institutions is also referred to in some contexts as Church-state separation. This goes hand in hand with an overall ideological connection. For example, in the last instance, both sets of institutions share common goals. The state is subordinate to religious ends even though it has its own function, internal norms and power structure. Because of this first order connection of

NOTES

the ultimate goals, there is an automatic third-order connection at the level of law and policy. In such states, religion is a natural object of law and policy. For instance, the revenue collected by the state may be available for religious purposes. The state may enact laws compelling individuals to congregate for religious purposes. The disintegration of the theocratic state began with the downfall of the Roman Empire from the 17th century onwards.

4.3 EVOLUTIONARY THEORIES

Let us understand the evolutionary theory of the state.

Evolutionary Theory

The evolutionary theory of the state is now considered the most widely accepted theory on the origin of the state. According to it, the state is neither the work of god, nor the mere extension of the family. Rather, it is the product of growth, a slow and steady evolution extending over a long period of time and ultimately shaping itself into the complex structure of a modern state. According to the evolutionary theory, there are basically five factors responsible for the evolution of the state. These are discussed below.

- (i) **Kinship:** This is the most vital factor on the origin of the state and was based upon blood relationship. Family constituted the first connection in the process of the evolution of the state with the expansion of the family arose new families and the multiplication of families led to the formation of clans and tribes.
- (ii) **Religion:** The second connection that helped unify society was religion. The worship of a common ancestor and common goods created a sense of social solidarity.
- (iii) **Force:** Force also played a vital part in the origin of a state. Force helped create and expand empires.
- (iv) **Property and Defence:** These also played a critical role in state formation, especially amongst nomads and tribals. According to Laski, the need to protect property ultimately compelled the ancient people to establish the state.
- (v) **Political consciousness:** This arose from the fundamental need for the protection and order. When people settled at a particular place, they felt a desire to secure it from encroachers.

Thus, it can be said that no one factor was responsible for the formation of the state, rather it was a multitude of factors that were responsible.

In recent times, the word 'state' has often been combined with the word nation to form the entity called nation-state or state-nation. Although these two words, nation and state, are often used interchangeably in everyday conversation, they are two quite different concepts.

Differences between Nations and States

A nation is a group of people who share a common symbolic identity, history, religion, and often, culture.

Check Your Progress

1. Who used the term 'state' for the first time?
2. What are the four factors that play a vital role in the formation of a state?

NOTES

treated the citizens cruelly and disrespectfully; as if they were in an occupied enemy country. Foreign rule is not an exact term also, since some states are multinational and the discontented nations may claim that rule of the central government is foreign rule, even if legally it is not. Military domination may take various forms. These are as follows:

- Annexation of territory from a defeated state.
- Stationing of troops on a part, or on most of that state's territory, whether as conquerors or as allies.
- Control over the foreign state's civil government apparatus through different chains of command.
- Stationing of strong military forces just beyond the foreign states' frontiers.

Military occupation in effect

The studies of military occupation of Europe shows that the conquering power had retained some of its forces within the defeated country for some time. The places occupied were usually selected for their strategic importance, and were often in border areas. The aim of the military occupation was to make sure that the defeated observed the terms of the peace treaty and did not become a danger.

When Napoleon relinquished his throne in 1814, the victorious allies whose armies had entered France accepted the former heir to the throne, Louis XVIII, and did not at first propose to keep their troops on French soil. After Napoleon returned and the battle of Waterloo had to be fought, though, it was considered necessary to take precautions against a revival of the threat from France, and occupation forces were stationed. They were not there for long; the allies soon satisfied themselves that Louis XVIII's government was peaceful and reliable, and the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818 decided to remove the occupation forces.

In 1871, the victorious Prussians kept troops in France until the French government paid the indemnity imposed by the peace settlement. This was expected to take five years, but the French paid it in less than three, and the occupation forces were removed in 1873. After the Great War, French, British and Belgian troops occupied positions on the west bank of the Rhine. The French encouraged self-rule among the Germans living on the west bank of the Rhine initially to create a separate state as a part of the French Empire. When this proved unsuccessful, they were contended with occupation, in order to ensure the security of their eastern frontier and to put pressure on the German government to pay large sums demanded as war damages. European politics in the 1920s were full of disputes and crises caused by damages; there were compromises in 1924 and 1929, and the troops were removed from the Rhineland in 1930.

In all three of these cases, security of the victorious states was the plan, and only a portion of the defeated country was occupied. At the end of World War II, the situation was quite different. One difference was that the defeated countries were occupied entirely. In Italy, Romania and Hungary, the war was fought throughout the country, from one extremity to the other, while in Germany resistance in the west, east, and south went on until all but a small corner was conquered.

Therefore, the victors at the end of the war were in control of all the enemies' territories, and in most of them such dreadful destruction had occurred, such vast numbers of people had been uprooted and transported far from their homes or work places, that only the resources of the victorious armies could get things moving. The second difference

NOTES

was that the victorious people, both governments and the public, in Soviet Russia as well as in the Western victor states, were resolved to destroy the whole political and social system variously known as 'Hitlerism' and 'Fascism', and to replace it with what they considered to be 'democracy'.

Military occupation in Europe from 1944 to 1945, then, were not just to make certain the security of the victor states, but to administer and assist reconstruction of occupied states. Missionary zeal, during this time, was a significant force. Broadly speaking, the same also applies to the American occupation of Japan. Missionary zeal and its acceptability to the conquered peoples differed widely. Germans and Italians were tired of all that Hitler and Mussolini had stood for, though these two leaders still had a few fanatical followers left. In both countries there was an old parliamentary tradition, and there were significant democratic socialist parties. Hence, the ingredients necessary for a Western type of democracy were present, and the popular mood favoured it. There were noticeable differences in political attitudes among the three Western governments, and among their representatives in the three western zones of Germany: the British had more sympathy for the German Social Democrats, the Americans for the conservative Christian Democrats, while the French initially supported the idea of Rhineland separatism.

As an alternative, a structure of representative government was built up in these three zones. The Federal Republic was established in 1949, also in the central government. The Germans have managed their political system since then.

One really cannot maintain that the Western Allies forced a political system on the Germans, though they certainly played a major part in building the structure. The period of military occupation of Germany legally ended when the Federal Republic became a member of the Atlantic Alliance in 1955, but Western troops remained in Germany as allies and not as occupiers.

In Italy the process was more rapid, since only British and American forces were present and there was no territorial division into separate zones. After the peace treaty with Italy was signed in 1946, Italy became fully sovereign as a parliamentary republic. In Austria there were four zones as in Germany, but a single Austrian central government was recognized by all four powers. Military occupation lasted until 1955, but then Khrushchev, who was at that time keen to improve his relations with the United States, and also with Austria's southern neighbour, Yugoslavia, agreed to sign a joint peace treaty in return for Austrian acceptance of neutrality on the Swiss model, and all foreign troops were evacuated. In these three countries, then, the reconstruction tasks of the Western occupation armies were, to a certain extent, successfully completed, due in large part to the incredible will to rebuild the occupied state.

4.3.2 Military Dictatorship

The type of government in which the political power dwells with the military is called a military dictatorship. Similar to several dictatorships, a military dictatorship might be authorized or unauthorized. Mixed structures, too, subsist, in which military exercises an intense authority without being completely central. The archetypal military dictatorship of Latin America was governed by a *junta*, a Spanish word which stands for 'conference' or 'board', or a working group which was a compilation of a number of officials, a large number of whom came through military's most superior headship. A number of military dictatorships are totally in the hands of a solitary officer, often called a 'caudillo', usually the senior-most army commander.

NOTES

In both cases, the chairman of the *junta* or the solitary commander takes over the office as head of state. Military governments habitually were ruled by a single governing person in the Middle East and Africa, and these were autocracies as well as military dictatorships. Leaders like Idi Amin, and Muammar al-Gaddafi, worked hard to erect a celebrity cult and went on to become the faces of their nations.

Majority of military dictatorships were created after a rebellion had made ground for the collapse of the preceding rule. An extremely unlikely example was the one set up by Kim Il-Sung's rule in North Korea and Saddam Hussein's rule in Iraq. These two states began as one-party states, but through the route of their continued existence went on to curve into military dictatorships. As the military became powerfully drawn in, the government and their leaders dressed themselves in uniforms. Other military dictatorships may gradually restore vital elements of a civilian government even as the senior military commander still sustains executive political power. Generals Zia-ul-Haq and Musharraf had seized singular referendums to select themselves President of Pakistan for further terms, usually forbidden by the constitution of Pakistan.

Prior to the 20th century, military governments portrayed themselves as the solution to a problem propagated by the current ruler. In the 20th century, this trend changed and they began to represent themselves as unprejudiced, impartial parties which wished to provide short-term guidance during times of disorder. The foundation of a permanent state of emergency is one of the most common features of a military government. Even though there are exclusions, military governments generally have little or no admiration for human rights and use means needed to silence political rivals; anyone seen opposing the army is perceived as an enemy. A military government is hardly ever willing to leave power unless forced to by popular rebellion, whether active or looming.

Latin America, the Middle East and Africa have been common areas for military dictatorships. The fact that the military often has more unity and institutional construction than most of the civilian institutions of society could be a basis for this. Since the 1990s, there is a reduction in incidences of military dictatorships. This could have happened as military governments do not receive international recognition easily. The end of the Cold War and fall of Russia has made it difficult for military leaders to use the pretext of communism for their rebellion. Since the Cold War had come to an end, in the Middle East, governments for instance those of Algeria and Egypt that were formerly evident military dictatorships have now changed into other forms of dictatorship.

A state that recognizes, supports and admires multiple ethnic cultures is known as a multicultural state. 1960s saw a change in definition of human characteristics. Though the Nazis had drawn a divide between the Aryans and the Non-Aryans throughout Europe and propagated hatred and humiliation towards millions of innocent people, their regime was ultimately overthrown by the Allies who restored some sanity in the world. After World War II, the concept of anti-racism started raising its head. Martin Luther King Jr championed the cause and proclaimed that whites and blacks had nothing uncommon except for their skin colour. For him, it was a matter of disgrace that whites thought of African-Americans as 'the lesser breed without the law' and insisted on ruling over them. African-Americans started taking pride in their history and started exclusive political mobilization. Women started noticing their difference from men and concluded that they were more sensitive and sympathetic than men.

The domination that ended with the downfall of the Nazis brought in its wake ideas of personal, cultural, sexual and political freedom. In the United States, this

progressive politics of identity was termed as 'multiculturalism'. In the United Kingdom, the concept of multiculturalism was more restrained. It primarily meant the immigration of non-white people from outside Europe to the continent and the resultant problems that ensued between various groups. People who were trying to settle in a foreign land and looking for their individuality lead to this vortex that brought together people with varied racial and national history.

The first countries to practice multiculturalism were Canada, Australia and the United States. In 1960s and 1970s, people settled in United States were indirectly pressured to conform to the cultural practices of major parts of society. In the next few decades, countries from western European societies like Britain, Sweden and the Netherlands began to import labour in tandem with their post-war economic reconstruction. In the 21st century, about 50 per cent of the entire population of most of the cities in these countries would be descendants of immigrants and would characterize its cultural, political and economic life.

4.3.3 Modern Multicultural States

Some of the major modern multicultural states have been discussed in this section.

United Kingdom

In 1970s and 1980s, the local communities in UK started opening up to embracing immigrants from Asian and African countries. The Labour Government of Tony Blair approved multicultural policies in the 1990s. Studies show that majority of these immigrants had come from the Caribbean and Indian subcontinents in the previous decades. In 2004, the number of people who were accepted as British citizens rose by a record 12 per cent from 2003. In the last decade, about 40 per cent of immigrants came from Asia and 32 per cent from Africa. People from India, Pakistan and Somalia made up majority of the immigrant population.

United States of America

USA has no structured and formulated policy regarding multiculturalism. Ever since the first half of the 19th century, constant immigrations have influenced the economic, social and political aspects of American lives. The amalgam of these immigrants without state interference in the very social fabric has come to show that America is tolerant of varied cultures.

Canada

Canada has long been viewed as a champion in multiculturalism as it had publicly accepted multicultural philosophy as part of its society. Finally, Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau had formally accepted multiculturalism during his tenure from 1968-1979. Multiculturalism is accepted in the Canadian Multiculturalism Act and Section 27 of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms enacted in 1982.

Australia

Australia stands second to Canada in accepting multiculturalism in its legal policies, for example, the formation of the Special Broadcasting Service. The 2006 census illustrates that about 50 per cent of the population were either born overseas or had one parent residing in some other country.

NOTES

NOTES

The Netherlands

Till the 1950s, Frisian, Limburgish and Dutch Low Saxon were the only official languages of the Netherlands. It was largely a monocultural society. Multiculturalism in the Netherlands is a recent phenomenon; the first mosque was built in 1955.

However, in the last decade, increase in the number of Hindus, Jews, Muslims, Roman Catholics, Protestants, etc. have led to the establishment of different schools for different communities. All these schools follow the same curriculum and are guided by the central department of education; only the lessons on their respective religions and culture differ. As of 2008, about 19.6 per cent of the total population was comprised of immigrants. The Constitution provides and safeguards civil and cultural rights of immigrants through a number of its Articles.

India

The basic tenet of Indian society is 'unity in diversity'. The vast country incorporates multiple languages, customs, religions, rituals, dance, music, architecture, etc. India has a rich socio-cultural history that is witness to foreigners being accepted within the social fabric. Throughout her extensive history, foreigners have come and settled here, bringing with them their rich and varied culture that soon became part of the mainstream society. The society consists of Hindu majority (80 per cent), trailed by Muslims (13 per cent). Christians, Sikhs, Buddhists, Jains, Jews and Parsis are all parts of the Indian social fabric. The boundaries of the states of have primarily been drawn based on the linguistic demarcation that exists in society. Majority of the states vary from one another in language, traditions, cuisine, attire, mythical style, architecture, music and celebrations, to name a few.

Indonesia

Indonesia's policy on multiculturalism may be appreciated by their national slogan, *Bhinneka tunggal ika*, which means unity in diversity. Though principally a Muslim State, Indonesia has large Christian and Hindu populations. In 1999, when Abdurrahman Wahid became the President, he immediately banned all racist and unequal laws against immigrants. Taman Mini, a park situated outside Jakarta was set up with an ethnographic import. Every province had a house to represent the regional architecture; distinctive local cloth, weapons and books were sold to promote different region. Multiculturalism was evident in the manners and traditions of every region. These differences are more objective, material distinctions between regions, rather than deep political and emotional aspects of the social order.

4.3.4 Pluralist States and Polyarchies

The main idea behind pluralism is plurality—variety, multiplicity and many-sidedness. Its core suggestion is that power and resources within society are scattered. Pluralism achieved fame, in fact superiority, as an explanatory model of political science in the thirty years subsequent to World War II, a period in which US experience came to lead the discipline. Its dominance went mostly uncontested in the period down to the late 1960s and it continues to be a well-known descriptive model. Currently, like most other such positions, it is found to be giving rise to 'reformed pluralism', 'critical pluralism', 'radical pluralism', 'neo-pluralism' and even 'Marxist pluralism'.

NOTES

Pluralism classically gives very little room to the idea of 'the State'. Pluralists have always been very apprehensive of such concepts. They wanted to concentrate upon visible behaviour—the actions of individual citizens, social groups or governmental officials—and have kept away from terms which they have tended to identify as abstract philosophizing. They have been suspicious of the idea of a unitary and sovereign state and have held up the dispersal of power especially in US institutions—the constitutional separation of powers, federalism, the lack of disciplined national parties, the entrenched rights of individual citizens—as examples for much wider admiration and emulations. Likewise, their attention has been focused not upon states but upon 'governments' or, better still, upon the activities of particular groups and individuals involved in the discharge of public functions.

Certainly, many of them have identified a sort of pluralism within the institutions of the state itself. Different ministries, agencies, even cabinet colleagues are seen to be following differing objectives, bringing assortment and multiplicity to the very core of government and state.

For pluralists, the actual source of democratic decision-making lies not in this disaggregated state, but in a diverse society. The thing that makes countries such as the UK and the USA good liberal democracies, in the pluralist outlook, is not so much their constitutional understandings, but to a certain extent, the nature of the wider society within which these are placed. Such societies are 'open'.

Power is to be found in many diverse places. Dissimilar groups are able to assemble differing sorts of resources, and power is generally non-cumulative. Citizens are open to express them and to look for, to organize and mobilize, to advance their numerous interests. They enjoy a 'civic culture' which is liberal, stable, established and capable of accepting and merging differences of interest without resorting to violent social and political conflict. They also enjoy a common agreement about the 'basic rules of the political game'. This agreement is not an expression of shared substantive viewpoint about what public policy should be. To a certain extent it expresses a readiness 'to agree to disagree', accepting that there should be an assortment of interests within society and that other citizens should have an equal right to organize themselves around their diverse and challenging interests.

Such a pluralist system also necessitates that citizens are willing to accept what is constantly a short-term conciliation between their numerous interests brokered by the public authorities. Under these conditions, the chief mechanism of policy-shaping is not the individual citizen casting a vote in some recurrent elections. The restraint of electoral party system search for the broadest possible voter appeal and are quite unsuccessful in communicating the wide range of very particular interests that individual citizens wish to see practiced. For pluralists, the right mechanism shaping policy results is the action of interest groups.

Upon such an account, the creation of public policy by governments is the outcome of a course of cooperation and adjustment in which citizens categorized in groups to stand for their interests wield pressure to realize their goals. If such a process is to be broadly democratic, it is obvious that all interests should probably be able to organize, that no group should enjoy such a command of resources that they are able to 'squeeze out' challenging interests, and that the agencies of the state should be open, unbiased and disjointed. Largely, mainstream pluralists insist that these criteria are essentially

NOTES

There were three important natural laws among them such as: (a) seek peace and follow it; (b) abandon the natural rights to things; and (c) that individuals must honour their contracts. The other laws of nature demonstrate how peace and justice are to be achieved in society. The laws of nature may be summarized by the precept: 'Act towards others in a manner in which you would want them to act towards you.' However, this precept is presented in a negative form by Hobbes, who argues that, the precept: 'Do not act towards others in a manner in which you would not want them to act towards you' is the most intelligible method of evaluating moral conduct. He argued that the laws of nature are rules of reason which are contrary to the natural instincts of human beings. The laws of nature to him is the theorem of peace. In his opinion 'a law of nature is a precept of general rule, found out by reason, by which a man is forbidden to do, that, which is destructive of his life or take away the means of preserving the same; and to omit that by which he thinks it may be preserved. Law and rights, differ as much as obligation and liberty, which in one and the same matter, are inconsistent.

Hobbes said that natural law may be revealed by civil law, and civil law may be revealed by natural law. However, natural and civil law may differ in whether or not they may be changed by a sovereign. Unlike civil law, natural law is immutable and is the eternal law of God. Natural law may be known by reasoning, but judgments concerning civil law may depend on both the ability to reason and the ability to interpret natural law.

Civil law, according to Hobbes is written, and that natural law is unwritten. He also contends that ignorance of the laws of nature is not an excuse for disobeying them, because these laws may be known by anyone who is capable of clear reasoning, and because the laws of nature may be summarized by the precept: 'Do not act towards others in a manner in which you would not want them to act towards you'. He also argued that ignorance of civil law may be an excuse for breaking a law only if the law is unclear or equivocal. In other cases, in which a law is clear and unequivocal, ignorance of the law is not an excuse for breaking the law. He declared that natural laws are also moral laws. These laws include: equity, justice, mercy, humility, and the other moral virtues. These moral laws are also known as 'divine laws'. The laws of the kingdom of God are divine laws, which may be known by reason, by revelation, and by faith. According to him, the kingdom of God is a commonwealth where God is Sovereign, and where God reigns eternally. Obedience to divine law and faith in God are all that is necessary to be saved from pain and sorrow, from sin and death. Thus, an eternally perfect and spiritual commonwealth may be found in the kingdom of God.

The law of nature for Hobbes meant a set of rules according to which an ideally reasonable person would pursue his own advantage, if he was perfectly conscious of all the circumstances in which he was acting and was quite unswayed by momentary impulse and prejudice. Since he assumes that in the large, men really do act in this way, the law of nature states hypothetical conditions upon which the fundamental trades of human beings allow a stable government to find it. They do not state values but they determine casually and rationally what can be a given value in legal and moral systems.

Absolute authority in Hobbes' account is followed by a set of limits on the obligation of subjects to obey and on the proper use of law and punishment. These limits are new in *Leviathan*: they do not appear in Hobbes' earlier works, *The Elements* and *De Cive*. Although certain natural rights are understood as non-renounceable in these works, the idea is not developed into anything corresponding to the 'true Liberty' of *Leviathan*. Nor is there anything in these works suggesting limits to the proper exercise of authority, since a great deal of Part Two of *Leviathan* Chapters 21 through 28 is either absent in

the earlier works or else discussed only obliquely. The discussion of law in *Leviathan* especially as regards the limits of obligation and the exercise of authority is a significant revision in Hobbes' political theory.

As Hobbes says, it is wrong to punish the innocent because this violates the laws of nature, those which require equity and which forbid ingratitude and revenge. Hobbes does not specify natural laws for any of the other limits he mentions but it is clear that the same three laws of nature would forbid the sovereign from outlawing or punishing the exercise of true liberties in all cases. Such acts are committed 'without injustice,' with no violation of the obligation owed to the law and by subjects who are fully law-abiding; to outlaw or punish such acts would be iniquitous, ungrateful and vengeful. Thus, the sovereign has a duty to respect each subject's natural rights.

Hobbes talks of covenant which individuals opted for to emerge out of state of nature. Now, you might want to ask why and how individual of the state of nature wanted to enter into a covenant. Since the first law of nature requires individuals to seek a peace, the only way to attain it was through a covenant leading to an establishment of a state. Individuals, thus, agree to enter into a covenant and surrender all their powers through a contract to a third party who was not a party to the contract. This third party which became the sovereign, received all the powers surrendered by the individuals. Thus, 'the commonwealth' was constituted when the multitude of individuals were united in one person, when every person set to the other, 'I authorize and give up my right of governing myself to this man, or this assembly of men, on this condition, that thou give up thy right to him, and authorize all his actions in like manner'.

(b) Covenants and the Sovereign

Individuals renounced the state of nature and enter into a covenant out of which an independent sovereign power emerged. The sovereign power was not a party to the contract but he was a beneficiary of that. The third party, the sovereign which was a consequence of the contract was an artificial person distinct from the natural individual. Individuals gave up all their natural rights to all the things through a common consent to a person or body of persons. Thus, they confer all rights on the sovereign for enforcing the contract by using force. They authorize the sovereign all their action as their own. The sovereign had no obligation. The sovereign was not the common will of all but it was only a substitute for conflicting individual will, as that would guarantee unity among multitude within a common wealth. Hobbes said that the contract created an artefact in the sovereign authority whereby each individual gave up his right of governing himself on the condition that others did likewise. All the individuals were guaranteed basic equality with every other member by consenting to a set of rules. This implies no one possessed more rights than other. The sovereign must treat all the individuals equally in matter of justice and laying taxes.

According to Hobbes, justice means equality in treatment and equality in rights. He also equated justice with fairness which means treating others as one would expect to be treated. The Sovereign was bestowed with all the powers. The contract was made by each with the other. The contract made by the individuals was a social and political contract. This contract created a civil society and political authority. According to Hobbes, a commonwealth or sovereign can be established by two methods: *acquisition*, and *institution*. When individuals get threatened into some mission, the method of acquisition is adopted whereas when individuals of their own impulse united, agreeing to transfer all their natural powers through a contract to a third party of one, few or many, the method of institution is adopted. Both the methods are contractual.

NOTES

NOTES

Thus, the social contract brings a sovereign into existence who enjoys supreme and absolute authority. Hobbes visualizes sovereign power as undivided, unlimited, inalienable and permanent. He created unlimited political obligation. Both the state and government was created simultaneously by the contract. Everywhere, individual in the society, except the sovereign himself became his subjects. As earlier stated, all natural rights of man are surrendered to the sovereign ones for all. The individual cannot withdraw the power conferred on the sovereign, because if they chose to revive their natural rights, they will have to go back into the state of nature which is characterized by anarchy and insecurity. This is the reason why Hobbes did not grant the people right to revolt. He condemned the Civil War of 1642, because of this reason.

The contract made by the individuals was perpetual and irrevocable. It means individuals cannot change the sovereign. By creating a civil society, the individuals limited their sovereignty voluntarily. Hobbes preferred a monarch to be sovereign. He preferred monarchy against aristocracy or democracy for the following reasons: (i) The self-indulgence of one compared to that of many would be cheaper; (ii) The existence of an identity of interest between the king and his subjects; and (iii) less intrigues and plots, which were normally due to personal ambitions and envy of members of the ruling elite. Since the state and society came into existence together through a single contract, repudiation of the contract would result not only in an overthrow of the government but also a disintegration of society itself. This is the reason why Hobbes made the power of the sovereign beyond any question. In a way, thus, he justifies an absolute government or monarchy. However, absolute power enjoyed by sovereign was not derived from the notion of kings. It was essentially derived through a contract based on individual consent.

Hobbes made the sovereign (*Leviathan*) the sole source and interpreter of laws. He alone is the interpreter of divine and natural laws. Sovereign of Hobbes was not bound by divine and natural laws. Even the sovereign is not subject to civil laws. Like Jeremy Bentham and John Austin, Hobbes defined the laws as a command of the sovereign. Since a law was command of the sovereign it could be wrong, unjust or immoral. The sovereign administers as well as enforces the law. His theory of sovereignty was a forerunner of Austin's monistic theory of sovereignty. As individuals surrendered all their powers, sovereign gained absolute power. He talked about absolute sovereign power only because of his through-going individualism. The absolute sovereign represented the individuals, and was constituted by them for providing order and security, and averting the worst of all evils, civil war. He did not recognize any prepolitical order of society based on kinship, religion and other associations, which normally contributed to sociability in the individual. He was quite unsympathetic towards customs, tradition and other moralities that existed outside the purview of the sovereign law. On this basis, he proclaimed that law was not derived from the social institutions of people but was the command of the sovereign. He ruled out private beliefs and divisions and multiplicity of authority which is antithetical to a stable political order. In his opinion, authority has to be unitary. He placed sovereign above the law.

The *Leviathan*, the sovereign of Hobbes has some rights and duties. These include: to govern and conduct policy, protect civil society from dissolution, limit or restrict freedom of expression, opinions and doctrines, control subject's property, reserve all conflicts through the right of judicature, make war and peace with other nations, confer owners and privileges, determine artificial religion and the form of its worship and prevent excess to subversive literature, etc. The will of the sovereign is absolute and the individual has no appeal against it. Hobbes visualized a unified sovereign authority. He did not give the

subjects of the right to change the form of the government. The contract was not between the individual and the sovereign. It was among the individuals themselves. Thus, as stated earlier elsewhere sovereign was not party to the contract. Hence, the individuals cannot be freed from the sovereign's authority rather the individuals have a duty and obligation to obey the sovereign.

Hobbes' sovereign was characterized by the position rather than the person who commanded it. He provided a comprehensive theory of political absolutism and reconciled legitimate political authority with conflicting yet justified human demands. He also stipulated that for ensuring civil peace, lesser association could exist only with the permission of the sovereign. He gave a subordinated status of the church against the sovereign. The sovereign enunciated by Hobbes stood outside the society. It was only fear and interest that supplied the reason for the existence of sovereign but the authorized sovereign had some limits. It is bound by the law of nature to ensure peace and safety. There were some duties to be performed by the sovereign towards the subject. One of the foremost duties was to protect the subject from rebellion. To achieve this Hobbes has seven injunctions: (a) patriarchic commitment to the status quo; (b) to resist demagogues; (c) to respect the established government; (d) the specific need for civil education; (e) the importance of decline that was inculcated in the home; (f) the law and order, to abstain from violence, private revenge, disowner to person and violation of property; (g) right attitudes would bring about the right behaviour.

Hobbes' account of authority in *Leviathan*—in contrast to his earlier works, has a two-tiered structure, one in which absolute authority is inscribed with recognizable limits upon its proper use. As a consequence of this absolute authority, the sovereign could declare any exercise of 'true liberty' illegal and punishable. But sovereigns might by the same authority cede certain essential rights of sovereignty or declare that the moon is made out of green cheese. These would all have the same legal force; they are all equally authoritative but equally improper. As a result, a command which forbids the exercise of 'true liberty' could be known to be authoritative only in terms which implied that it could not be a proper law. Any 'punishment' on this basis would instead be an act of hostility—a recognizable misuse or abuse of the sovereign's proper authority.

He placed great emphasis on the fact that the sovereign is never obligated to subjects because as a non-party to the social contract, the sovereign is understood to have remained in the state of nature, i.e., the sovereign's authority is derived from being a third party beneficiary of the social contract. We may perhaps understand Hobbes to mean that the sovereign's authority to use coercive power to frame the will of subjects arises in the amoral context of the state of nature, a context which persists even under the social contract and becomes manifest in the various instances where he specifies that the subject's inalienable right of defence limits the sovereign's authority.

In the case of the sovereign's right to punish, he is quite clear that this right derives from the right of nature which only the sovereign retains as a non-party to the social contract. Political authority is justified by the social contract because subjects create civil society by lying down or transferring the right of nature in the proprietary sense. But, since subjects can never be understood to transfer, or lay down their right of self-defence, in cases of capital punishment, any obligations arising from the social contract which would require subjects to forbear acts of resistance are suspended, i.e., the condemned subject and sovereign are understood to be in a pre-civic amoral relationship.

NOTES

NOTES

2. Locke's Theory of Social Contract and Civil Society

John Locke proceeded to derive civil society from the consent of its member. The consent, by which each person agrees with other to form a body politic, obligates him to submit to the majority. The compulsion to constitute a civil society was to protect and preserve freedom and to enlarge it. The state of nature was one of liberty and equality but it was also one where peace was not secured being constantly upset by the 'corruption and viciousness of degenerate men'. It led to three important wants: The want of an established, settled, known law; the want of a known and indifferent judge; and the want of an executive power to enforce just decisions. Through a contract, individuals consented to submit to the majority rule and organized themselves as a community or civil society. Locke says men being by nature all free, equal and independent, none can be put out of this estate (state of nature) and subjected to political power of another without his own consent. This is the reason why the problem was to form a civil society by common consent of all men and transfer their right of punishing the violators of natural law to an independent and impartial authority.

After the formation of civil society, this common consent becomes the consent of the majority. As a result of the contract, all men unanimously agree to incorporate themselves in one body and conduct their affairs by opinion of the majority. They surrender their powers partially, namely the three specific rights that constituted the natural right to enforce the laws of nature. At first, individuals establish a civil society, and then they establish a government to act as a judge in the nature of a 'fiduciary power' for promoting certain ends. Thus, Locke envisioned two contracts, one by which the civil society is established and the other which creates the government.

According to Jeremy Waldron, contract and consent have three stages in Locke's description: First, man must agree unanimously to come together as a community and pull their natural powers so that they can act together to uphold one another's right; second, the members of this community must agree by a majority vote to set up legislative and other institutions; third, the owners of property in a society must agree, either personally or through their representatives to pay the taxes that are imposed on the people.

Locke's depiction of several stages of contract was a clear departure from Hobbes's depiction. In Hobbes theory, state and society were formed together but in Locke's theory, they were created in different steps. In the first stage, civil society was found and in the second stage, only government was established. This is the reason why, when a government is dissolved society remains intact. By drawing a distinction between the process of formation of society and the state, Locke places the government under the control of society, so there is no scope for absolutism unlike Hobbes.

The relationship between society and the government is expressed by the idea of trust because it obviates making the government a party to the contract and giving it an independent status and authority. Within the government, the legislative power was supreme, since it was the representation of the people, having the power to make laws. There was also an executive which concedes to usually one person who has the power to enforce the law. According to Locke, the executive which included the judicial power had to be always in session. It enjoyed prerogatives, watched subordinates and was accountable to the legislature. He also advocated for the separation of power between executive and legislature. Besides the legislature and executive, there was a third wing of the government, which is called the federative power. It means the power to make treaties and conduct external relation.

NOTES

Unlike Hobbes, he created a limited sovereign and rules out political absolutism. He advocated that a good state is the one which existed for the people who formed it and not vice versa. The government has to be based on the consent of the people subject to the constitution and the rule of law. Government will act as a trustee of the people's right. Powers of the government are derived from the people. Natural laws and individual rights act as a limitation on the government's power. He also advocated that supreme power resided in the people, and the people as a community had the inalienable right to institute and dismiss a government. He justified resistance to unjust political power. After overthrowing a government, an individual can establish a new one.

3. Jean Jacques Rousseau's Theory

Jean Jacques Rousseau is considered as the greatest thinker that France has ever produced. Not only in France but in the entire history of political theory, he was the most exciting and most provocative. By the very magic of his style no other political thinker could come anywhere near him. He was a genius and a keen moralist who was ruthless in his criticism of 18th century French society. He was one of the most controversial thinkers, as evident from the conflicting, contradictory and often diametrically opposite interpretations that existed of the nature and importance of his ideas. He was a philosopher, writer and composer of 18th century Romanticism. He was born in Geneva, Switzerland on 28 June 1712. During that period, Geneva was a city-state and a protestant associate of the Swiss Confederacy. He rose to fame with his prize winning essay *Discourse on the Science and Arts*. In this essay, he rejected progress based on the Arts and Sciences, as he did not elevate the moral standards of human beings. He traced the rise of inequality and the consequent fall of the human individual. He wrote a novel namely *La Nouvelle Heloise* in 1761. In this novel, the themes of his early essays reappeared, and his preference for nature and the simple pleasures of country life became evident. It is only after his death that his *Confessions* was published. He accomplished many things during his lifetime which included writing on music, politics and education. His fame primarily rested on his writings. He also composed some operas. He remained mainstay of the Paris opera for years to come. He also wrote a dictionary of music and devised a new system of music notation. He wrote *The Social Contract*, his most famous book in Paris. He died in 1778.

(a) Revolt against Reason

More than most men, Rousseau projected the contradiction and maladjustments of his own nature upon the society about him and sought an anodyne offer his own painful sensitivity. For this purpose, he adopted the familiar contrast between natural and the actual current in all the appeals to reason. But he did not appeal to reason. On the contrary, he termed the contrast into an attack upon reason. Against intelligence, the growth of knowledge, and the progress of science, which the enlightened believes to be the only hope of civilization, he said amiable and benevolent sentiments, the good. He criticized the idea of enlightenment since his early period.

In his prize winning essay *Discourses on the Science and Art*, he depicted the drawbacks of science and arts including its impact on morality. According to him, science had brought moral degradation among men. He criticized the idea that science has brought progress. He termed it as an elusion. It was not progress and in fact was regression. The advancement of science and modern civilization has made individual life unhappy. It had made him less virtuous. He advocated for a simple society. He said virtue can be prevalent only in a simple society.

NOTES

In his criticism of modern advancement society, he alleged that man has been growing corrupt day by day. With the advancement of the civilizations, man has become corrupt. He advocated that the abundance in the world has brought more evil than good. According to him, luxury is the fertile source of corruption. It not only negatively impacts man but also undermines the nations. He cited the example of Athens. It is because of its luxury, wealth, science and elegance that brought vices which led to its downfall in the long run. He also cited the example of Rome. As long as Rome was simple and devoid of luxury, it had respect all over the empire but the time it embraced luxury and wealth it began to decline. He severely criticized the advancement of art and science. He argued that the minds of human beings have been corrupted in proportion as the arts and science have advanced through the ages.

To Rousseau the much-vaunted politeness, the glory of civilized refinement was a 'uniform perfidious veil' under which he saw jealousy, suspicion, fear, wildness, reverse, fraud and hate. Science brought intelligence and knowledge revolution. The supporter of enlightenment eulogized it. But he against this notion gave preference to amiable and benevolent sentiments, the reverence and goodwill. He preferred sentiments and conscience to reason. He argued intelligence was dangerous because it undermined reverence. He termed science as destructive because it undermined faith. Reason was bad to him because it undermined morality. For Rousseau, morality is nothing other than the ability to see oneself through the eyes of others and act appropriately. This is a fascinating description of morality. Learning to live with others is the essence of morality. Humans have the capacity to act morally but it is not natural in the sense of being fully fixed in all humans from birth. It is capacity that has to be developed, educated and nurtured.

(b) Critique of Civil Society

Rousseau maintained that liberty in the state of nature was a great boon. However, with the increasing population and the depletion of the treasures of nature it was no longer possible for man to enjoy natural liberty as before. Thus, in the changed circumstances, the natural liberty was threatened when the forces of nature no longer sustains them, they have to consolidate their own force to save themselves. They, therefore, create a civil society to maintain their freedom. According to him, vanity among human beings and difference in property and possessions led to inequality. The rich became richer and poor became poorer. Laws were enacted to protect property rights. Civil society degenerated into a state of war, extreme inequality, ostentation, cunning, ambition and enslavement. Through laws and other political devices, the rich were able to corner power and dominate, while the poor descended into slavery. Civilized man was born a slave and died as one.

In the state of nature, man was a 'noble savage'. He lived in isolation and had limited desires. According to him, it was neither a condition of plenty nor scarcity. There was no conflict for cooperative living. Individuals had no language or knowledge. They had no idea of any art or science. He argued in this type of situation that man was neither happy nor unhappy. He had no conception of just and unjust, vice and virtue. He was not guided by reason, but guided by self love or the instinct of self preservation. This state of nature was not perennial. Gradually individuals discovered the utility and usefulness of labour. Man began to collaborate and created a provisional order. It led to a patriarchal stage when man began to build shelter for themselves and families stayed together. He began to use language and reason. The division of labour came into being. It led him

NOTES

from the subsistence economy to an economy of productive development. Individuals learned metallurgy and agriculture. It gave him iron and corn and made him civilized. However, it ruined humanity and morality. The growth of agriculture and division of labour created the idea of property. Rousseau famously stated that 'the first man who after fencing of a piece of land, took it upon himself to say this belongs to me and found people simple minded enough to believe was the true founder of civil society'.

Man's talents and skills created inequality among the people. The longing for possession and wealth led to enslavement of some people and led to conflict and competition. It is this conflict, which led a demand for a system of law to ensure order and peace. Especially the rich people demanded it to save their possession and wealth. Thus, the social contract envisioned by the rich was to maintain their status and position. As a result of this demand and social contract, the civil society and law was originated. It brought ban to the poor and boon to the rich. It destroyed natural liberty.

According to Rousseau, the emergence of civil society degenerated human society. He argued that the natural man lost his ferocity once he began to live in society. As a result, he became weak. He lost natural independence as his desires were expanded and comforts became a necessity. He became dependent which created problems in human relationship as they became vain and contemptuous. Their vanity brought various social ills. Vanity overpowered man and guided his actions which degenerated individual's mind and the society. He also severely criticized enlightenment which believes in human progress of reason through science and technology. It brought down moral improvement which thereby led to human unhappiness in his book *Emile*. He stated that though God has made all things good, it was man who meddled with them and made them evil.

It is in his *The Second Discourse on the Origins of Inequality* he developed his views expressed earlier in his prize-winning essay *Discourses on the Science and Arts*. In this work, he narrated the fall of man. He highlighted how nature got twisted, warped and corrupted with the emergence of civil society. The civil society was necessitated by the rise of the institution of private property and the need to defend it by institutionalizing social inequality through law. Thus, he underlined the difference of 'natural man' and 'civilized man'. He appreciated the natural man and criticized severely the civilized man who was created as a result of the emergence of civil society.

(c) General Will

The creation of popular sovereignty by vesting it in the *General Will* was a unique contribution of Rousseau which led the foundation of modern democracy. The concept of General Will is the central theme of Rousseau's doctrine. It is distinguished from other types of human will. According to him, the General Will is always right, that is the will that one has as a citizen when one thinks of the common good and not of one's own particular will as a private person. Many later thinkers have used the distinction between actual will and real will in order to explicate Rousseau's distinction between particular will and General Will. The existence of these two types of will is a source of conflict within the minds of men. Actual will is motivated by his immediate, selfish interest whereas real will is motivated by his ultimate collective interest. Actual will is concerned with his ordinary self, whereas real will with his better self. The satisfaction of his desire is the aim of his actual will but real will induces him to acts of reason. The characteristic of actual will can be termed as transient, unstable and inconsistent whereas real will is stable, constant, consistent and determinant. The actual will is detrimental to human freedom. Thus, to attain freedom, the individuals should follow the direction of the real

NOTES

will. His real freedom is reflected by the real will. The real will is concerned with the interest of the community and subordinates his self-interest. The problem is that individuals at times may not be able to discriminate between his actual will and real will. This problem can be eliminated by the transition from the 'particular' to 'general' will. The general will is the harmonization of the interest of each with those of all. However, it is not a 'compromise' or the lowest common factor. It is an expression of the highest in every man. It reflects the true spirit of citizenship. Unlike particular will, the General Will always guides individual through a proper way.

Rousseau believed a unified collective view would emerge for two reasons. First of all, he envisaged a relatively simple society of farmers and artisans with no rich or poor (though he railed against property, he never advocated its abolition), a situation that it is the duty of the sovereign to maintain. All are equal and consequently there would be few conflicts and what is good for society would be relatively simple, a situation in which it would be easy inculcate love of the community. According to him, the General Will would be the source of all laws. The human being would be truly free if he followed the dictates of the law. Civil liberty meant freedom from the assault of others, from following the arbitrary will of another person, and obedience to one's notion of liberty.

Of course, if one had to be free then one had to obey one's own will which meant that one's will, and the laws of a state would have to be in harmony. The free state would be a consensual and participatory democracy. He categorically said that the General Will could emerge only in an assembly of equal law makers. It could not be alienated. The 'executive will' could not be the 'general will'. Only the legislative will, which was sovereign, could be the General Will. For Rousseau, it was the direct democracy that embodied the legislative will. The individual participated in the articulation of the General Will, for citizenship was the highest that one could aspire for. The General Will could not be the will of the majority. In fact, it did not represent the will of all; it was the difference between the sum of judgments about the common good and the more aggregate of personal fancies and individual desires. It would always aim and promote the general interest and will of its members.

According to Rousseau, submission to the General Will creates freedom. He spoke of a total surrender but not to a third party. Unlike Hobbes, he vested sovereign power in the political community. He created a sovereign which was inalienable and indivisible. But it was not vested in a man or a group of men, rather it was vested in a body politic. The people cannot give away, or transfer, to any person or body their ultimate right of self-government, of deciding their own destiny. Thus, he expounded the concept of popular sovereignty. His concept of inalienable and indivisible sovereignty does not permit people to transfer their legislative function, the supreme authority of the state to the organs of government unlike Locke. So far as the judicial and executive functions are concerned, they have to be exercised by special organs of the government, however, they are completely subordinate to the sovereign people. Sovereign power cannot be represented. He maintained that representative assemblies ignore the interest of the community and are often concerned with their particular interest. This is the reason why he advocated direct democracy. Sovereignty originated with the people and stayed with them. For him, government and sovereign were different. According to him government was the agent of the General Will which is vested in the community. Sovereign to him was the people, constituted as a political community through social contract.

NOTES

It would be pertinent to mention here that Rousseau, in his book *The Discourse on Political Economy*, first coined the term General Will. He points out in the book that General Will tends always to the preservation and welfare of the whole end of every part, and is the source of the laws, constitute for all the members of the state in relation to one another and to it, the rule of what is just and unjust. It is an outcome of the moral attitude in the heart of citizens to act justly. Here an individual sacrifices his private interest and embraces the public interest. The General Will is emerged from all and applied to all. It comprises rational will of all the members of the community. He pointed out that if someone refuses to obey the General Will he can be compelled to do so. He famously advocated that man can be forced to be free. When a man is being compelled to obey the General Will, it essentially means that he is being asked to follow his own best interest because it is by obeying the General Will that he can express his moral freedom. Obedience to the General Will is not the corrosion of their liberty because obedience to the General Will essentially implies obedience to part of their own selves.

In a nutshell, Rousseau advocated a policy that would aim for the general rather than the particular interest of its members. The freedom that the noble savage enjoyed in the state of nature would be possible under the right kind of society governed by the 'General Will'. Society and the individual, in his theory were complementary.

4.5 SUMMARY

- The term state originates from the Latin words *stare* which means 'to stand' and *status* that means 'a standing or condition'. The term state was used for the first time by the famous Italian philosopher Machiavelli in his book *El Principe*.
- In the formation of state, population is considered to be the most vital element. According to the various definitions just mentioned, it becomes clear that there will be no state in an unpopulated region.
- The second important element in formation of a state is territory. The importance of territory would become clearer with the example of the Jews.
- The political fluidity and ethnic complexity of the eastern Mediterranean region had been considerably increased by the dramatic downfall of the Minoan Empire in the middle of the second millennium BC.
- The Greek city-states may be taken as models of ideal city-states in the ancient world. A Greek city-state, known as a *polis*, was an administrative centre of a limited territory.
- An imperial state existed as part of an empire. An empire was deemed to be a group of countries under the direct or indirect control of a foreign power or government, which shaped their political, economic and cultural development.
- Theocracy may be described as the 'rule of the deity'. The word 'theocracy' has been derived from the Greek word *theokratia* composed of two smaller words, *theos* which may be defined as 'god' and *kratein* which means 'to rule'
- In recent times, the word state has often been combined with the word nation to form the entity called nation-state or state-nation. Although these two words, nation and state, are often used interchangeably in everyday conversation, they are two quite different concepts.

Check Your Progress

5. Who did Hobbes consider the sole source and interpreter of Laws?
6. What is the compulsion to constitute a civil society?

NOTES

- A state that has a defined territory and residents with identical racial and cultural background is termed a nation-state. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, 'nation-state is a sovereign state of which most of the citizens or subjects are united also by factors which define a nation, such as language or common descent'.
- Military occupation is the domination by military force of one state over another. Here we are concerned with foreign rule and not with internal military dictatorship.
- The studies of military occupation of Europe shows that the conquering power had retained some of its forces within the defeated country for some time. The places occupied were usually selected for their strategic importance, and were often in border areas.
- The type of government in which the political power dwells with the military is called a military dictatorship. Similar to several dictatorships, a military dictatorship might be authorized or unauthorized.
- The main idea behind pluralism is plurality—variety, multiplicity and many-sidedness. Its core suggestion is that power and resources within society are scattered.
- Pluralism achieved fame, in fact superiority, as an explanatory model of political science in the thirty years subsequent to World War II, a period in which US experience came to lead the discipline.
- The term 'polyarchy' was pioneered by Robert A. Dahl, a professor at Yale University, to portray a form of government wherein power is given in the hands of three or more persons.
- In Hobbes' opinion, it is natural law which prompts men to abandon the state of nature and to establish law and government.
- According to Hobbes, justice means equality in treatment and equality in rights. He also equated justice with fairness which means treating others as one would expect to be treated.
- Hobbes' sovereign was characterized by the position rather than the person who commanded it. He provided a comprehensive theory of political absolutism and reconciled legitimate political authority with conflicting yet justified human demands.
- Locke proceeded to derive civil society from the consent of its member. The consent, by which each person agrees with other to form a body politic, obligates him to submit to the majority.
- In Hobbes' theory, state and society were formed together but in Locke's theory, they were created in different steps.
- More than most men, Rousseau projected the contradiction and maladjustments of his own nature upon the society about him and sought an anodyne offer his own painful sensitivity. For this purpose, he adopted the familiar contrast between natural and the actual current in all the appeals to reason.
- Rousseau maintained that liberty in the state of nature was a great boon. However, with the increasing population and the depletion of the treasures of nature it was no longer possible for man to enjoy natural liberty as before.
- The concept of General Will is the central theme of Rousseau's doctrine. It is distinguished from other types of human will. According to him, the General Will is always right, that is the will that one has as a citizen when one thinks of the common good and not of one's own particular will as a private person.

NOTES

4.6 KEY TERMS

- **Jews:** The *Jews* also known as the *Jewish* people, are an ethno-religious group originating from the Israelites, or Hebrews, of the Ancient Near East.
- **Sovereignty:** *Sovereignty* is understood in jurisprudence as the full right and power of a governing body to govern itself without any interference from outside sources or bodies.
- **Leviathan:** For Hobbes', the leviathan is the maker of laws, the judge of first principles, the foundation of all knowledge, and the defender of civil peace.
- **Polyarchy:** In Western European political science, the term polyarchy was used by Robert Dahl to describe a form of government in which power is invested in multiple people.

4.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The term 'state' was used for the first time by the famous Italian philosopher Machiavelli in his book *El Principe*.
2. The four factors that play vital role in the formation of a state are people, territory, government and sovereignty.
3. A state that has a defined territory and residents with identical racial and cultural background is termed a nation-state.
4. The type of government in which the political power dwells with the military is called a military dictatorship.
5. Hobbes made the sovereign (*Leviathan*) the sole source and interpreter of laws.
6. The compulsion to constitute a civil society was to protect and preserve freedom and to enlarge it.

4.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write any five definitions of 'state' given by famous political philosophers.
2. Write a short note on Greek city states.
3. What is the difference between nation and state?
4. Mention the key features of a state.

Long-Answer Questions

1. How have nation-states originated?
2. What is military dictatorship? Discuss in detail.
3. What are modern multicultural states? Explain with suitable examples.
4. Discuss social contract theory in detail.

4.9 FURTHER READING

- Baylis John and Steve Smith (eds). 2005. *The Globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bottomore Tom (ed.).2000. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, New Delhi: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lenin V.I. 1973. *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

NOTES

UNIT 5 CONCEPTS: RIGHTS, LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

NOTES

Structure

- 5.0 Introduction
- 5.1 Unit Objectives
- 5.2 Rights
 - 5.2.1 The State of Nature and Natural Rights
 - 5.2.2 Rights and Politics
- 5.3 Liberty
 - 5.3.1 Relation between Liberty and Law
- 5.4 Equality
 - 5.4.1 Definitions of Equality
 - 5.4.2 The Marxist View of Equality
- 5.5 Summary
- 5.6 Key Terms
- 5.7 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 5.8 Questions and Exercises
- 5.9 Further Reading

5.0 INTRODUCTION

This unit discusses concepts like Rights, Liberty and Equality. Democracy is the form of government dedicated to the realization of the values of self-determination. It bears a complex relationship with equality. Democracy needs equality of democratic agency, which is different from the forms of equality flowing from the values of distributive justice or fairness. When the forms of equality demanded by distributive justice are defined by reference to philosophic reason and not by reference to democratic self-determination, there occurs an intrinsic tension between democracy and distributive justice.

Political theorists clarify the meaning of political concepts by looking at how they are understood and used in ordinary language. They also debate and examine the diverse meanings and opinions in a systematic manner. When is equality of opportunity enough? When do people need special treatment? How far and how long should such special treatment be given? Should poor children be given mid-day meals to encourage them to stay in schools? These are some questions which they address. As you can see, these issues are eminently practical; they provide guidelines for framing public policies on education and employment. As in the case of equality, so also in the case of other concepts, political theorists engage with everyday opinions, debate possible meanings and thrash out policy options.

Liberty and equality are complementary to each other. It is the motivating principle of almost all revolutions. History has recorded many battles and shedding of much blood to ensure liberty. Even in the twentieth century, two World Wars were fought to make the world safe for democracy and liberty. Liberty or freedom is a very precious condition without which an individual cannot develop his personality.

This unit focuses on the normative concepts of equality and liberty for the reconciliation of individual authority. The relevance of equality and liberty in the Indian democracy has also been discussed in the unit.

NOTES

Natural Rights vs. Legal Rights

Natural rights can be defined as the rights which are 'natural', i.e., they are 'not artificial, or man-made'. They are the rights which are derived from deontic logic, from human nature, or from the edicts of a god. They are universal, i.e., they are applicable to all people, and do not derive from the laws of any specific society. They are inherent in every individual and cannot be taken away. For example, it has been argued that humans have a natural right to life. They are sometimes called moral rights or inalienable rights.

In contrast, legal rights are based on the customs, laws, statutes or actions by legislatures of society. An example of a legal right is the right to vote of citizens. Citizenship, itself, is often considered as the basis for having legal rights, and has been defined as the 'right to have rights'. Sometimes, legal rights are called civil rights or statutory rights. They are culturally and politically relative as they are dependent on a specific societal context to have meaning.

Some thinkers view rights in only one sense, i.e., either as natural or legal, while others accept that both senses have a measure of validity. Throughout history, there has been considerable philosophical debate about these senses. For example, according to Jeremy Bentham, legal rights were the essence of rights, and therefore he denied the existence of natural rights; whereas Thomas Aquinas believed that rights asserted by positive law but not grounded in natural law were not properly rights at all, but only a facade or pretence of rights.

Claim Rights vs. Liberty Rights

A claim right can be defined as a right which necessitates that another person has a duty to the right-holder. Somebody else must do or refrain from doing something to or for the claim holder, such as perform a service or supply a product for him or her. Every claim-right requires that some other duty-bearer should perform some duty for the claim to be satisfied. This duty can be to act or to refrain from acting. For example, several jurisdictions recognize broad claim rights to things such as 'life, liberty, and property'; these rights impose an obligation upon others not to assault or restrain a person, or use their property, without the permission of the claim-holder. Similarly, in jurisdictions where social welfare services are provided, citizens have legal claim rights to be provided with those services.

On the other hand, a liberty right or privilege is a freedom or permission for the right-holder to do something. There are no obligations on other parties to do or not do anything. For example, if a person has a legal liberty right to free speech, that simply means that it is not legally prohibited for them to speak freely. However, it does not mean that anyone has to help enable their speech, or to listen to their speech, or even refrain from stopping them from speaking. Nevertheless, other rights, such as the claim right to be free from assault, may strictly limit what others can do to stop them.

Liberty rights and claim rights are the opposite of one another: a person has a liberty right which permits him to do something only if there is no other person who has a claim right restricting him from doing so. In the same way, if a person has a claim right against someone else, the other person's liberty is restricted.

Positive Rights vs. Negative Rights

A right can also be referred to as a permission to do something or an entitlement to a specific service or treatment. Such rights are called positive rights. However, when rights allow or require inaction, they are called negative rights; they either permit or do

NOTES

nothing. For example, in some democracies, e.g., the US, citizens have the positive right to vote and they have the negative right not to vote; instead, people can stay home and watch television, if they want to. In other democracies, e.g., Australia, however, citizens have a positive right to vote but they do not have a negative right to not vote, as a fine can be levied on non-voting citizens. In view of that:

- Positive rights are permissions to do things, or entitlements to be done. For example, the purported 'right to welfare'.
- Negative rights are permissions not to do things, or entitlements to be left alone.

Individual Rights vs. Group Rights

The general concept of rights is that individuals have permissions and entitlements to do things which other persons, or which governments or authorities, cannot violate. However, there are situations in which a group of persons is thought to have rights, or group rights. In view of that:

- Individual rights are rights held by individual people, regardless of their group membership or lack thereof.
- Group rights have been argued to exist when a group is seen as more than a mere composite or assembly of separate individuals but an entity in its own right.

In other words, it is possible to see a group as a distinct being in and of itself. It is similar to an enlarged individual which has a definite will and power of action and can be thought of as having rights. However, there is another sense of group rights in which people who are members of a group can be thought of as having specific individual rights because of their membership in a group. As per this view, the set of rights which individuals as group-members have is expanded because of their membership in a group.

There can be opposition between individual and group rights. An instance in which group and individual rights disagree is conflicts between unions and their members.

Other distinctions

Other differences between rights depend more on historical association or family resemblance than on accurate philosophical distinctions. These include the distinction between civil and political rights, and economic, social and cultural rights.

5.2.2 Rights and Politics

Rights are often included in the foundational questions which are dealt by governments and politics. Often the development of these socio-political institutions has formed a dialectical relationship with rights.

Rights about particular issues, or the rights of particular groups, are generally areas of special concern. Often these concerns take place when rights come into conflict with other legal or moral issues, sometimes even other rights. Some such issues are labour rights, reproductive rights, disability rights, patient rights, prisoners' rights, etc. Moreover, information rights, such as the right to privacy are becoming more important, with increasing monitoring and the information society.

Some examples of groups whose rights are of significant concern include animals, and amongst humans, groups such as children and youth, parents (both mothers and fathers), and men and women.

NOTES

As a result, politics plays a vital role in developing or recognizing the above rights, and the discussion about which behaviours are included as 'rights' is an continuing political topic of importance. The concept of rights varies with political orientation. Positive rights, such as a 'right to medical care', are highlighted more often by left-leaning thinkers, while right-leaning thinkers emphasize more on negative rights, such as the 'right to a fair trial'.

History of Rights

The specific details of rights have greatly varied in different periods of history. In several instances, the system of rights propagated by one group has come into sharp and bitter conflict with that of other groups. In the political sphere, currently the question of who has what legal rights is sometimes addressed by the constitutions of the respective nations.

Most historic notions of rights were authoritarian and hierarchical, with different people being granted different rights, and some having more rights than others. In contrast, modern conceptions of rights often stress on liberty and equality as among the most important aspects of rights, though conceptions of liberty (e.g., positive or negative) and equality (e.g., of opportunity or of outcome) frequently differ.

5.3 LIBERTY

Liberty has been a magic word in the history of mankind which has inspired many revolutionary struggles against tyranny and despotism. It has been the most powerful weapon in the hands of the unarmed and has defeated the strong armies of the dictators and despotic rulers. Liberty and humanity are closely associated with each other. Liberty is the motivating principle of almost all revolutions. History has recorded many battles and shedding of much blood to ensure highly coveted liberty. Even in the twentieth century, two World Wars were fought to make the world safe for democracy and liberty. In a sense history is a record of unending struggle for liberty.

Liberty or freedom is a very precious condition, without which individual cannot develop his personality. It is an abstract concept and as such it is difficult to give precise meaning of liberty. As R.N. Gilchrist writes: 'Everyone has a vague notion of liberty of some kind and a desire for it, but among ten people using the word, perhaps no two will be able to say exactly what they mean or, if they do say it, will not agree each other in their definitions.' Being an abstract concept, it has evoked so much response from human beings that a French revolutionary has aptly exclaimed, 'Oh! Liberty, what crimes are committed in the name!'

The word liberty owes its origin to Latin word 'Liber' which means freedom. Thus, liberty means freedom from restraints. It implies freedom to do anything one desires to do without any interference.

The dictionary meaning of the term liberty is freedom from constraint, captivity or tyranny and freedom to do as one pleases. The terms liberty and freedom are generally used as synonymous terms. Various political scientists have defined liberty in different ways. Some of the standard definitions are given below:

Check Your Progress

- 1. What are the factors on which a sound political nation depend on?
2. State the definition of claim right.

NOTES

Definitions of Liberty

The following are the important definitions of liberty:

- Laski defines liberty as 'the eager maintenance of that atmosphere in which men have the opportunity to be their best selves'.
French Declaration of the Rights of Man (1789) says, 'Liberty consists in the power to do everything that does not injure another.'
According to T.H. Green, 'Freedom consists in a positive power or capacity of doing or enjoying in common with others.'
According to Seeley, 'Liberty is the absence of restraint or opposite of over government.'
Mckechnie writes: 'Freedom is not the absence of all restraints, but rather the substitution of rational ones for the irrational.'
'Liberty', observes Burns, 'means liberty to grow to one's natural height, to develop one's abilities.'
Gettell says: 'Liberty is the positive power of doing and enjoying those thing which are worthy of enjoyment and work.'
'Liberty is', writes GD.H. Cole, 'the freedom of the individual to express without external hindrances to personality.'
Mahatma Gandhi says: 'Liberty does not mean the absence of restraint but it lies in development of personality.'
Locke maintains: 'Where there is no law, there is no freedom.'
Ramsay Muir says: 'By liberty I mean, the secure enjoyment by individuals an by natural and spontaneous groups of individuals, such as a nation, church, trade union of the power to think their own thoughts and to express and act upon them, using their own gifts in their own gifts in their own way under the shelter of law, provided they do not impair the corresponding rights of others.'

Two Aspects of Liberty

The various definitions of liberty indicate its two aspects, i.e., negative and positive aspects.

1. Negative aspects of liberty

The negative aspect of liberty means absolute freedom of the individual or it means that the individual has the freedom to do anything; Absence of all restraints is the meaning of the individual's all actions into 'self-regarding and 'other-negative liberty. J.S. Mill divided the man's all actions into 'self-regarding and 'other-negative actions. Those actions of the individual which concern only the individual are self-regarding actions. Those actions of individual which affect others are other-regarding actions. There should not be the State interference with self-regarding actions. The State interference is justified only in other-regarding activities, in case his action amounts to an intervention into the domain of the freedom of other individuals. The negative concept of liberty means absence of all restraints or limitations on individual actions. No civilised society can afford to grant such liberty to its members.

2. Positive aspects of liberty

The Liberty has a positive connotation. It does not mean the absence of restrictions. On the other hand, true liberty exists only when every citizen enjoys the opportunity for self-

NOTES

realization and the State maintains those rights and opportunities which help the citizens to develop all that is best in them. 'The true test of liberty lies in the extent to which the law of the land helps the citizen to develop all that is good in him.' The positive aspect of liberty includes the right of the man to enjoy or do something that is worth enjoying or worth doing.

Liberty as a positive concept refers to a condition or an atmosphere created by the state. The individual, in the condition or atmosphere so created, finds it easy to develop into his best. Mill says: 'That the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilised community, against his will, is to prevent harm to other. Over himself, his own body and mind, the individual is sovereign.' This statement explains the real meaning of liberty which involves its negative but also positive. His idea of liberty means an atmosphere where every individual is accorded an opportunity to develop his personality. Laski's view of liberty means an atmosphere where every individual is accorded an opportunity to develop his personality. Laski's view of liberty also fits into the socialistic theories of modern times. To sum up, 'liberty' in modern times means that individual should be free to avail opportunities to develop is personality. It does not mean complete absence of restraints. On the other hand, the modern States do impose limitations on individual's actions. Liberty means power to do everything that does not injure others. Thus, liberty has the following features:

- Liberty does not mean absence of all restraints.
 - Liberty means absence of unjust and tyrannical restrictions.
 - Liberty means legal, moral and reasonable restrictions on actions of individual.
 - Liberty means the absence of special privileges.
 - There can be no liberty when the rights of some depend upon the mercy or pleasure of others.
 - Liberty is an essential condition for the development of individual personality.
 - Liberty means the rights of the individual to do things which are not harmful to others or society.
 - All the individuals are entitled to liberty equally.
- The state should not be biased or discriminate in the enjoyment of liberty by the individuals. Liberty is not licence.

Normative Theories of Liberty

It is customary to classify liberty under the following seven categories:

1. **Natural theory of liberty:** The concept of natural liberty owes its origin to the famous contractualist philosophers Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau. In their 'state of nature' men enjoyed natural liberty. Natural liberty is based upon the liberty that is natural to man. He is born with it. Natural liberty implies complete or unrestricted freedom for one to do what he wills. It is another name for the liberty of the jungle that is known as 'licence'. As such, it cannot be applicable to our social life or civil society. Liberty in modern times is considered as a product of civil society. Our liberty arises out of the membership of civilised society.
2. **Moral theory of liberty:** Man's condition will be deplorable, if he does not have moral liberty or freedom. Moral liberty consists in acting in accordance with one's rational or real self. It is related with the self-realization of the individual. It means

NOTES

freedom to do things according to the dictates of one's conscience. Political liberty and civil liberty do not have much significance without moral liberty. Philosophers like Kant, Hegel, Green and Bosanquet pay much attention to it. Thus, moral liberty has a meaning only in the context of the common good, and it includes the good of each member and postulates free scope for the development of his personality.

3. **Civil theory of liberty:** Civil Liberty is the liberty which a man enjoys in a State or civil society and it consists of the rights which are guaranteed to us by the State. It implies the right of each to do as he chooses within the limits prescribed by law. It may involve protection from interference at the hands of the government. Civil liberty in the main includes freedom of conscience, freedom of opinion, freedom of religion, freedom of movement and equality in the eye of the law. Lord Bryce observed that 'civil liberty has a positive as well as a negative side. It imparts activity, it implies the spontaneous ... exercise of the powers of willing and doing.' Civil liberty is of immense value to the individual in a state.

4. **Political theory of liberty:** Political liberty is sometimes known as constitutional liberty. It is the right of individual to take part in the State. It includes those rights that are guaranteed by the State to the citizens and such rights concern the question of participation in the affairs of the State. Thus the right to vote, the contest in election or hold a public office, right to form or join in a political party, etc. can be included under political liberty. It may be pointed out that real political liberty is possible only under a democratic form of government. According to Laski, two conditions are essential for the enjoyment of political liberty:

- Individual should be educated to the point where he can express what he wants in a way it is intelligible to others.
- There should be provision for impartial mass media and supply of news. People should be properly informed to give judgement on the government's performance.

5. **Economic theory of liberty:** It includes those rights that are enjoyed by man concerning his livelihood. Economic liberty implies absence of unemployment, concerning his livelihood. Economic liberty implies absence of unemployment, exploitation, unfair wage, sub-standard living, insecurity, etc. Thus, when the State ensures employment to all citizens, makes them free from the tyranny of unemployment, one can say that the citizens enjoy economic liberty. The significance of economic liberty cannot be underestimated. Political liberty or civil liberty becomes meaningless in the absence of economic liberty. Economic liberty means security of one's daily bread and reasonable opportunity for earning the same. The individual should be made free from the constant fear of unemployment and insufficiency and must be safeguarded against the wants of tomorrow. Economic liberty consists in the individual's right to work and to a minimum wage, the right to leisure by the regulation of hours of work in fields, factories and mines, the right to form unions and the right to provision against old age, sickness, unemployment, accidents and also maternity benefits. It may be stated here that political democracy is meaningless without economic democracy.

6. **National theory of liberty:** National liberty means the right of people to rule over themselves. It means the absence of imperialism, foreign control and colonialism. National liberty envisages that every nation must be free from foreign domination. It should be a sovereign State possessing both internal and external sovereignty.

NOTES

National liberty exists where the State is a national State, that is, where the community is independent and sovereign. Civil, political and economic liberty are restricted, if there is no national liberty. India attained national liberty only in 1947. National liberty is more important than all other types of liberty. It is the foundation of civil, political and economic liberty.

7. **International theory of liberty:** The concept of international liberty covers the world as a whole. It implies renunciation of war, limitation on the production of armaments giving up of the use of forces, peaceful settlement of disputes, etc. It also puts adequate curbs on the strength of military force so that it may not crush the liberties of the local people or of the people of other country. Thus, international liberty covers the entire humanity. It believes in coexistence of nation-states, international co-operation, and peaceful world order. The classification of liberty has been given in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Characteristics of Different Types of Liberty

BASIC CONCEPTS LIBERTY						
Natural Liberty	Moral Liberty	Civil Liberty	Political Liberty	Economic Liberty	National Liberty	International Liberty
Independent of and prior to the State.	1. Right to rational self. 2. Right to dictate of reason. 3. Right to one's conscience. 4. Right to develop personality.	1. Right to speech. 2. Right to movement. 3. Right to own property. 4. Right to life. 5. Right to from association.	1. Right to vote. 2. Right to elected. 3. Right to hold public office. 4. Right to criticise government. 5. Right to petition.	1. Right to work. 2. Right to get adequate wage 3. Right to leisure 4. Right to benefits against sickness, old age, etc. 5. Right against exploitation.	Liberty Complete internal and external independence or people's right to rule over themselves.	1. Renunciation of war. 2. Abandonment of use of force. 3. Pacific settlement of disputes 4. Lamination on the production of armaments.

Safeguards of Liberty

No doubt, law is the safeguard of liberty. However, all laws are not good. Some laws endanger our liberty. Hence we shall briefly discuss certain other safeguards of liberty. If these safeguards exist, liberty becomes real and meaningful.

- 1. Democratic form of government:** A democratic form of government is the best safeguard of liberty. Despotism or dictatorial governments are not conducive to the enjoyment of liberty.
- 2. Constitutional guarantee of fundamental rights:** Even in the democratic State, liberty may be crushed by the bureaucracy or by the party in power. Hence various checks should be provided. This is why it is customary in these days to have a set of fundamental rights in all democratic constitutions.
- 3. Separation of powers:** The 'separation of powers' ensures liberty. It implies the separation of three branches of government, e.g., executive, legislative and judiciary. Such a separation means each branch would check the power of the other from encroaching upon liberty.
- 4. Strong public opinion:** A vigilant public opinion and effective opposition can be a safeguard of liberty in a democratic State. Both should be highly critical about the action of the government, when it endangers liberty.

NOTES

5. **Eternal vigilance:** Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. When people want to enjoy liberty, they themselves must be conscious and defend their liberty against any encroachment. According to Judge Learned Hand, 'Liberty lies in the hearts of men and women, when it dies there, no constitution, no law, no court can save it; no constitution, no law, no court can even do much to help it.'

6. **Rule of Law:** The rule of law which provides equality before law to all its citizens is sure guarantee of liberty. In England, there is the rule of law which is regarded as the key to the British liberty. In Britain, power is not exercised arbitrarily, but according to law of the land. A.V. Dicey observes: 'There is in the English Constitution an absence of these declarations or definitions of rights so dear to foreign constitutions. In England the right to individual liberty is a part of the constitution because it is secured by the courts.' The rule of law means that all governmental power must be derived of his liberty except under the authority derived from law. It also means that the law of the State should not discriminate between one class of persons and another.

7. **Independence of judiciary:** It follows from above that there should exist an independent and impartial judiciary to act as the sentinel of liberty. In every democratic society, the judiciary has been empowered to determine whether a law is constitutional or not, whether an action of executive violates a right of the citizen. Hence the judiciary should be independent of both the executive and the legislature.

8. **Responsible government:** It is held that a government formed by the representatives of the people and responsible to them, is a safeguard of liberty. Besides, there should exist and function a healthy party system with opposition in the popular legislature. The opposition by criticizing the government keeps the government on the right path and acts as the watchdog of people's liberty. Hence a healthy party system is necessary for the preservation of liberty. A bi-party system with a strong and responsible opposition provides the best democratic form of government, where liberty is well safeguarded.

5.3.1 Relation between Liberty and Law

The nature of relationship between liberty and law is a controversial issue. Some people consider law as the very opposite of liberty. The more the number of laws, the less would be liberty. Enactment of laws means curtailment of liberty. Such a view was held by the Sophist in ancient Greece. The 'Laissez Faire theory' advocated, in the 18th and 19th centuries, also held similar opinion. Some people like the anarchies go to the extent of abolishing the State in order to ensure complete liberty for all individuals. On the contrary, law is regarded as a condition of liberty. Liberty is not licence. By obeying the law of the State, we enjoy our liberty. But there is a limitation to it. Excessive or oppressive law affects or restricts liberty.

Then what is the proper relationship between liberty and law? The true answer to this question lies in a reconciliation of these two opposite views. A law that is supported by the public opinion is undoubtedly a condition of liberty. In this sense law becomes an upholder of individual liberty. When labour laws are passed providing for better wages, fixed working hours and pensionary benefits for the workers, such laws guarantee the liberty of the workers against encroachment by the selfish employers.

But all laws are not good. When a law is made in complete disregard of public opinion, such a law stands on the way of our liberty. We are justified in disobeying such a bad law imposed upon us by a dictator or an alien ruler.

NOTES

To conclude we observe that all good laws or the laws supported by public opinion are the condition of liberty from the normative perspectives. Even good laws may restrain individuals from doing harm to others. Thus, law and liberty are complementary to each other and a careful reconciliation between the two is necessary.

5.4 EQUALITY

The term 'equality' ordinarily means that all men are equal and all should be entitled to equal opportunity and treatment. It implies a levelling process in which chances are given to all for development of their potentialities. It also means that special preference of all kinds should be abolished. No discrimination should be made on the ground of birth, wealth, sex, caste, creed or colour. Like liberty it is not only a negative concept, it also has a positive connotation. In this sense it implies provision of adequate opportunities to all. No one should be debarred from the realization of his ambition in life, if he possesses the requisite merit. That is why the state should provide adequate opportunities to all for developing their abilities to their full stature. This equality is required for social justice.

The demand for equality arose as a protest against prevailing inequality in society. It is mostly a modern concept. The American Declaration of Independence (1776) proclaims that 'all men are created equal'. The French Declaration of Rights of Man (1789) also emphasizes on the principle of equality.

This declaration says: 'Men are born and always continue to be free and equal in respect to their rights.' These two events have helped to a considerable extent to develop the concept of equality in modern world. Thus, equality is a concept which has a very broad meaning. It has no definite implication. Perfect equality is an impossible task. When nature has created differences among men, it is difficult to have perfect equality in society. Even democracy has been defined as 'a system which gives everyone equal opportunity to become unequal'. However, what equality emphasizes is grant of equal opportunities, all should be equal at the beginning of race. Perfect equality is no possible at time in any society.

5.4.1 Definitions of Equality

Equality is a levelling process. 'The ideal of equality has insisted that men are politically equal, that all citizens are equally entitled to take part in political life, the exercise their franchise to run for and hold office. It has insisted that individuals should be equal before the law, that when the general law confers rights or imposes duties, the rights and duties shall extend to all or conversely that they shall not confer special privileges on particular individuals or groups'. Undoubtedly, it implies fundamentally a levelling process. According to Laski, 'It means that no man shall be placed in society that he can over-reach his neighbour to the extent which constitutes denial of the latter's citizenship.' Locke opines that equality is a state or condition 'wherein all the power and jurisdiction is reciprocal, no one having more than others.' Further, according to Lipson, 'Equality implies the absence of manmade and socially fostered discriminations in the avenues of advancement. The absence of any discrimination in the use of opportunities for self-development is called equality.' Barker writes: 'It is derived from the supreme value of the development of personality - in each alike and equally, but each along its own different line and of its own separate motion.' He further writes: 'We are thus arranged as it were, in a level line at the starting point of the race that lies ahead; and we start from that level line, so far as the State is concerned, with equal conditions guaranteed to each for making the best of

Check Your Progress

- 3. Mention the etymological derivation of the word 'liberty'.
- 4. Name the philosophers related to natural theory of liberty.

himself - however much we may eventually differ in what we actually make of ourselves.'

Negative and Positive Aspects of Equality

Equality is a multi-dimensional concept. It has two aspects, namely, negative and positive. Laski has given both the negative and positive dimensions of equality. In a negative sense, equality means the absence of special privileges based on birth, caste, class, colour, wealth, race, sex, etc. In political sphere, it opposes the concentration of power in a few persons and advocates the idea that everyone should have and equal access to the corridor of power.

In a positive sense, equality means the provision of adequate opportunities for all. The adequate opportunities do not mean equal opportunities. It implies equality of chances for the development of the faculties of individual. The provision of adequate opportunities means that the state should provide suitable opportunities for all citizens, irrespective distinction. Laski has rightly said that 'equality is most largely a problem of proportions. The urgent claims of all must be met before we can meet the particular claims of some'. Barker observes: 'There must, indeed, be equality of opportunity before all capacity can be free to develop.'

Thus, the following are the essential features of equality:

- It means absence of special privileges.
- It is a democratic concept.
- It implies provision for adequate opportunities of development.
- It provides for minimum standard of living for every individual.
- It is the basis of all right.
- Equality and the idea of the rule of law go together.

Kinds of Equality

The following are the different kinds of equality as found in different political systems.

1. **Natural equality:** Natural equality implies that all men are born equal and are endowed with equal gifts and talents. It also means that the state should try to reduce inequality, rather than perpetuating it. The State should provide those social and economic opportunities that offer equal chances. Natural equality is rather an ideal and not an immediate reality. This ideal should be attained in a society as far as possible.
2. **Civil equality:** It is also known as legal equality. There is civil equality in the State when persons are subject to the same law in enjoyment of the various rights and liberties. There can be no civil equality when law makes distinction between on individual and the other. Civil equality as a concept has accepted in a democratic form of government. It implies that all citizens should be treated alike in the matters of possession of their rights without any discrimination on the grounds of religion, belief, caste or creed.
3. **Political equality:** Political equality implies that all citizens should have political rights and should have equal access to all offices of authority. It means universal adult suffrage. It also implies rights to form political parties and contest in election. These rights are necessary in a democratic society.

NOTES

NOTES

4. **Social equality:** It means that all citizens are equally eligible to enjoy various opportunities in society. It also implies absence of other privileges. Social equality is a difficult idea to attain. It cannot be enforced entirely by law. The Constitution of India has accepted equality as a goal in its preamble. It has abolished untouchability by law. Though untouchability still exists in some part of the country in spite of legal prohibition, efforts are being made to ensure social equality.
5. **Economic Equality:** Economic equality, according to Lord Bryce, is 'the attempt to expunge all differences in wealth, allotting to every man and woman and equal share in worldly goods.' It means that wealth should be enjoyed equally by all. It also implies abolition of poverty. The primary needs of an individual are not fulfilled, there cannot be real democracy. Political equality is said to be meaningless unless it is accompanied by economic equality. In the communist countries emphasis has been given on economic equality. In modern democracy emphasis is also given on reasonable economic equality among the citizens. Accumulation of wealth has been considered to be a vice in recent times. Poverty amelioration programmes have been launched in India to bring the poor above poverty line.
6. **International equality:** In the modern state there is talk of international equality. International equality implies equality among the nation states as sovereign bodies. All the nations of the world should be equality treated without any discrimination. It prevents interference in the internal affairs of one nation by other nation. The nations whether small or big, should be treated with identical terms. It also means that the international disputes should be settled through peaceful methods. In economic sphere, it demands that the benefits of science should be shared by all countries. Table 5.2 summarizes the various types of equality.

Table 5.2 New Rudiments of Political Science Equality

Natural	Social	Political	Economic	Civil	International
All are equal by birth, hence no discrimination of any kind whatsoever should be made.	Equality of rights and opportunities, hence possibilities of discrimination on legitimate grounds should not be there.	Equal participation of all in the management of public affairs: 1. Universal adult suffrage 2. Open recruitment to public services 3. Free and fair periodic elections. 4. Free mass media agencies. 5. End of traditional privileges.	Non-concentration of national wealth in few hands, hence equality of proportions: 1. Guarantee of a civic minimum 2. Special arrangements for the protection of the interests of the weaker sections. 3. Private sector under the rules of general benefit.	Equal enforcement of the fundamental rights and duties on all: 1. Equality before law. 2. Equal Protection of law for all. 3. Equality at equal levels. 4. Availability of justice at low cost. 5. Justice without undue delay.	End of discrimination between states on the basis of geography, population, military power etc. 1. Equal treatment for all nations 2. Distribution of scientific and technological achievement among all nations. 3. Eradication of great evils like slavery and illiteracy from the world. 4. Abandonment of the use of force. 5. Pacific settlement of international disputes.

NOTES

Equality is an abstract concept. It has evoked tremendous response from the political philosophers and revolutionaries. Liberty and equality are related to each other. It is undoubtedly a very difficult concept to achieve. The champions of democracy support the idea that equality is necessary but at the same time, they consider it as an ideal only. Equality of status and opportunity which the Preamble of the Indian Constitution proclaims, is an ideal to which mankind is moving nearer. The obstacles on the path of equality are gradually removed. It is more realised today than it was realised in earlier times.

5.4.2 The Marxist View of Equality

The Marxists have not developed a systematic theory of equality as such. Nowhere Karl Marx and Frederic Engels have adequately explained the theory of equality. Thus their views on 'equality' are the outcome of the overall philosophy of Marxism—a philosophy which aims to absence of exploitation and the establishment of a 'classless' and 'stateless' society.

The Marxists maintain that 'inequalities' in society emerged with the emergence of the concept of private property which, in turn, creates the concept of class—the 'haves' and 'have nots', or the 'exploiters' and the 'exploited' or the bourgeois and the proletariat. Further, the present capitalist state is a class state. Its law and institution protect the interest of the propertied classes only and perpetuate inequalities in society. In other words, the existence of classes is *since pro quid* for the existence of inequalities and hence Marxism advocates the abolition of classes. Engels observes that 'the real content of the proletarian demand for equality is the demand for the abolition of classes'. Lenin also says that 'there can be no real, actual equality until all possibility of the exploitation of one class by another has been totally destroyed'. Only in a classless society, the egalitarian principle 'from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs', can be put into practice. Marxism maintains the view that economic equality is the most fundamental of all the other equalities. It does not agree that the state can create equality in a class divided society. But with the abolition of classes and the establishment of a fully communist society, the concept of equality will be redundant.

Relationship between Liberty and Equality

At first sight, liberty and equality may appear to be contradictory. If one enjoys liberty, one may intervene in the liberty of other. It is contended that liberty and equality are opposed to each other. The elitist theory believes that political equality is an impossibility and without elites, neither democracy nor liberty can exist.

Let us first discuss how liberty and equality are opposed to each other. Scholars like Lord Acton, Tocqueville, Bagehot, Hayek, Friedman, etc., argued that liberty and equality are opposed to each other. Particularly Lord Acton and De Tocqueville hold that liberty and equality are antagonistic and cannot co-exist. Lord Acton says: 'The passion for equality made vain hope for freedom.' His main argument is that both liberty and equality exist in inverse ratio. It means more of liberty and equality exist in inverse ratio. It means more of liberty less of equality, and vice-versa.' It is argued by these scholars that liberty refers to unrestrained freedom for every individual to satisfy his appetite for wealth and power. This freedom results into the degeneration of the social order. Hence the desire to have equality destroyed the possibility of having liberty. It can be said that these groups of thinkers defended the cause of liberty for the privileged section of the society which is not popular now.

NOTES

The concept that liberty and equality are antithetical is also supported by the elitist theory. It pleads that without an elite, democracy will change into mobocracy and liberty will have no place in such a system. But presence of an elite means inequality and hence equality and liberty are against each other. But in actual practice, liberty is enjoyed under limitations. Unrestrained liberty is a licence. Liberty is not actually inimical to equality. Liberty should be enjoyed equally by all citizens in the State. That is why R.H. Tawney has rightly said that 'a large measure of equality, so far from being inimical to liberty, is essential to it'.

Liberty and equality are claimed as fundamental rights in the most of the democratic countries of the world. Without equality, liberty appears to be a mockery. Liberty cannot be ensured unless all are made equal in the eyes of law. Both liberty and equality have a common aim. Both are necessary for the development of the individual personality. Liberty is best realized in an atmosphere of equality. Between the two, liberty is considered to be more essential. It is basically required for the full development of the individual personality. Liberty is best realised in an atmosphere of equality. Between the two, liberty is considered to be more essential. It is basically required for the development of individual personality. Equality seeks to serve the requirements of liberty. Individuals first desire liberty but cannot exist without equality. Both are complementary to each other.

Thus, you can conclude that liberty and equality are not antithetical. Rather they are complementary to each other. Unless equal opportunity is provided to all, there can be liberty only for a few. Without freedom, equality has no meaning for equality is a condition of liberty.

Relationship between Law and Equality

Law and equality are interrelated. Equality is a levelling process. It means absence of special privileges and discriminations. Law is a product of the levelling process. It aims at elimination of social privileges and discriminations. Law codifies rights and gives real shape to liberty. Rule of law is the basis of every society. It is rule of law that enforces equality. Operation of a law requires equality of treatment to all those who are similarly placed. If law is not equally applied, it gives rise to discrimination. Law requires a base to operate and equality provides the base. Equality will be meaningless unless backed by law. Law creates as well as protects equality. On the other hand, equality makes law strong and sound. That law is defective which contains unreasonable and discriminatory provision. Such a law will not last long. Equality is the first principle of a just law. Hence law and equality are inter-related and both supplement each other.

Equality vs Inequality

Social inequalities have existed in society since time immemorial. Political philosophers have discussed the causes of inequalities and their very nature with great interest even in the distant past. Aristotle, in his book, *Politics*, refers to three distinct social classes and noting down the main difference between *citizens* and *slaves, men* and *women* on the basis of rational and civic capacities.

A similar classification existed in our Hindu Society as stated in the scriptures of the past. The society was divided into four classes called *varnas* — Brahmin, Kshatriya, Vaishya and Shudra. While the Brahmins formed the superior class, the Shudras were looked down upon and made to do all the menial work. The Kshatriyas were basically warriors and the Vaishyas were the merchants.

NOTES

Struggle for Equality

It is not just inequality that has existed for ages, voices being raised against inequality based upon privileges and birth is also a very old phenomenon. The doctrine of equality is as old as that of inequality in the history of western politics. The most prominent star in Greek philosophy was said to be Zeno who was the founder of the Stoic School and promoted equality among men. As per Stoicism, all human beings possess the ability to reason, a quality that differentiates them from animal. All men are the same, that is, they are equal as men. The Stoics promoted the concept of universal brotherhood and raised their voice against slavery.

Liberty and Inequality as Opposed to Each Other

Early liberalism was based on the fact that liberty was the opposite of equality. With classical liberalism giving too much importance to liberty, equality became subservient to it. It was believed that liberty and equality were natural. By nature, liberty and equality are opposed to each other. Locke, Adam Smith, Bentham, James Mill, Tocqueville and other early liberal thinkers were of the opinion that the liberty of the individual should have minimum restrictions. For example, some thinkers, did not think equality was a natural right. Similarly, some others felt that equality and liberty were antithetical. Their argument was that the desire for equality has done away with the chances of achieving liberty. During this period, liberalism was based upon the free market concept and open competition among the egoistic rational individuals. It is believed that although economic competition leads to unequal outcomes, it is quite progressive.

Equality and Liberty as Complimentary to Each Other

The early liberal argument that equality and liberty are mutually exclusive was based on the assumption that the conflict between personal interests and social requirements is inevitable. However, this dichotomy of individual versus society was proved wrong historically. Equality became the main requirement of liberty in the 19th century as a result of the demand made by the positive liberals and socialists, for economic and social equality. Positive liberals believed that liberty and equality were complementary to each other and the state was assigned the task of using legislation and regulation to rectify the social and economic imbalances. This viewpoint was supported by Rousseau, Maitland, T.H. Green, Hobhouse, Lindsay, R.H. Tawney, Barker, Laski, Macpherson, and so on.

Positive liberalism considered the individual as a social being with personal desires that could be satisfied in the context of a cooperative social relationship within a social environment. According to it, liberty was as good as 'equality of opportunity', that is, that opportunity should be given to each individual to realize what his personality implies. This can only be possible by placing deliberate social restraints upon individual freedom. According to Tawney, the liberty of the weak depended on the restraint of the strong while the liberty of the poor depended on the restraint of the rich. Each individual is entitled to this liberty as much as others to do to others what he would have them do to him. That none should be at others' mercy, is a demand of liberty. Liberty makes equality a reality by providing opportunities for all to be their best. In the absence of liberty, equality becomes dull uniformity.

Equality and Justice

Equality and justice share a controversial relationship like liberty. The society is replete with inequalities based on sex, age, ability, social status, wealth, opportunity, etc. Inequalities

NOTES

of wealth and social status give rise to inequalities of power and result in many becoming subordinates of a chosen few. History has not only justified but also perpetuated such inequalities. The Greeks divided their society on the basis of caste, status and birth. Although early liberalism championed the cause of equality in terms of law and politics, no attempt was made to sort out the economic and social inequalities that were a result of freedom of contract, competition and private property.

John Rawl, author of *A Theory of Justice*, attempted to outline a social theory of justice hoping to reconcile the theories of rights and liberties of liberalism with economic and social equality. He believed that a just society would require maximization of equal basic liberties where one individual's liberty would not clash with another individual's.

He also proposed a set of guidelines to establish a sense of justice with respect to social and economic inequalities. These inequalities, should be arranged in a manner that would contribute to the maximum benefit of the least advantaged in the society, and the offices and positions should be equally accessible and open to everyone under conditions of equality of opportunity. According to his general concept of justice all essential social goods should be equally divided among all, unless an unequal distribution would in some way favour the members of the society. Simply put, the inequality above the income median is required for the society from the point of view of justice only when it assists reduction of the existing inequalities. Equality is required because the principle of justice on the basis of equality is increasingly advantageous to all members of the society, especially the ones who are least favoured. However, Rawls does not rule out inequalities altogether in the cases where they serve as incentives, creating a greater stock of goods for distribution to the least advantaged.

At a more abstract and basic level, the relationship between equality and justice can be understood in the sense of not equal distribution but treatment of people as equals. At least at the theoretical level, justice requires the government to treat its citizens with equal consideration. Each citizen has a right to equal concern and respect. According to Kymlicka, this more basic notion of equality can be seen not only in Nozick's libertarianism but in Marx's communism as well. According to libertarianism equality implies equal rights over one's labour and property. The Marxists consider it as equality of income and wealth. Any theory claiming that some people are not entitled to equal consideration from government, or if it is claimed that specific types of people are not worth considering as much as others, then most the theory would be rejected by most people in the modern world. In this context, it is apt to say that the crux of all contemporary theories of justice is the fact that every individual matters and is entitled to being treated equally.

Recent Debate on Equality: Affirmative Action from the Normative Viewpoint

Affirmative action implies policies that take factors such as religion, colour, race, gender and national origin into consideration so as to benefit to an individual or group that is underprivileged or under-represented. Such policies focus on employment, education, public contracting as well as health programmes. The term 'affirmative action' was born in the US, and was first mentioned in President John F. Kennedy Executive Order 10925. It was used to refer to measures for achieving non-discrimination. In 1965, President Lyndon Johnson issued Executive Order 11246 requiring federal contractors to take 'affirmative action' for hiring irrespective of religion, race and national origin. In 1968, this anti-discrimination list found an addition, 'gender'. In India this is referred to as 'reservation', whereas in UK 'discrimination' and in Canada, 'equality'.

NOTES

Affirmative action refers to the promotion of equal opportunity. It is often instituted in government and educational settings to ensure that minority groups within a society are included in all programmes. Compensating for discrimination or exploitation in the past by the superior /ruling classes of a particular culture can justify 'affirmative action'.

Quota-Based Affirmative Action Programme in India

In India, the affirmative action programme based on quota, is referred to as the 'reservation system'. It comprises two components — SC/ST and OBC. They should be examined separately. 22.5 percent of all government jobs, seats in educational institutions that have complete or partial government funding and electoral constituencies at all levels of government are reserved for SC and ST persons. This quota is roughly proportional to their share in the population. While this was enshrined in the Indian constitution, adopted in 1950, via Article 15 (4) (reserve places for the under privileged in state run educational institutions) and Article 16 (4) (reservation of government jobs), this program has a history that precedes independence. In some areas, such as parts of present day Kerala and Karnataka, the British introduced quotas almost a hundred years ago. Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, an outstanding theoretician and one of the most important leaders of the Dalit movement drafted the constitution of independent India. Making affirmative action for SCs and STs a part of the constitution, a move largely due to Ambedkar, ensured that it is mandatory and cannot be questioned in theory. However, in practice, due to the upper caste predominance in all these institutions, its implementation is indifferent and not free from legal battles and quotas often remain incompletely fulfilled.

To sum up, in India, affirmative action policies have a much longer history than the US, are constitutionally guaranteed (for SC-ST), and take the form of quotas in government jobs, educational institutions, and electoral seats at each level of government.

5.5 SUMMARY

- A sound political nation mainly depends on certain political values and their appropriate knowledge and access.
- In Locke's view, it is not a state of constant warfare. He points out that it is a state of 'peace, goodwill, mutual assistance and preservation'.
- The conception of natural rights and theory of property is one of the important themes in Locke's political philosophy. According to Locke, natural right forms in the root of morality implanted in human conscience.
- Natural rights can be defined as the rights which are 'natural', i.e., they are 'not artificial, or man-made'. They are the rights which are derived from deontic logic, from human nature, or from the edicts of a god.
- A claim right can be defined as a right which necessitates that another person has a duty to the right-holder. Somebody else must do or refrain from doing something to or for the claim holder, such as perform a service or supply a product for him or her.
- A right can also be referred to as a permission to do something or an entitlement to a specific service or treatment. Such rights are called positive rights.
- Rights are often included in the foundational questions which are dealt by governments and politics. Often the development of these socio-political institutions has formed a dialectical relationship with rights.

Check Your Progress

5. What do you understand by the term 'equality'?
6. Who has written the book *Politics*?

NOTES

- Liberty has been a magic word in the history of mankind which has inspired many revolutionary struggles against tyranny and despotism.
- Liberty as a positive concept refers to a condition or an atmosphere created by the state. The individual, in the condition or atmosphere so created, finds it easy to develop into his best.
- The nature of relationship between liberty and law is a controversial issue. Some people consider law as the very opposite of liberty. The more the number of laws, the less would be liberty.
- The term 'equality' ordinarily means that all men are equal and all should be entitled to equal opportunity and treatment. It implies a levelling process in which chances are given to all for development of their potentialities.
- The Marxists maintain that 'inequalities' in society emerged with the emergence of the concept of private property which, in turn, creates the concept of class—the 'haves' and 'have nots', or the 'exploiters' and the 'exploited' or the bourgeois and the proletariat.
- At first sight, liberty and equality may appear to be contradictory. If one enjoys liberty, one may intervene in the liberty of other. It is contended that liberty and equality are opposed to each other.
- Liberty and equality are claimed as fundamental rights in the most of the democratic countries of the world. Without equality, liberty appears to be a mockery. Liberty cannot be ensured unless all are made equal in the eyes of law.
- Law and equality are interrelated. Equality is a levelling process. It means absence of special privileges and discriminations. Law is a product of the levelling process. It aims at elimination of social privileges and discriminations.
- Affirmative action refers to the promotion of equal opportunity. It is often instituted in government and educational settings to ensure that minority groups within a society are included in all programmes.

5.6 KEY TERMS

- **Omnipotent:** Omnipotent derives from the Latin term 'Omni Potens', meaning 'All-Powerful' and refers to something or someone having great power and influence.
- **Dichotomy:** Dichotomy refers to the division into two mutually exclusive, opposed, or contradictory groups.
- **Libertarianism:** Libertarianism is a collection of political philosophies that uphold liberty as a core principle.

5.7 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. A sound political nation mainly depends on certain political values and their appropriate knowledge and access.
2. A claim right can be defined as a right which necessitates that another person has a duty to the right-holder.

NOTES

3. The word 'liberty' owes its origin to Latin word 'Liber' which means freedom
4. Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau were the philosophers related to natural theory of liberty.
5. The term 'equality' ordinarily means that all men are equal and all should be entitled to equal opportunity and treatment.
6. *Politics* is written by Aristotle.

5.8 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on state on nature and natural rights.
2. What is the relationship between rights and politics?
3. Write any five definitions of liberty.
4. What are the essential features of equality?

Long Answer Questions

1. Compare and contrast different rights that are available to people of a nation.
2. What are the two aspects of liberty? Discuss in detail.
3. How is liberty classified? Discuss.
4. What do you understand by equality? Mention the different kinds of equality.

5.9 FURTHER READING

- Baylis John and Steve Smith (eds). 2005. *The Globalization of World Politics- An Introduction to International Relations*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Bottomore Tom (ed.). 2000. *A Dictionary of Marxist Thought*, New Delhi: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lenin V.I. 1973. *Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism*, Peking: Foreign Languages Press.

UNIT 6 CONCEPTS: LIBERALISM AND MARXISM

NOTES

Structure

- 6.0 Introduction
- 6.1 Unit Objectives
- 6.2 Liberalism
 - 6.2.1 Growth of Liberal Trend: Laski
 - 6.2.2 Communitarianism
- 6.3 Marxism
 - 6.3.1 Theory of Alienation
 - 6.3.2 Strands of Contemporary Marxism
- 6.4 Summary
- 6.5 Key Terms
- 6.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 6.7 Questions and Exercises
- 6.8 Further Reading

6.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will learn about the ideology of Karl Marx, a German philosopher, economist, sociologist, historian, journalist and revolutionary socialist. Some of his major works are *The Holy Family* (1844), *The Communist Manifesto* (1848), *Poverty of Philosophy* (1847), *Critique of Political Economy* (1859) and *Das Capital*, the first volume of which appeared in 1867. You will also learn about the ideology of Liberalism.

6.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the concept of liberalism
- Discuss the meaning of communitarianism
- Explain the concept of Marxism
- Describe the political thoughts

6.2 LIBERALISM

Laski was an English economist and political theorist whose ideas are well known in intellectual circles. He was a man of many talents, and his importance lies in the fact that he always tried to put his political philosophy in practice to make it applicable to real-life situations. John Rawls was a liberal democrat and a prolific writer who wrote on various topics of international relations. Rawls was distressed about the prevailing situation in the capitalist world. He wanted to bring about tangible changes in a society plagued with distressing situations at a time when the world was divided between the rich and the poor. He had a vision of a community in which everybody could play a due role according to his/her capacity. Nozick criticized Rawls's approach and adopted a

NOTES

realistic approach, taking into account different modes of acquisition of goods and entitlement of different individuals.

Liberals promote ideas like constitutionalism, liberal democracy, human rights, capitalism, free and fair elections and freedom of religion. These ideas are extensively accepted, even by those political parties which do not frankly admit a liberal ideological course. Liberalism includes classical liberalism, which became well-admired in the eighteenth century; and social liberalism, which became famous in the twentieth century.

For the first time, liberalism emerged as a powerful force in the Age of Enlightenment. It rejected several initial postulations that governed many earlier theories of government, such as absolute monarchy, nobility, established religion and the divine right of kings. First liberal thinker, John Locke, who is frequently credited for the conception of liberalism as a distinctive philosophical tradition, employed the idea of natural rights and the social contract to dispute that:

- The rule of law should swap absolutism in government.
- Rulers were subject to the assent of the governed.
- Private individuals had a basic right to life, liberty and property.

The rebels in the American Revolution and the French Revolution freely used liberal philosophy to give good reason for the armed defeat of dictatorial rule. The 19th century saw the setting up of liberal governments in many nations in Europe, Latin America and North America. Liberal concepts spread even further in the 20th century, when in two World Wars, liberal democracies were victorious, surviving major ideological confrontations from fascism and communism. In today's modern world, liberalism, in its different forms, continues to be a political force of diverging degrees of power and impact on almost all countries.

6.2.1 Growth of Liberal Trend: Laski

Laski traced the historical evolution of the theory and practice of liberalism and interpreted this evolution in economic terms. He concluded that the changes in the political theory and practice of liberalism were conditioned by the economic exigencies of the different phases of capitalism. In this way, he substantiated his thesis about the class character of the modern liberal state by examining its historical background. Finally, he concluded that the philosophy of liberalism had entered a phase of decline on account of the developing crisis and contradictions of the capitalist system. The only philosophy which could take its place, he felt, was the philosophy of socialism.

In the realm of constitutional theory, Laski has bequeathed upon us two monumental works *Parliamentary Government in England*, which is a critical commentary of the British constitution, and *The American Democracy*, probably the most comprehensive survey of the American democracy in action ever undertaken by any single writer. In his analysis of the parliamentary system in England, he arrived at certain remarkable conclusions. First, he declared that the existence of a monarchy even in the present form is inconsistent with the true spirit of democratic equality. Moreover, the influence of the monarch in any constitutional crisis or emergency is bound to be exerted on the side of reaction as typified by the resignation of the MacDonald government in 1931 and an immediate formation of a reactionary national coalition in its place. Similarly, Laski proposed the abolition of the House of Lords as he considered a hereditary second chamber inconsistent with a genuinely democratic system.

NOTES

Laski visualized the creation of a strong cabinet. He did it to effectively control the House of Commons and bring about a socialist transformation of British society through legislative decrees and immediate administrative action. These changes could only be done by removing reactionary checks like the discretion of the monarch in forcing untimely plebiscites and the power of a second chamber to delay legislation. Criticizing this proposal, George Catlin remarks that this constitutional thesis is only superficially non-monarchical and democratic. In fact, it implies a belief in the government of a veiled socialistic dictatorship, which does not recognize any checks upon its power, whether by the constitution, judiciary, a second chamber or an electoral referendum.

Laski has made similar observations about the working of the American constitution. In *The American Presidency*, he analysed the nature of the working of the Presidential government in the USA and concluded that the system of checks and balances was not conducive to real efficiency in the government. The fathers of the American constitution, he thought, had designed it to suit the needs of a social structure based upon the ideals of laissez faire. Those ideals had now become quite irrelevant in the context of the worldwide vogue of positive government.

In *The American Democracy*, Laski examined other political institutions through which democracy in the USA operates and discussed the impact of the social, economic and cultural environment upon its functioning. He declared that the spectacle of the separation of powers was really a spectacle of confusion of powers. The pattern of division of powers between the federal and state governments had become obsolete in the context of modern developments. The difficulties, which President Roosevelt faced in the realization of his New Deal Programme, showed clearly how the American political system was designed to serve the interests of reaction. He regarded the Supreme Court's veto over legislation as undemocratic and pleaded for strengthening of the presidential office and proposed devices for a closer cooperation between the legislative and executive wings of Government.

Laski also criticized the party system in the USA as corrupt and antiquated. He lamented the fact that a socialist party had not yet developed in the US. He foresaw two alternative lines of development for capitalist democracy in USA—it must either renounce its capitalist character and become a socialist democracy or choose the second alternative of dissolving democracy internally and seek the solution of its economic crisis in aggressive imperialism abroad.

Political Liberalism

On the question of stability, Rawls' later work contented that whether it was possible that a society that was ordered by the two principles of justice endured? His answer to this question is traced in a collection of lectures titled *Political Liberalism*. In this, he introduced the idea of an overlapping consensus – or agreement – on justice as fairness between citizens who hold different religious and philosophical views or conceptions of the good. Further, 'Political Liberalism' also introduced the idea of public reason – the common rationale of all citizens. This is, in a sense, a right understanding for the betterment of society for all practical purposes.

Rawls addressed the most pressing criticism fabricated in 'A Theory of Justice' – the criticism that the principles of justice were simply an alternative systematic conception of justice that was understandably not better to utilitarianism or for that matter any other

NOTES

comprehensive theory. From the point of view of critics, 'justice as fairness' is merely a different comprehensive and rational doctrine that happens to be compatible with other rational doctrines. For them, it did not distinguish between a moral and a comprehensive theory that catered to the problem of justice and a political conception of justice that people with conflicting yet logical, religious or metaphysical views would accept to regulate the intrinsic unit of society. The distinction of Rawls' accounts and the earlier ones of liberalism is that it requires reaching a point of consensus without appealing to any one metaphysical source.

The idea of 'political liberalism' goes against the views of social contractualists like John Locke or John Stuart Mill, who promote a more robust cultural and metaphysical liberal consensus regardless of the 'deep' religious or metaphysical values that the parties appreciate. This outcome is underlined as an 'overlapping consensus' due to often conflicting and different accounts of nature, morality, etc. These tend to 'overlap' with each other regarding the issue of better rules applicable to humanity. Rawls further brought changes in the principles of justice, which are as follows:

- Each person has an equal claim to a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties, which scheme is compatible with a similar scheme for all.
- Social and economic inequalities satisfy two conditions: first they must be attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair and equal opportunity and second, they must be to the greatest benefit of the least advantaged members of society.

These principles are subtly modified from those in *A Theory of Justice*. The first principle now reads 'equal claim' in place of 'equal right', and also replaces the phrase 'system of basic liberties' with a fully adequate scheme of equal basic rights and liberties.

Contemporary Liberalism

In this section, you will be acquainted with John Rawls' and Robert Nozick's versions of the contemporary liberalism.

1. John Rawls

Contemporary liberalism owes much to the classical as well as modern liberalist thinkers such as Locke, Kant and Mill. However, if one has to single out one important political philosopher of the twentieth century whose influence has been the most profound in liberal thinking it is John Rawls. Before going into the details of the Rawls' philosophy let us have a brief look into his life profile.

John Rawls was born in 1921 in Maryland, United States. Rawls attended school in Baltimore for a short time before transferring to Kent School, an Episcopalian preparatory school in Connecticut. Rawls studied graduation at Princeton University. After his completion of graduation in 1943, he joined the Army and participated in World War - II. After the war, he returned to Princeton to pursue a doctorate in moral philosophy. Rawls married Margaret Fox, a graduate, in 1949. He finished his Ph.D. from Princeton in 1950 and thereafter he taught there until 1952, when he received a Fulbright Fellowship to Oxford University, where he was influenced by the liberal political theorist and historian Isaiah Berlin and the legal theorist H.L.A. Hart. After returning to the United States, he served first as an assistant and then associate professor at Cornell University. In 1962, he became a full professor of philosophy at Cornell, and soon achieved a tenured position at MIT. That same year, he moved to Harvard University, where he taught for almost

NOTES

forty years, and where he trained some of the contemporary figures in moral and political philosophy, including Martha Nussbaum, Thomas Nagel, Onora O'Neill, Christine Korsgaard, Susan Neiman and Thomas Pogge. Rawls is noted for his contributions to liberal political philosophy.

John Rawls was Professor Emeritus of Philosophy at Harvard University. He is the author of the well-known and path breaking *A Theory of Justice* and the more recent work *Political Liberalism*. His book *A Theory of Justice* provides a skeletal account of Rawls' project of using social contract theory to generate principles of justice for assigning basic rights and duties and determining the division of social benefits in a society. This book is regarded as the most important work of political philosophy written in English since the Second World War. It has influenced modern liberals and social democrats alike.

Rawls proposed a theory of 'justice as fairness' that is based on the belief that social inequality can be justified only if it is of benefit to the least advantaged. This presumption in favour of equality is rooted in Rawls's belief that most people deprived of knowledge about their own talents and abilities would choose to live in an egalitarian society, rather than an inegalitarian one. As for most people, the fear of being poor will outweigh the desire to be rich, redistribution and welfare can be defended on grounds of fairness. The universalist presumptions of his early work were modified to a certain degree in his another famous work *Political Liberalism*. Two monumental treaties written by Rawls—*A Theory of Justice* (1971) and *Political Liberalism* (1993) have laid the contemporary terms of debate and discussions on liberalism and its values.

Rawls revived the social contract tradition of Locke, Rousseau, and Kant. Both of these philosophers redeployed and depend Mill's vindication of liberty in a free society, and argued against conventional judgements, especially those of utilitarianism that treated individuals as means towards attending the collective good. A liberal state, according to Rawls, must not only guarantee that all its citizens have an equality of fundamental liberty rights, such as voting, and freedom of speech, religion and association; it must also ensure that those who are least well-off are assured as good a life as possible. He asserts that freedom should never be sacrificed on the grounds of an increase in material well-being. This is why he gives priority to the equal enjoyment of liberty (the liberty principle) over the principle that requires the welfare of the least well-off to be taken care of (the difference principle). Overall Rawls holds out an account of egalitarian liberalism that is hospitable to redistributive experiments of the liberal state.

John Rawls in his celebrated work *A Theory of Justice* has pointed out that a good society is characterized by a number of virtue. Justice is the first virtue of a good society. In other words, justice is a necessary but not a sufficient condition of a good society. A well-ordered society, according to Rawls, is effectively regulated by a public conception of justice. It is a society which everyone accepts and knows that the others accept, the same principles of justice and the basic institutions satisfy these principles. For Rawls, what is directly relevant for social ethics and justice is the individuals' means to pursue their own ends and to live whatever 'good life' they choose for themselves. These means are 'basic liberties', on the one hand, and 'primary goods', on the other.

Rawls weaves an intricate and elaborate pattern of enquiry and provides a coherent, systematic and powerful defence of a new kind of egalitarianism that preserves and extends individual liberty. He outlines the features of his conception in an article that appeared in 1957, entitled *Justice as Fairness* culminating in *A Theory of Justice*. The

NOTES

elaboration and clarification of theory continues through a series of book and two more books *Political Liberalism* and *The Law of People's*.

According to Rawls, the problem of justice consist in ensuring a just distribution of 'primary goods', which include rights and liberties, powers and opportunities, income and wealth, means of self-respect and so on. He has described his theory as the theory of pure procedural justice. It means that once certain principles of justice are unanimously accepted, the distribution resulting from their application will be necessarily just. Rawls has severely criticized those theory of allocation which ignore moral worth of the individual for the attainment of any pre-determined goal. He has attacked utilitarianism because in calculating the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number' it does not care if it leads to extreme hardship to any particular individual. He has brilliantly argued that you cannot compensate for the sufferings of the distressed by enhancing the joys of the prosperous. Rawls has evolved a unique methodology for arriving at a unanimous procedure of justice.

Rawls observes that the political constitution and the principal economic and social arrangements, such as the legal protection of freedom of thought and liberty of conscience, competitive markets, private property in the means of production and the monogamous family, must be accepted as given.

Unfortunately, this system breeds deep inequalities that cannot possibly be justified by an appeal to the notions of merit or desert. It is these inequalities, presumably inevitable in the basic structure of any society, to which the principles of social justice must in the first instance apply. The justice of a social scheme depends essentially on how fundamental rights and duties are assigned and on the economic opportunities and social conditions in the various sectors of society. In this way, Rawls is interested in developing a conception of justice that can provide a standard by which the distributive arrangements of a given society can be assessed but which need not concern itself with the fundamental question of ownership of the means of production. His aim is to present a conception of justice, which generalizes and carries to a higher plane the familiar theory of the social contract. The guiding idea is that the principles of justice for the basic structure of society are the object of the original agreement.

Rawls has evolved a unique methodology for arriving at a unanimous procedure of justice. Following the tradition of the 'social contract', Rawls has envisaged an 'original position' by abstracting the individuals from their particular social and economic circumstances. In Rawls own words 'In Justice as fairness the original position of equality corresponds to the state of nature in the traditional theory of the social contract. This original position is not, of course, thought of as an actual historical state of affairs, much less as a primitive condition of culture. It is understood as a purely hypothetical situation characterized so as to lead to a certain conception of justice. These individuals are symbolically placed behind a 'veil of ignorance' where they are supposed to be deliberating as rational agents. They are totally unaware of their wants, interests, skills and abilities as well as of the condition which lead to discrimination and conflict in the society. But they have an elementary knowledge of the economics and psychology, and are also endowed with a 'sense of justice'. Each individual wants to maximize his or her well-being, without being envious. They are self-interested but not egoists. They are not prepared to take a risk or resort to gambling.

According to Rawls, in such a state of uncertainty the national negotiators will choose the least dangerous path. In other words, each individual will hypothetically place himself or herself in 'the least advantage positions' while recommending the criteria

NOTES

of allocation of the primary goods. Hence, each of them will demand greatest benefit for the least advantaged. R.P. Wolf observes Rawls revives a version of the theory of the social contract as a way of discovering a via media between utilitarianism and intuitionism. Morally, he is more comfortable with the intuitionists but methodologically his heart is with the utilitarians and with the new-classical economists.

Rawls's basic concern might be put this way—What is the most reasonable conception of justice for a society of free and equal persons? What principles should our society meet, if it is to be fair to persons conceived of as free and equal: both conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal? In particular, should it be utilitarian, libertarian, a less liberal egalitarian society a less egalitarian liberal society? Theory offers a three-part answer to this question:

- Rawls presents two principles of justice, and offers an argument for those principles according to which the members of society would choose them in an 'original position' behind a 'veil of ignorance', which hides all information about their social position and natural endowments.
- He presents a sketch of a society that operates on these principles, to show that they are realistic.
- He argues, finally, that a just society—just by the lights of justice as fairness—would be stable in part because living in a just society and having a sense of justice guided by his principles is good for those who live in the society.

As a result of the hypothetical negotiations under such conditions, three principles of justice will be accepted by all, according to Rawls, in this order:

- Principal of equal liberty (for example, equal right to most extensive liberty compatible with similar liberty of others) which postulates that nobody's liberty will be sacrificed for the sake of any other benefit (liberty in this sense implies equal right to political participation, freedom of expression, religious liberty, equality before the law etc.). The principle also implies that each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty of all.
- Second principle comprises of two parts:
 - o Principle of fair equality of opportunity, particularly for acquiring offices and positions; and
 - o Difference principle, which implies that any departure from equal distribution of the primary goods can be justified only when it could be proved to bring greatest benefit to the least advantaged. In other words, a special reward for extraordinary ability and effort to any individual can be treated as just only if it results in the greatest benefit to the least privileged.
- When these conditions have been fulfilled, the criteria of efficiency can be justly applied in a competitive economy. In other words, the rule of allocation 'to each according to his ability' can be applied only if higher efficiency of the concerned individuals results in ameliorating the condition of the least privileged.

Rawls introduced the ideas of the 'chain connection', which implied that in order to strengthen a chain you should start with strengthening its weakest link, and then repeat the process by identifying the weakest link on each occasion. The justifiability of any special concessions, subsidies or protection depends on the empirical facts whether or not such benefits filter down ultimately to help the neediest.

NOTES

The protections of the basic liberties are especially stringent. Rawls's equal basic liberty principle has priority over the second principle. So, Rawls may seem to be endorsing a libertarian view. But his first principle is about specific liberties, not liberty or choices as such. In particular, the market liberties that were the concern of the *Lochner* Court are not covered by his first principle of justice. So, those liberties can be regulated to achieve the aims of the second principle of justice. So, what does the 'priority of liberty' mean? It means that justifications for limiting a basic liberty must show how the proposed limit improves the protection of the basic liberties overall. For example, to protect the religious liberty of religious minorities, you might restrict the scope of majority rule by adopting a constitutional right to liberty of conscience that ensures the free exercise of religion. This plausibly counts as a restriction of political liberty, as much as it limits the scope of that liberty. So, one basic liberty (political liberty) is restricted to ensure another basic liberty (religious liberty). But this is the force of the priority of liberty—it is not similarly permissible to restrict political liberty in order to improve the economic conditions of the least advantaged: for example, to restrict the voting rights of the better off in order to improve the economic circumstances of the less well-off.

The difference principle says that inequalities are permissible only if they maximally benefit the least advantaged. To appreciate the moral idea behind the principle, let us assume that a society guarantees equal basic liberties and fair equality of opportunity. Still, it may show considerable inequalities. In particular, suppose some people have highly marketable skills based on relatively scarce natural talents, and that others lack similarly high-end marketable skills. Assume people in both groups get up, work hard and contribute. Nevertheless, they receive substantially different rewards in the labour market and those differences in turn have a large impact on what they aspire to, and on the extent to which they can achieve their aspirations. How, in a society dedicated to the proposition that you all are created equal, can such inequalities, founded as they are on the contingencies of natural talent, be acceptable?

The answer provided by the difference principle is that you need to mitigate these inequalities owing to differences in natural talent. More positively stated, when the difference principle is in effect, everyone and in particular the least advantaged group shares in the benefits that flow from the diversity of talents in the population.

The difference principle treats the distribution of talents as a common asset in that it seeks to ensure that the variety in our talents works to the benefit of all, and in particular benefit the least well-off. It does not mandate a socially beneficial use of one's talents but does say that people can legitimately expect greater economic rewards from the use of their talents and abilities only if the use benefits the least well-off. The point of the difference principle is not to rail against the differences of natural endowments, or to eliminate them. The question of political morality is what to do with such differences, given their potentially large consequences for the fate of morally equal persons. The difference principle proposes an answer. In advancing the difference principle, Rawls urges, in effect, that you reject the idea that a market economy should be a kind of talent contest, designed to discover and reward the gifted. Instead, it should work as one part of a fair scheme of cooperation, and ensure a reasonable life for all members, understood as free and equal persons. 'In justice as fairness', Rawls says, 'men agree to share one another's fate. In designing institutions, they undertake to avail themselves of the accidents of nature and social circumstance only when doing so is for the common benefit'.

Third, the large ambition of justice as fairness is to effect a 'reconciliation of liberty and equality'—to bring elements of both liberal and egalitarian political thought

NOTES

together into a single coherent political philosophy. To see, consider how the two principles work in combination. Assume first that what matters to people is not only to have legally protected liberties, but for those liberties be valuable: for them to be worth something. Assume, second, that the value of a person's liberty is importantly determined by the resources available to that person for using the liberty. In particular, assume that the worth or value of my liberties to me is an increasing function of the resources over which I exercise control: as my command of resources increases, I can do more with my liberties.

Now put the two principles together: the first ensures equal basic liberties; the second guarantees that the minimum level of resources is maximized. If the worth of a person's liberty—its value to the person—is an increasing function of the level of his/her resources, then by maximizing the minimum level of resources, you also maximize the minimum worth of liberty. Thus, the two principles together require that society 'maximize the worth to the least advantaged of the complete scheme of equal liberty shared by all'. Maximizing the minimum worth of liberty 'defines', Rawls says, 'the end of social justice'.

It may be argued that Rawls' theory does meet the criteria for a theory of economic justice since it does propose to regulate distributive arrangements in society by an ethical principle. This argument cannot be sustained because Rawls places a severe limit to the amount of redistribution of income allowed by his ethical norm. This limit is dictated by the market economy. His ethical principle of distributive justice prescribes that transfers of income from the rich to the poor should not reach a point at which 'greater taxes interfere so much with economic efficiency that the prospects of the least advantaged in the present generation are no longer improved but begin to decline'.

2. Robert Nozick

Robert Nozick (November 16, 1938–January 23, 2002) was an American political philosopher, most prominent in the 1970s and 1980s. He was a professor at Harvard University. Robert Nozick was one of the principal advocates of libertarianism, which is one of the contemporary version of liberalism. Nozick was born in Brooklyn, the son of a Jewish entrepreneur from the Russian shtetl whose name was Cohen. Nozick was married to the poet Gjertrud Schnackenberg. He died in 2002 after a prolonged struggle with cancer. He was educated at Columbia where he studied with Sidney Morgenbesser, did his Ph.D. at Princeton and studied at Oxford as a Fulbright Scholar.

Robert Nozick's major works included: *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974), *Philosophical Explanations* (1981), *The Examined Life* (1989), *The Nature of Rationality* (1993/1995), *Socratic Puzzles* (1997), *Invariances: The Structure of the Objective World*. His other works involved decision theory and epistemology. He is best known for his book *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974), a libertarian answer to John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* (1971). It is widely seen as one of the most important contemporary works of political philosophy, and it has had a profound influence upon New Right theories and beliefs.

Nozick's *Anarchy, State, and Utopia* (1974), which received a National Book Award, argues among other things that a distribution of goods is just if brought about by free exchange among consenting adults and from a just starting position, even if large inequalities subsequently emerge from the process.

Nozick appealed to the Kantian idea that people should be treated as ends (what he termed 'separateness of persons'), not merely as a means to some other end. Nozick here challenges the partial conclusion of John Rawls's Second Principle of Justice of his

NOTES

A Theory of Justice that 'social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are to be of greatest benefit to the least-advantaged members of society'.

Anarchy, State and Utopia claims a heritage from John Locke's Second Treatise on Government and tries to base itself upon a natural law doctrine. Locke only relied on natural law as God-given to counteract the King of England's claim to divine right and thus claim to all the property of England. Nozick suggested, again as a critique of utilitarianism, that the sacrosanctity of life made property rights non-negotiable. This principle has served as a foundation for many libertarian pitches into modern politics. Most controversially, Nozick argued that a consistent upholding of the libertarian non-aggression principle would allow and regard as valid consensual/non-coercive enslavement contracts between adults. He rejected the notion of inalienable rights advanced by most other libertarian academics, writing in Anarchy, State and Utopia that the typical notion of a 'free system' would allow adults to voluntarily enter into non-coercive slave contracts.

Nozick various books, The Examined Life (1989), pitched to a broader public, explores love, death, faith, reality and meaning of life. The Nature of Rationality (1993), presents a theory of practical reason that attempts to embellish notoriously spartan classical decision theory. Socratic Puzzles (1997) is a collection of papers that range in topic from Ayn Rand and Austrian economics to animal rights, while his last production, Invariances (2001), applies insights from physics and biology to questions of objectivity in such areas as the nature of necessity and moral value.

He developed a form of libertarianism that was close to Locke's and clearly influenced by nineteenth-century US individualists such as Spooner and Tucker. He argued that property rights should be strictly upheld, provided that wealth has been justly acquired in the first place or has been justly transferred from one person to this position it means support for minimal government and minimal taxation and it undermines the case for welfare and redistribution. Nozick's rights-based theory of justice was developed in response to the ideas of John Rawls.

Libertarianism treats liberty of the individual as its central concern. But it focuses on formal liberty and insists on minimal role of the state in economic activities of individuals. It regards the right to property as an important ingredient of individual liberty. It is largely opposed to the idea of welfare state. This perspective is chiefly represented by Nozick's theory of justice. Libertarianism differs from other right-wing theories in its claim that redistributive taxation is inherently wrong, a violation of peoples' rights. People have right to dispose freely of their goods and services, and they have this right whether or not it is the best way to ensure productivity. Put another way, government has no right to interfere in the market, even in order to increase efficiency. As Robert Nozick puts it, 'Individuals have rights, and there are things which no person or group may do to them (without violating their rights). So strong and far-reaching are these rights that they raise the question of what, if anything, the state and its officials may do'. As people have a right to dispose of their holdings as they see fit, government interference is equivalent to forced labour—a violation, not of efficiency, but of our basic moral rights.

A libertarian is critical of liberal idea of justice—utilitarian and contractual and bases his conception of justice on the ideal of liberty. Nozick's entitlement theory of justice provides a powerful philosophical defence of the libertarian position of the minimal state. The entitlement theory is proposed as a critique and an alternate model to Rawls' theory. It is purely a procedural theory of distributive justice, which defends whatever arises from a just situation by just steps is itself just.

NOTES

In his book Anarchy State and Utopia, Nozick sought to advance an alternative to Rawls, theory of justice. While Rawls sought to moderate his libertarianism by a modicum of egalitarianism and communitarianism, Nozick stuck to libertarianism in its pure form. Rawls may be termed as left liberal or egalitarian liberal advocating a substantially redistributive welfare state. But Nozick can be termed as right liberal or libertarian who is the ardent advocate of a laissez-faire 'night watchman' state. Nozick wrote, 'our main conclusions about the state are that a minimal state, limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts and so on, is justified: that any more extensive state will violate a person's rights not to be forced to do certain things, and is unjustified; and that the minimal state is inspiring as well as right'.

Robert Nozick's version of libertarian theory of justice has three aspects: principle of justice in original justification or acquisition, in transfer and of rectification of unjust holdings. The first principle sets the conditions for creation of property. The second of its passage from one owner to another and the third for remedies in case any of the other two are violated. Various aspects of Robert Nozick's theory need more elaboration, which is as follows:

- **Modes of acquisition:** Nozick has criticized John Rawls, approach, which seeks to determine the principle of distribution of certain goods as if they have come to us as a gift from heaven. Nozick has adopted a realistic approach, which stood account for the different modes of acquisition of goods and entitlement of different individuals to own those goods. According to Nozick, there are three sources through which an individual acquires various goods. These sources are as follows:
 - o **By themselves:** Nozick points out that individuals have absolute right over them. An individual is free to use his limbs and brain to do whatever he likes.
 - o **By the natural world:** Individuals may acquire bits of the natural world through several methods and may become entitled to their use as they like. This is precisely the area where principles of entitlement are required to be determined according to logic.
 - o **By applying themselves to the natural world:** An individual's entitlement to the products achieved by natural world may not be questioned. Voluntary transfer of these goods will establish others entitlement to them.
- **Principle of entitlement:** Nozick's entitlement theory regards social distribution of goods as just it is generated by processes that are just, succinctly summed up as 'from each as they chose, to each as they are chosen'. People's entitlement to self-ownership of their body and mind—their physical and mental faculty is obvious, which needs no further justification. Their entitlement to bits of the natural world and the products of their labour should be based on the principles of justice. More precisely, there are three main principles of Nozick's 'entitlement theory':
 - o **A principle of just initial acquisition:** It is an account of how people come to own the things initially, which can be transferred.
 - o **A principle of transfer:** Whatever is justly acquired can be freely transferred.
 - o **A principle of rectification of injustice:** How to deal with holdings if they were unjustly acquired or transferred.
- **Initial acquisition:** Those who come to settle in an uninhabited continent may legitimately acquire its land and natural resources on the first come first served

NOTES

basis, as long as no body is made worse off by their doing so. This means that this mode of acquisition should not result in creating scarcity for others—a condition, which may scarcely be satisfied. This is similar to the condition spelled out in John Locke's *Second Treaties of Government* (1690) in the case of similar acquisitions, viz. as long as enough and as good is left for others. The historical answer is often that natural resources came to be someone's property by force. According to Nozick, the use of force makes acquisition illegitimate, so current title is illegitimate. Hence, those who currently possess scarce resources have no right to deprive others of access to them—e.g. capitalists are not entitled to deprive workers of access to the products or profits of the existing means of production.

- **Voluntary transfer:** This principle applies to all property whether acquired through initial acquisition or by mixing one's labour with the natural world, i.e., by means of ones talents, efforts, enterprise etc. in a market situation. In other words, if I use others' labour and pay them as per market rates. I become owner of the product of their labour. This must be based on voluntary contract, without force or fraud. In all such transactions, an individual shall be treated as 'end-in-itself', and not as a means to others' ends. This is similar to the moral principle enunciated by Emanuel Kant, a German philosopher. Hence, a contract through which an individual sells himself or any other individual to slavery will be void.

- **Rectification:** This principle is related to the idea where the state or the international community will be justified to intervene in order to restore justice. Nozick concedes that the history of the world abounds with voluntary transfers as well as unjust acquisitions of natural resources. As long as economic disparities result from voluntary transfers, Nozick is not bothered. But if some country has gained control over rare natural resources depriving others of their legitimate share, Nozick would step in to register his protest. If the inventor of the cure of a dreaded disease like cancer demand exorbitant charges from his patients, there is nothing wrong in this deal for Nozick, because he does not make any body worse off by treating his patients. But if there is a single source of water which is needed by all human beings, nobody has the right to take it in his control.

The conclusion of Nozick's entitlement theory is that a minimal state, which is limited to the narrow functions of protection against force, theft, fraud, enforcement of contracts, and so on, is justified. A more extensive state will violate persons' rights and will forced them to do certain things, and is unjustified. Hence, there will be no public education, no public health care transportation, roads, or parks. All of these will involve the coercive taxation of some people against their will, violating the principle 'from each as they choose, to each as they were chosen.'

Rawls and Nozick differ on the question of which rights are most important in treating people as ends in themselves. To oversimplify, you can say that for Rawls, one of the most important rights is to have a right to a certain share of society's resources. For Nozick, on the other hand, the most important rights are rights over oneself—the rights which constitute 'self-ownership'. In his book *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, Nozick wrote in the first sentence that individuals have rights, and there are things which no individual or group can do to them (without violating these rights), which can be termed as the heart of his theory. He further said that say society must respect these rights because they 'reflect the underlying Kantian principle that individuals are ends and not merely means. They may not be sacrificed or used for achieving other ends without their consent.'

NOTES

6.2.2 Communitarianism

The term community stands for a form of society whose members are informed by the 'community spirit' or 'a sense of community'. It denotes a 'network of relationships' which are characterized by intimacy and durability. It may be distinguished from 'association', which is based on impersonal and contractual relations. Liberal theory equates society with 'association', whereas communitarian theory equates society with 'community' to determine the nature and extent of social obligation. Communitarians argue that an individual cannot assure full development of his personality unless he is committed to the spirit of community toward his fellow-beings.

Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration; there are no 'unencumbered selves'. Although it is clearly at odds with liberal individualism, communitarianism has a variety of political forms. Left-wing communitarianism holds that community demands unrestricted freedom and social equality (the view of anarchism). Centrist communitarianism holds that community is grounded in an acknowledgement of reciprocal rights and responsibilities (the perspective of Tory paternalism and social democracy). Right-wing communitarianism holds that community requires respect for authority and established values (the view of the New Right). Communitarianism is a contemporary philosophy. It marks a departure from the philosophy of liberalism because it places the relation between an individual and society in a new perspective. The communitarianism repudiates the picture of the self-implied in the liberal theory. Liberal theory implied an unencumbered detached from pre-existing social form, as exemplified by the concept of possessive individualism. It postulates that an individual is the sole proprietor of his own person or capacities for he owes nothing to society. Such a view denies his commitment to other individuals, traditions, practices and conception of the good. It holds that self is prior to its ends. It is fully competent to choose its ends as well as its roles and dispositions. In contrast to this 'atomistic' view of individual, communitarianism advances the concept of situated self, as constituted by social role, practices and situations, in other words, communitarianism holds that an agent's identity is constituted by specific commitments to his social situations.

While liberalism insists on 'liberty' of individual, his interest and rights, communitarianism focuses on his social identity and upholds acceptance of 'authority' because it expresses our common will or reflects our common identity, our shared values and believes. It is significant to note that liberalism had one liberty of the individual but atomistic view of society held by liberalism let to the erosion of the sense of responsibility and the moral standards attached thereto. Communitarianism seeks to restore that sense of responsibility and reconstruct moral standards on that basis.

A major critique of contemporary Anglo-American liberalism—certainly the critique that resonates most in East Asia—has been termed 'communitarianism'. The basic themes of the communitarian critique have a long history, but modern day communitarianism began in the upper reaches of Anglo-American academia in the form of a critical reaction to John Rawls' landmark 1971 book *A Theory of Justice*. Drawing primarily upon the insights of Aristotle and Hegel, political philosophers such as Alasdair MacIntyre, Michael Sandel, Charles Taylor and Michael Walzer disputed Rawls' assumption that the principal task of government is to secure and distribute fairly the liberties and economic resources that individuals need to lead freely chosen lives. These critics of liberal theory never identified themselves with the 'communitarian movement'

NOTES

(the 'communitarian' label was pinned on them by others, usually critics), much less offer a grand communitarian theory as a systematic alternative to liberalism. Nonetheless, certain core arguments meant to contrast with liberalism's devaluation of community recur in the works of the four theorists named above, and for purposes of clarity one can distinguish between claims of three sorts: 'ontological' or 'metaphysical' claims about the social nature of the self, methodological claims about the importance of tradition and social context for moral and political reasoning and normative claims about the value of community. Each strand of the debate has largely evolved from fairly abstract philosophical disputes to more concrete political concerns that may have motivated much of the communitarian critique in the first place.

Communitarian accounts of the ontology of the self were rejected by early liberal critics as internally contradictory, but they are now widely accepted as essential to most forms of liberalism. Retrospectively, this communitarian-liberal 'merger' makes sense, because close textual analysis shows that every argument made by the major communitarian philosophers was, in fact, political—not metaphysical. To wit, all of the communitarians' arguments led to the conclusion that communitarianism would provide a firmer political grounding for the liberal ideal of equal individual freedom than was offered by the individualist ontologies. *The Politics of Communitarianism and the Emptiness of Liberalism* traces this political mode of philosophizing to the British New Left that shaped Alasdair MacIntyre and Charles Taylor; and to the threat to Rawlsian liberalism represented by Robert Nozick, against whom both Michael Sandel (Taylor's student) and Michael Walzer were arguing.

Communitarianism points to the shortcomings of liberalism and attempts to redefine the relation between an individual and the community. Liberalism promotes individualism to focus on individual freedom, which undermines an individual's affinity with the community. Liberals base their theories on notions of individual rights and personal freedom, but neglect the extent to which individual freedom and wellbeing are only possible within community. Once, you recognize the dependence of human beings on society, then your obligations to sustain the common good of society are as weighty as your rights to individual liberty. Hence, communitarians argue, the liberal 'politics of rights' should be abandoned or at least supplemented by, a 'politics of the common good'.

When every individual turns to seek his own good, no one is emotionally attached to anyone. An individual would manage to have many means of comfort at the expense of his emotional security. In other words, if an individual devotes himself to the pursuit of self-interest, he cannot secure good life in the fullest sense of the term. Communitarians hold that only community is capable of realizing the common good.

6.3 MARXISM

Karl Heinrich Marx was born on 5 March 1818 in the predominantly Catholic city of Trier in the Rhineland province of Prussia in a Jewish family. His father was a moderately well-to-do lawyer. His parents were descendants of a long line of Jewish rabbis. His father was a rabbi in Trier who became protestant Christian when Marx was six years old and his children were also baptized in that faith. This was a nominal conversion for his parents but for Marx it became ultimately a deep intellectual and emotional rebirth. Marx not only ceased to be a Jew but he also became bitterly anti-semitic and charged Judaism with many of the inequities cited against by the Jew-baiting Nazis of

Check Your Progress

1. What are the ideas liberals usually promote?
2. Who has written *The American Presidency*?
3. State the definition of communitarianism.

NOTES

the Third Reich. Indeed, one of the sore trials of Marx's life was the fact that the cast of his countenance was so characteristically Hebraic that he could never be mistaken for anything but a Jew. According to M. Rubel in his book, *Karl Marx*, *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences*, it was the consciousness of Marx's Jewish background that heightened his awareness about 'his sense of marginality, his ambivalence toward society, and eventually of his conflicting qualities – thinker and prophet, scientists and moralist'.

When Marx was seventeen years of age in 1835, he began studying law at the University of Bonn. However, he soon abandoned the study of law in favour of philosophy, the study of which he pursued at the University of Berlin and Jena in 1836. He changed his course to philosophy under the influence of the young Hegelians. He became an active member of 'young Hegelian' while he was a student but soon shifted his interest to humanism and ultimately to scientific socialism. He was also influenced by some of the major movements of his times.

During his formative years, the idea of evolution was very much in the air in one form or the other. One of the versions of it was articulated by Hegel (*Evolution of Absolute Idea or Spirit*) while another version was propounded by Charles Darwin in his famous book *Origin of Species*. Though Marx, accepted some of the themes propounded by these writers, he also rejected many. He offered an alternative theory of historical evolution which is called the theory of dialectical materialism. He also had polemical arguments with many of his contemporaries, which include Proudhon and Bakunin, and various socialist groups.

He completed his doctorate in philosophy in 1841. The accession of Wilhelm IV in 1840 sealed Marx's prospects of an academic career. Marx fell in love with his childhood sweetheart, Jenny, daughter of Baron Ludwig von Westphalen, his spiritual guide since his adolescence. He married her in 1843 after a seven year period of courtship. Following this, he was unable to secure a University appointment as a teacher. So he joined the staff of the *Rheinnische Zeitung*, a democratic newspaper in Cologne. The following year, the paper was suppressed by the Prussian Government, and Marx went to Paris.

In Paris, he met Proudhon, the leading French socialist thinker, Bakunin, the Russian anarchist, and Friedrich Engels, who soon became his lifelong companion and close collaborator. According to W. Ebenstein in his book, *Great Political Thinkers—Plato to the Present*, Engels was the first to draw the attention of Marx to England as a laboratory in which industrial capitalism could be accurately observed.

In 1844, while Marx was in Paris, he became interested in the working class movement and political economy. During that period, Marx and Engels began working on the *German Ideology* (1847). Marx was expelled from France in 1845 by the intervention of the Prussian Government, following which he went to Brussels. It was there that Marx with the aid of Engels composed the most influential of all his writings *The Communist Manifesto*. In the revolutions of 1848, in France and Germany, he actively participated, and as early as 1849, he was expelled again by the Prussian Government.

In the late summer of 1849, he went to London where he became a permanent resident for the rest of his life. In 1848, Marx and Engels helped in the founding of the Communist League, which existed till 1950. Marx worked and studied in the museum from 1850–1860. In September 1864, Marx was an active member in the formation of the International Working Men's Association in London. The organization has since been called the first international and it continued in existence with annual

NOTES

meetings until about 1862, when its headquarters were transferred from London to New York where it soon died. Then Marx devoted himself exclusively to research and writing.

Shortly after, he moved to London, where he began contributing articles on the German situation to the *New York Herald Tribune*. According to P. Johnson, in his book, *Intellectuals*, Marx was helped financially by Engels. He lived a life of poverty. Three of his six children died of want and his own health did not remain well. Jenny died in 1881. She helped him a lot by editing many of Marx's scripts and preparing them for publication. Karl Marx died on March 14, 1883.

6.3.1 Theory of Alienation

The theory of alienation is one of the most original contributions of Marx to political philosophy. It is the work of young Marx which remained unpublished during his lifetime. It was discovered from the archives of German Social Democrats (1927) and later published as *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts* (1844). It can be distinguished from Marx's later works which are characterized by scientific rigour. According to O.P. Gauba in his book, *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Marx's early works contain his humanist thought of communism, and focus on the concepts of alienation and freedom. They also expose the dehumanizing effect of capitalism.

Marx's theory of alienation was derived directly from German philosopher G.W.H. Hegel, though its roots can be traced back to much earlier times. Alienation, for Hegel, consisted in man's failure to realize that the world was not external to spirit. When man saw this, they would become free and this freedom has been realized in history. Marx's main criticism of Hegel was that man's alienation would not end with the hypothetical abolition of the external world. The external world was, in fact, part of man's nature and only the establishment of the right relationship between man and his environment could put an end to the condition of alienation.

Marx thus rejected the idealist notion of spirit and substituted its supposed antithesis to the external world by the real antithesis between man engaged in alienated labour and his social self, eager to achieve fulfilment through creative work under conditions of freedom.

In his early writings, Marx discussed several forms of alienation, ranging from religious alienation to philosophical, political and economic categories of alienation. As labour was man's most significant activity, economic aspects of alienation were regarded by Marx as more important than its ideological and political aspects. In the religious forms of alienation, gods have usurped man's position. Religion serves the dual purpose of a compensation for suffering and a projection of man's hopes and desires. Marx believed that the abolition of religion as the elusory happiness is the demand for their true happiness.

Philosophy too could constitute a form of alienation. Speculative philosophy reduced history and man to a mental process, and replacing God by the Absolute was no better than secularized theology. Marx analysed the form of political alienation in a similar manner. The state, he said, contained a true description of human nature, but at the same time, it deprived man of the opportunity of achieving it. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx analysed the economic aspects of alienation.

The members of the proletariat were obviously the most alienated section of capitalist society. Marx, however, applied the concept of alienation to all social cases including capitalists.

NOTES

Marx defined human freedom as the absence of man's alienated condition. For him, alienation and freedom were historical negations. Man expresses his humanity through productive labour which can be of economic, social, artistic, literary or scientific nature. Man as a subject transforms the material objects around him to express his creative capacities. In capitalist society, man's productive activity is deformed in such a way as to cause his alienation and estrangement. In *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts*, Marx mentioned four aspects of estrangement: alienation from the product of work, from the work itself, from one's fellow-beings and from human species – life. Estrangement or alienation is a radical loss of freedom because it is the negation of free genuinely human creative activity.

This concept can be divided as follows:

- First, according to Marx, the worker in the capitalist mode of production does not own or control the products of his own labour. The proletariat does not use the life wealth which he creates. Thus, he is alienated from his own product. The life which he has given to the object sets itself against him as an alien force. The labourer himself becomes a commodity whose value is equal to the bare means of his subsistence. The capitalist, on the other hand, who purchases the labour power of the proletariat is the real owner of the wealth which he creates.
- Second, Marx affirms that the alien relationship of the worker to the products of his labour is only a manifestation of the alienated nature of the productive activity itself. The labourer who sells his labour-power for a wage, produces commodities under orders from the capitalist. His work is, therefore, neither free nor voluntary because he does not satisfy any creative urge of his own by working in a factory owned and managed by his bourgeois employer. The bourgeois institutions of private property reduce him to the status of a wage-slave. Human beings lost the ability to see their own products for what they were, and were willing to be enslaved by them. This was what Marx meant by commodity fetishism.
- Third, alienated labour results in the estrangement of the proletariat from his fellow-being. It results in the hostility between the employed and unemployed workers who look upon each other as alien force. The workers similarly see in the manager and the proprietor alien forces profiting from his alienated work. The basis of genuine social relation is thus totally destroyed in capitalism.
- Fourth, the three given aspects of man's alienation show his engagement with others of his species. The egoistic, self-centred existence of the estranged proletariat alienates him from man's entire cultural heritage.

As Marx pointed out, the oppressed members of the working class are scarcely aware of the artistic, scientific, literary and other achievements of the human race. They lack the capacity to understand and enjoy these beautiful and valuable gifts of human creativity. Man is, thus, cut off from the history of his own species. By dehumanizing his existence, man becomes a slave to his own alienated activity. What is true of the worker is equally applicable to those who live parasitically on appropriations of the product of estranged labour. The capitalist, who rides on the backs of the proletariat, also leads an alienated life because he is also not personally engaged in any creative work and is a victim of the fetishization of the commodities.

Thus, it is the division of labour with all its effects, private ownership of the means of production and the products of labour, fetishism of commodities, the power of money, state, church and other institutions confronting the individual as alien forces, which produce

NOTES

- Individual spirit which desired happiness and provided energy.
- World spirit which strived for higher freedom that came with the knowledge of the self.

However, though Marx agreed with Hegel that there was a constant movement in the dialectical process, he believed that 'matter' and not the 'idea' was the essence of the universe; and the social institutions were the manifestation of changing material conditions. Matter undergoes the dialectical process because of its inherent tensions, until perfect material conditions, exemplified by a 'rational mode of production', come into existence. Marx emphasized the real rather than the ideal, the social rather than the intellectual, matter rather than mind. For Marx, the key idea was not the history of philosophy, but the history of economic production and the social relation that accompanied it.

Marx acknowledged Hegel's great contributions, which was to recognize world history as a process, as constant motion, change, transformation and development, and to understand the internal connection between the movement and its development. From Hegel, he also learned that various angles of the developmental process could not be studied in isolation, but in their relations with one another and with the process as a whole. Hegel applied dialectics to the realm of ideas. However, Marx as a materialist believed that consciousness was determined by life, and not the other way round.

Unlike the latent conservatism and idealism of Hegelian philosophy, Marxism rejected the status quo – capitalism – as intolerable. Social circumstances socially changed, with no social system lasting forever. Capitalism arose under certain historical circumstances, which would disappear in due course of time. Thus, Marx, like Hegel, continued to believe that dialectics was a powerful tool. It offered a law of social development, and in that sense, Marx's social philosophy was a philosophy of history like Hegel's.

Engels, in his book, *Anti-Duhring* (1878), postulated three laws of material dialectics or dialectical materialism, which are as follows:

- Transformation of quantity into quality and vice versa.
- Interpretation of opposites.
- Negation of negations.

These principles signify the process of resolving contradictions of material conditions of human life which pave the way for social progress. Class conflict is also a manifestation of this process.

Karl Marx does not systematically explain his theory of dialectical materialism anywhere in his works. However, he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical and not mechanical. In mechanical materialism, evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of their environment. In dialectical materialism, evolution is the development of matter from within, environment helping or hindering, but neither originating the evolutionary process, nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal. Motion, to the dialectical materialism, is the mode of existence of matter. The ultimate reality in matter is motion.

Moreover, this is a dialectical process, the reconciliation of opposing movements in an endless effort to achieve a more perfect harmony. Matter to the dialectical materialist is active, not passive, and moves by an inner necessity of its nature. It contains within itself the energy necessary to transform it. Matter is self-moving or self-determining.

NOTES

The universe is self-sufficient, self-creating and self-perpetuating. Hegel explained the dialectical process as the activity of God in the world, Marx borrows the 'energy' from Hegel's immanent God in the world, dissociates it from God and locates it in matter itself.

The dialectical materialism is more interested in motion than in matter, in a vital energy within matter invariably deriving it towards perfect society, just as Hegel's demi-urge drove forward to the perfect realization of spirit. According to Sukhbir Singh in his book, *History of Political Thought: Bentham to Present Day*, Engel said, 'The dialectical method grasps things and their images, ideas, essentially in their sequence, their movement, their birth and death'.

Historical Materialism

According to O.P. Gauba in *An Introduction to Political Theory*, while dialectical materialism represents the philosophical bases of Marxism, historical materialism represents its scientific basis. It implies that in any given epoch, the economic relations of society – the means whereby men and women undertake production, distribution and exchange of material goods for the satisfaction of their needs – play an important role, in shaping their social, political, intellectual and ethical relationships. Marx applied dialectics to the material or social world consisting of economic production and exchange. A study of the productive process explained all other historical phenomena.

Marx noted that each generation inherited a mass of productive forces, an accumulation of capital and a set of social relations which reflected these productive forces. The new generation modified these forces, but at the same time, these forces prescribed certain forms of life, and shaped human character and thought in distinct ways. The mode of production and exchange was the final cause of all social changes and political revolutions. Marx considered matter as being active, capable of changing from within. It was not passive, needing an external stimulus for change, a conception found in Hobbes.

The Marxian interpretation of human history is economic. Marx saw evolutionary changes in the ethical, religious, social, economic and political ideas, and institutions of mankind. According to him, institutions and ideas, and therefore, actions are subject to endless change. The chief motive force which brings about this change in human beings is not the Hegelian idea but the material conditions of life. Human history, therefore, has a material basis.

The Marxist perspective postulates that the structure of society may be understood in terms of its base (the foundation) and superstructure (the external build-up). The base consists of the mode of production while the superstructure is represented by its legal and political structure, religion, morals, social practices, literature, art and culture, etc. The mode of production has two components—forces of production and relations of production. Forces of production cannot remain static; they have an inherent tendency of development in the direction of achieving the perfect society.

Forces of production have two components—means of production (tools and equipment) and labour power (human knowledge and skills). Men and women constantly endeavour to devise better ways of production. Improvement in the means of production is manifested in the development of technology. This is matched by development of human knowledge and skills as required to operate the new technology. Hence, there is the corresponding development of labour power. On the other hand, relations of production

NOTES

in any given epoch are given by the pattern of ownership of means of social production. This gives rise to two containing classes – haves and have-nots.

According Gauba's *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Marx talked of four stages of human history—ancient times, medieval times, modern times and future society based on communism. In earlier stages of historical development, development of the forces of production fails to make any dent in the pattern of ownership. In other words, changes in the mode of production bring about changes in the nature of contending classes but they do not bring about an end of the class conflict. Change in the nature of contending classes is itself brought about by a social revolution. When material productive forces of society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, these relations turn into their fetters.

The new social class which comes to own new means of production, feels constrained by these fetters and overthrows the old dominant class in a revolution. As a result of social revolution, an old social formation is replaced by a new social formation. In this process, world contending classes are replaced by new contending classes but class conflict continues on a new plan. This has been the case till the rise of capitalism, which will be overthrown by a socialist revolution leading to the eventual emergence of classless society.

Marx, in his analysis of history, mentioned the important role of ideology in perpetuating false consciousness among people, and demarcated the stages which were necessary for reaching the goal of communism. In that sense, both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat were performing their historically destined roles. In spite of the deterministic interpretation of history, the individual had to play a very important role within the historical limits of his time, and actively hasten the process.

Marx had a very powerful moral content in his analysis, and asserted that the progress was not merely inevitable, but would usher in a perfect society free of alienation, exploitation and deprivation. His materialistic conception of history emphasizes the practical side of human activity, rather than speculative thought as the moving force of history.

The State of Revolution

Marx critically dissected the Hegelian theory of the modern state and its institutions in his *Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right* (1843). According to Marx, Hegel's separation of civil society and the state was only relevant in his perception of a particular historical context. The state was not eternal. It would eventually disappear. Marx contended that the state was not 'a march of God on Earth' as Hegel described, but an instrument of the dominant economic class exploiting and oppressing the other sections of society. Marx rejected the dichotomy between civil society and the state in Hegelian philosophy, and concluded that the state and bureaucracy did not represent universal interests.

Marxism advocated the class perspective of the state. It is different from the mechanistic theory as well as from the organic theory of the state. It treats the state neither as a 'natural institution' nor as an 'ethical institution' as the organic theory has held. It, of course, treats the state as an artificial device, but unlike the mechanistic theory, it treats the state neither as a manifestation of the will of the people, nor as an instrument of reconciliation of conflicting interests. According to the class theory, the state comes into existence when society is divided into two antagonistic classes, one owning the means of social production and the other being constrained to live on its labour.

NOTES

In other words, it is the emergence of 'private property' that divides society into two conflicting classes. Gauba, in his book *An Introduction to Political Theory*, says that those owning the means of production acquire the power to dominate the other class not only in the economic sphere but in all spheres of life.

In an antagonistic class society, the state is a political instrument, 'a machine for maintaining the rule of one class over another'. The economically dominant class that possessed the means of production, acquires a powerful instrument for the subjection of the oppressed and exploited in the state. The state has a clearly defined class character. According to Sakhbir Singh's *History of Political Thought: Bentham to Present Day*, being the principal component of the superstructure founded on the economic basis of society, the state takes every measure to strengthen and protect this basis.

With the emergence of 'private property', society is divided into 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes. The dominant class, in order to maintain its stronghold on economic power, invents a new form of power – political power. The state is the embodiment of political power. It is, therefore, essentially subservient to economic power. Thus, according to the class theory, the state neither originates in the will of the people, nor does it stand for the benefit of all society, but is an instrument devised by a dominant class for its own benefit. It is imposed on society from above to serve the interest of a particular

The state has not existed from eternity. It came into existence at a particular stage of historical development. It is a product of the conscious effort of the dominant class which first acquires the means of production and thereafter political power. The state is therefore, by no means, a natural institution as the organic theory has maintained.

In his book, *An Introduction to Political Theory*, Gauba further says that Marx also observes that at a later stage, the means of production are somewhat developed, that is, when the hunting, fishing and food-gathering economy is replaced by an economy based on animal husbandry, domestic agriculture and small industry. There is 'surplus production' which is cornered by a class owning the means of production. As a result, 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes come into existence. The structure of society is always determined by the prevalent form of production. The hand-mill gives you society with the feudal lord; the steam-mill gives you society with the industrial capitalist. The attitudes and outlook of society – the legal, political and intellectual relations as well as the religious and social systems are also determined by the material conditions of life. This means that whatever the form of the state, it is invariably an instrument of the dominant class.

Bourgeois ideologists had pictured the state as some kind of supernatural force given to man by providence since time immemorial. Such a theory of the state solved to justify the privileges of the bourgeois and the existence of exploitation and capitalism. In contrast to bourgeois ideologists, Marx has demonstrated that the state is not something introduced into society from outside, but is a product of society's internal development. The state was brought into being by changes in material production. The succession of one mode of production by another causes a change in the state system.

According to Marx, the state has not always existed. Primitive society which had no private property and no classes had no state either. Naturally, there were certain social functions, but they were performed by men chosen by the entire society which had the right to dismiss these people at any time and to appoint others. However, the further times, relations between people were regulated by public opinion. Private development of productive force led to the disintegration of primitive society. Private property appeared, accompanied by classes – slaves and slave-owners. It became

NOTES

Social Revolution

On the basis of scientific analysis of the system of capitalism, Marx had declared that a social revolution was inevitable. Revolution was certain to come, because the forces of discontent would eventually accumulate and break through all obstacles. Marx had no doubt about it but the questions remained as to how it would come and what would follow. For these questions, Marx had definite answers. The proletariat must organize for political action and make revolution. *Communist Manifesto* declared that all the presiding classes that got the upper hand sought to fortify their already acquired status by subjecting society at large to their conditions of appropriation.

The proletarians cannot become masters of the productive forces of society, except by abolishing their previous mode of appropriation. They have nothing of their own to secure and fortify. All previous historical movements were movements of minorities or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority. Therefore, the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of ruling class, to win the battle of democracy.

According to Marx, social progress would have to come about through a violent struggle between classes. By progress, Marx meant the expansion of the productive capacity of both society and individual human beings. This would ultimately lead to greater freedom and equalities and to the realization of man's capacity. Marx observed the dramatic conflict of classes intensified during a period of social upheaval reached its climax in a political revolution. The fundamental cause of any revolution was the desire and endeavour of a subject class to capture the state power from the ruling class by force; and to reorganize the state apparatus to suit its own specific needs.

A successful revolution would remove those social, economic and political institutions which obstruct the development of the class for whose benefit the revolution has been carried out. Marx has developed this general prognosis of class conflict and general and specific causes of revolution in such works as *The German Ideology*, *The Communist Manifesto* and *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. When Marx discussed the revolution, he enriched his general theory with a wealth of empirical facts. In his *Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*, Marx produced a masterpiece of contemporary French revolutionary history, taking account the complexities of the revolutionary events, wherein a multitude of classes interacted changing continuously their alignments. Moreover, Marx clearly recognized the crucial role played by individuals in promoting or thwarting the course of revolution.

The Marxist Theory of Revolution is the consequence and the concentrated expression of Marx's view of historical development, that is, to say of the sequence of social formation in history. He saw the driving force of social development in the historical tendency towards establishing property relations which corresponded to the level of development and character of the technique used for production during a particular period. Marx found the key to understand the sequence of the various modes of production in the law of motion, which was activated by social classes whose interest coincided with the developing tendency. For Marx, social revolution is an ongoing process in which causes and effects are dialectically related.

According to E. Fischer, in *Marx in his Own Words*, Marx said, 'in the social production of their life, men enter into definite relation that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of

NOTES

development of their material productive forces.At a certain stage of their development the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or what is but a legal expression for the same thing – with the property relation within which they have been at work hitherto. From forms of development of the productive forces relations turn into their fetters. Then begins an epoch of social revolution'.

D. Molellan, in his book, *Karl Marx-Early Text*, quotes Marx who observed, 'what is the basis of a partial, purely political revolution? It is that a part of civil society emancipates itself and attains universal domination, that a particular class undertake the general emancipation of the society from its particular situations. This class frees the whole of society but only under the pre-supposition that the whole of society is in the same situation as this class, that it possesses, or can equally acquire for example, money and education'.

Contradictions between the principles of the state and the real economic life of the citizens were characterized by Marx as a merely political revolution. All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movements were the self-conscious, independent movements in the interests of the immense majority. Thus, the radicalism of the revolution depended on the class that was instrumental in causing it. The proletariat alone could represent the interests of the society as a whole, a society in which the class struggle was so intensified and polarized as to promise its abolition through a social revolution. For Marx, the Paris Commune was the 'political form of human emancipation'.

It is necessary to remember that Marx emphasized the human causes of revolution. Marx, in his book *Progress of Philosophy*, said, 'Of all the instruments of production, the greatest productive force is the revolutionary class itself. The organization of the revolutionary elements as a class presupposes the existence of all the productive forces that could be endangered in the womb of old society'. But the proletariat had to undergo a massive transformation through its own education in the school of class struggle before it could become a fit agent of revolution. In the revolution, the proletariat will acquire the capacity of undertaking the task of socialist reconstruction.

The name that Marx gives to this activity is 'revolutionary praxis'. It embodies through a dialectical unity of theory and practice, the subjective and objective causes of revolution. He sums this up in his book *The German Ideology* in the following words, 'In revolutionary activity the changing of oneself coincides with the changing of circumstances'. It implied that the proletariat must become a class 'for itself' by developing class consciousness, which is a necessary cause and precondition of a successful revolution.

Marx did not believe in revolutionary prophecy. He did not go into detail concerning the exact nature strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution which he thought to be imminent. Concerning the possibility of a successful revolution, Marx adopted his view according to the historical situation in which he found himself. According to D. McLellan in *The Thought of Karl Marx*, Marx was very optimistic during the European revolution in 1848 but his hopes faded gradually thereafter except for a brief revival during the Paris Commune of 1871.

By 1851, Marx was convinced of the primacy of economic factors in determining the possibilities of revolution. His considered view about revolution now was that only a severe economic crisis caused by a falling rate of capitalist profits in a slump could

NOTES

precipitate it. The effective cause of revolution has to be located in economic situation and nowhere else, and new revolution is possible only as a consequence of a worsening trade cycle leading to increasing misery of the proletariat. It is just as certain as this crisis. Marx became so convinced of economic determinism of the revolutionary process at this stage that he was prepared to dissolve to *Communist League* when it appeared to be falling under the control of leaders who believed in attempting a revolution irrespective of the economic situation. During the next decade, he expected the capitalist crisis to breakout that would provoke a socialist revolution.

Marx's materialist view of history would indicate that it was most likely to breakout in the most advanced industrial countries like Britain, France or the United States. In D. McLellan's *The Thought of Karl Marx*, we see that in a letter to Engels in 1859, Marx mentioned that 'Revolution is imminent on the continent and will immediately assume a socialist character. Can it avoid being crushed in the small corner, because the moment of bourgeois society is in the ascendant over much larger areas of the earth?'. However, Marx also believed that in some underdeveloped countries such as Germany, a bourgeois revolution could spark a subsequent socialist revolution.

Later in his life, he came to believe that backward Russia might prove the starting point of a new European revolution, initially bourgeois but ultimately proletarian in character. Lenin implemented this Marx's theory of two-stage revolution in his own way in the Russian revolution in 1917 and Mao did the same in his own characteristic way in bringing about the Chinese revolution. While Marx generally regarded force as the midwife of the revolution, he conceded that socialism could come about as a culmination of a peaceful mass movement in some of the capitalist democracies.

Marx was opposed to the use of revolutionary terror as it weakened the cause of revolution. He strongly criticized the use of terror by the Jacobins in the French revolution. Physical force, however, as opposed to terror, was to Marx a perfectly acceptable revolutionary weapon provided the economic, social and political conditions were such as to make its use successful. It was also Marx's view that a successful revolution in one country could not be stabilized if it remained confined to the borders of a single country.

6.4 SUMMARY

- Laski was an English economist and political theorist whose ideas are well known in intellectual circles. John Rawls was a liberal democrat and a prolific writer who wrote on various topics of international relations.
- Liberals promote ideas like constitutionalism, liberal democracy, human rights, capitalism, free and fair elections and freedom of religion.
- The rebels in the American Revolution and the French Revolution freely used liberal philosophy to give good reason for the armed defeat of dictatorial rule.
- Laski traced the historical evolution of the theory and practice of liberalism and interpreted this evolution in economic terms.
- The idea of 'political liberalism' goes against the views of social contractualists like John Locke or John Stuart Mill, who promote a more robust cultural and metaphysical liberal consensus regardless of the 'deep' religious or metaphysical values that the parties appreciate.

Check Your Progress

4. Name the philosopher from which Marx borrowed his dialectical method.
5. Who has written *Anti-Duhring*?

NOTES

- Contemporary liberalism owes much to the classical as well as modern liberalist thinkers such as Locke, Kant and Mill.
- Libertarianism treats liberty of the individual as its central concern. But it focuses on formal liberty and insists on minimal role of the state in economic activities of individuals.
- A libertarian is critical of liberal idea of justice—utilitarian and contractual and bases his conception of justice on the ideal of liberty.
- The term community stands for a form of society whose members are informed by the 'community spirit' or 'a sense of community'. It denotes a 'network of relationships' which are characterized by intimacy and durability.
- Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration; there are no 'unencumbered selves'.
- The theory of alienation is one of the most original contributions of Marx to political philosophy. It is the work of young Marx which remained unpublished during his lifetime.
- In the *Theses on Feuerbach* (first published as an appendix to the 1888 edition of Engels' *Ludwig Feurbach*), Marx led the foundation for what he called dialectical materialism.
- Karl Marx does not systematically explain his theory of dialectical materialism anywhere in his works. However, he makes it clear that his materialism is dialectical and not mechanical.
- In mechanical materialism, evolution is the path taken by material things under the pressure of their environment.
- In dialectical materialism, evolution is the development of matter from within, environment helping or hindering, but neither originating the evolutionary process, nor capable of preventing it from reaching its inevitable goal.
- With the emergence of 'private property', society is divided into 'dominant' and 'dependent' classes. The dominant class, in order to maintain its stronghold on economic power, invents a new form of power – political power.
- According to the Marxist view, the main feature of the state is the existence of public authority representing the interest of the class which dominates economically and not of the entire population.
- Marx believed that a successful revolution in one country could not be stabilized if it remained confined to the borders of a single country.
- The Marxist Theory of Revolution is the consequence and the concentrated expression of Marx's view of historical development, that is, to say of the sequence of social formation in history.
- Marx did not believe in revolutionary prophecy. He did not go into detail concerning the exact nature strategy and tactics of the socialist revolution which he thought to be imminent.
- Marx was opposed to the use of revolutionary terror as it weakened the cause of revolution. He strongly criticized the use of terror by the Jacobins in the French revolution.

NOTES

6.5 KEY TERMS

- **Constitutionalism:** Constitutionalism is a complex of ideas, attitudes, and patterns of behaviour elaborating the principle that the authority of government derives from and is limited by a body of fundamental law.
- **Capitalist:** Capitalist refers to a person who uses their wealth to invest in trade and industry for profit in accordance with the principles of capitalism.
- **Envisage:** Contemplate or conceive of as a possibility or a desirable future event.
- **Libertarian:** A person who advocates civil liberty.
- **Epistemology:** The theory of knowledge with regard to its methods, validity and scope.

6.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Liberals promote ideas like constitutionalism, liberal democracy, human rights, capitalism, free and fair elections and freedom of religion.
2. Laski has written *The American Presidency*.
3. Communitarianism is the belief that the self or person is constituted through the community, in the sense that individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration; there are no 'unencumbered selves'.
4. Marx borrowed his dialectical method from Hegel.
5. Engels has written *Anti-Duhring*.

6.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What do you understand by political liberalism?
2. Write a short note on rectification.
3. What is theory of alienation?
4. What are the two directions in which contemporary Marxist thought developed?
Discuss.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Describe the thoughts that Harold Laski talks about in terms of growth of liberal trend.
2. Write a detailed note on the concept of political liberalism.
3. Discuss the concept of contemporary liberalism in your own words.
4. Explain the points highlighted by John Rawls in his book *A Theory of Justice*.
5. Who is a libertarian? Explain.
6. Assess how communitarianism is relevant in today's world.

NOTES

6.8 FURTHER READING

- Miller, D. 1987. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Limited.
- Sabain, G. H. 1961. *A History of Political Theory*. New Delhi: Oxford and IBH Publishing Company.
- Hampsher-Monk, I. 1992. *A History of Modern Political Thought: Major Political Thinkers from Hobbes to Marx*, Oxford: Blackwell Publisher Ltd.
- Coleman, J. 2000. *A History of Political Thought*. New Delhi: Wiley-Blackwell.

UNIT 7 SOVEREIGNTY

Structure

- 7.0 Introduction
- 7.1 Unit Objectives
- 7.2 Monistic Sovereignty
 - 7.2.1 Austin's Legal Analysis of the State
 - 7.2.2 Criticism of Austin's Theory of Sovereignty
- 7.3 Pluralistic Sovereignty
 - 7.3.1 Evaluation
- 7.4 Summary
- 7.5 Key Terms
- 7.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 7.7 Questions and Exercises
- 7.8 Further Reading

NOTES

7.0 INTRODUCTION

For the survival of any state, unity among these elements is important, i.e., the population of the state must obey the commands of one and only one authority. The authority to whom people owe their allegiance must not be divided. Sovereignty represents this unity and indivisibility of authority. This authority is expected to be supreme both in internal and external matters. This is known as popular sovereignty. It may be exercised directly, as in a popular assembly, or, more commonly, indirectly through the election of representatives to government. The pluralist theory of sovereignty is of recent origin. It is the result of the social developments in the 19th century, such as democracy and the growth of complex economic and social organizations as a result of industrialization.

Prior to its development, the democratic concept of 'popular sovereignty' or the belief in the 'indeterminate people as the ultimate source of power' had undermined the influence of the 'monistic theory of sovereignty'. Although purely legal, this theory was nevertheless accepted as a clear, factual and logical exposition of the concept of sovereignty. Therefore, until the end of the 19th century, there was no single, clear-cut, lucid, apprehensive and accepted theory of sovereignty of the state and the situation was quite confounding.

7.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Discuss the concept of sovereignty
- Examine the suitability of Austin's theory of sovereignty in contemporary times
- Assess the various propositions of Austin's theory of sovereignty
- Evaluate the criticism against Austin's theory of sovereignty

7.2 MONISTIC SOVEREIGNTY

NOTES

The term 'sovereignty' is derived from the Latin word *Superanus* which means 'supreme' or 'paramount'. The exercise of the supreme power by the state is commonly called 'sovereignty' and states are, therefore, described as 'sovereign'. The modern state, is the outcome of the anarchy of the wars of religion in the 16th century and it is from those crises that the state derived its present attributes—the most important of which is sovereignty. The state inherited the supreme power of the Church which expressed itself in the form of the doctrine of State Sovereignty. It is, in the words of a French writer of the 16th century, a body which gives orders to all and receives orders from none. Harold J. Laski, author of *A Grammar of Politics*, further observes: 'It issues orders to all men and all associations within that area, it receives orders from above of them. Its will is subject to no legal limitation of any kind. What it 'proposes is right by mere announcement of intention.'

Thus, 'sovereignty'—a juristic concept as used in connection with the state—indicates the supreme, final and ultimate power of the state in internal and external spheres. In other words, the sovereignty of the state is unlimited internally as well as externally. It is an original and absolute power and it cannot be divided. Division of sovereignty implies its destruction. Sovereignty, accordingly, represents the unity of the state and a sovereign state is one which is externally free and internally supreme. The authority exercised by the state, i.e., the government, is delegated Professor Gettell has aptly said:

'If sovereignty is not absolute, no State exists; if sovereignty is divided more than one State exists. There can be no legal power at the back of the sovereignty of the State and no legal check on its scope.'

John Austin, the famous English Jurist, stated his theory of sovereignty in his book *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, published in 1832. His exposition of the concept of sovereignty has left an indelible imprint on the scheme of our subject and even today no aspect of sovereignty can be studied in its proper perspective without a reference to his teachings. Austin was greatly influenced by Thomas Hobbes and Jeremy Bentham. His views are largely based on the teachings of Hobbes. However, his purpose was similar to that of Bentham, like him, Austin wanted to distinguish between law and morality, as well as between a positive law as recognized, followed and enforced by law courts on the one side and customs, conventions, traditions and usages having the sanction of many centuries on the other. His primary object, therefore, was to establish an exact juristic terminology and to present a clear outline of the organization of a government's legal powers. His theory was conditioned mainly by his views of the nature of law. He defined law as a 'Command given by a superior to an inferior.'

7.2.1 Austin's Legal Analysis of the State

The concept of Austin's theory of sovereignty can be better understood if we first follow the legal analysis of the state presented by him. He believed that it was very essential to discover in a given society the definite superior to whom the people render habitual obedience. Further, the sovereign should not obey any higher authority. When we are able to recognize that authority which gives commands that are habitually obeyed and the authority not receiving them, we have found the sovereign power in the state.

In an independent political community, that sovereign is determinate and absolute. The will of the sovereign is illimitable because, if it could be constrained to act, it would

NOTES

cease to be supreme. Its will is indivisible and also inalienable for the obvious reason that if the sovereign authority parts with its sovereignty, it cannot of its own resume it. Law, therefore, is simply the will of the sovereign. It is a command obliging the subject to do, or to refrain from doing certain acts; failure to obey is visited by a penalty. The sovereign itself is limited by a positive law because it is its creator. Law and morals are merely his will. Within the sphere of law, therefore, as Hobbes forcefully stated, there is no such thing as an unjust command, the sovereign being unlimited, has the legal right to will whatever he may happen to desire.

Propositions of Austin's Theory of Sovereignty

Austin speaks of vesting sovereignty in a determinate human superior. His famous statement of the doctrine of sovereignty is contained in a passage in his book *Province of Jurisprudence Determined*. He states: 'If a determinate human superior, not in the habit of obedience to a like superior, receives habitual obedience from the bulk of a given society, that determinate superior is the sovereign in that society and the society (including the superior) is a society political and independent.'

Austin further states: 'Every positive law, or every law, simply and strictly so called, is set by a sovereign person or a sovereign body of persons to a member or members of the independent political society wherein that person or body of persons is sovereign or supreme.'

Major propositions

Austin's view of sovereignty is purely legal or juristic. It may be reduced to the following propositions.

1. That there is in every independent political community some persons or body of persons who exercise sovereign powers. There can be no state without sovereignty. It is immaterial whether this sovereign power is exercised by one person or a group of persons. A state with the monarchical form of government is as sovereign as a state where people are sovereign and are represented in a duly elected Parliament. Sovereign power is as essential in an independent political community as the centre of gravity in a mass of matter.
2. That the sovereign is a determinate person or a body of persons. 'He is not necessarily a single person: in the modern Western World he is very rarely so; but he must have so much of the attributes of a single person as to be determinate.' The state for Austin is a legal order in which there is determinate authority acting as the ultimate source of power. Sovereignty, therefore, neither resides in the general will as Rousseau conceived, nor in the mass of the people, nor in the electorate, as none of them is a determinate body. 'This superior cannot be,' as Garner puts it, 'the general will' as Rousseau taught, nor some abstraction like a public opinion, moral sentiment, the common reason, the will of God, and the like, but it must have some determinate person or authority. 'In Britain, this determinate sovereign can be found in the Parliament, which is a supreme law making and law-enforcing authority of the state.'
3. That such a determinate human superior must not himself obey any other higher authority. It issues orders to/all men and associations within its territory but receives orders from none of them. Nor is it under the control of another state. If it does obey any internal or external authority, it no longer remains sovereign. The determinate human superior may act unwisely, or dishonestly, or, in an ethical

NOTES

sense, unjustly, but for the purpose of the legal theory the character of his action is unimportant. So long as laws emanate from the legal sovereign, they are commands which must be obeyed. It is here that we find a similarity between the views of Austin and Hobbes.

4. That the sovereign must receive habitual obedience from the bulk of the community. That is to say, obedience must be a matter of habit and not mere occasional and forced one. Obedience rendered to an authority for a short time does not make it a sovereign. Austin's thesis is that obedience to the sovereign authority must be continual, regular, undisturbed and uninterrupted. Moreover, obedience rendered to the sovereign must not necessarily be from the whole of the society. It is enough for the purposes of the sovereign power that it comes from the bulk of the society. Where habitual obedience from the bulk of the society is not forthcoming, there is no sovereign power. Thus, sovereignty involves not only the submission of the many but also its performance.
 5. That command is the essence of law. You must do certain things; you must not do certain things. Failure to obey law, as commanded, is visited by penalty. Thus, the sovereign determines the rates of property, of good and evil and of lawful and unlawful action. To quote Austin; 'Law is the aggregate of rules set by man as politically superior, or sovereign, to men as politically subject.'
 6. That the sovereign power is indivisible. There must be as many states as there are sovereigns. To divide sovereignty is to destroy it. It is a unity and incapable of division. G. Jellinck is of the view that the notion of 'a divided, fragmented, diminished, limited, relative sovereignty' is a contradiction in terms.
- Thus, Austin's analysis clearly points out the existence of the supreme power which is determinate, absolute, illimitable, inalienable, indivisible, all-comprehensive and permanent. It is object to no limitation or command by some other superior. However, Austin's theory is from a lawyer's perspective of sovereignty and it has been subjected to scathing criticism.

7.2.2 Criticism of Austin's Theory of Sovereignty

Austin's theory of sovereignty has been criticized by several writers. The prominent among them are historical jurists, advocates of democracy, supporters of internationalism, and the pluralists. The main points of their criticism are as follows:

1. **Sovereignty does not reside in a determinate human superior:** Sir Henry Maine, 'together with other historical jurists, points out that sovereignty does not reside in a determinate human superior. In his book *Early History of Institutions* he explains that in history sovereignty has never been determinate and absolute. 'A despot with a disturbed brain', he says, 'is the sole conceivable example of such sovereignty.' He emphasizes the existence of 'vastness of influences, which we may call, for shortness, a moral, that perpetually shapes, limits or forbids the actual direction of the forces by this sovereign.' The rules which regulated the life of his subjects were derived from their immemorial usages, and these rules were administered by domestic tribunals, in families or in village community. He himself was subject to the customary laws of the community, and never issued a command in the Austinian sense of the term. Also, it is not only in regard to the 'oriental society' that Henry Maine finds Austin's analysis inadequate. Maine states sovereign, however despotic, could disregard 'the entire history of the community, the mass of its historic antecedents, which in each community determines how

NOTES

the sovereign shall exercise or forbear from exercising, his irresistible coercive power.'

From this, it is clear that a sovereign in the Austinian sense is not indispensable to the state existence. It is absurd to say that wherever there is no Austinian sovereign, there is either a dormant anarchy or else a state of nature. The real rulers of a society, says John Chipman Gray, are undiscoverable.

2. **Austin's definition of law is defective:** Austin's definition of law, which forms the basis of his theory of sovereignty, is defective and cannot be accepted on its face value. M.J. Laski says that to think of law as simply a command is even for the jurist, 'to strain the definition to the verge of decency. For, there is a character of uniformity in law in which the element of command is, practically speaking, pushed out of sight. The notion of law as a 'Command' has been criticised on the ground that it ignores the great body of customary law which has grown up through usage and interpretation, and which never had its source in the will of a determinate superior. It errs in treating all law as being merely a 'Command' and exaggerates the single element of force to the neglect of the obvious historical facts with which Austin could not have been unacquainted. No sovereign can ignore the existence of customary law which has grown through usage in every country. Austin himself was fully conscious of the force behind customs and he met this position by asserting that 'whatever the sovereign permits, he commands'. However, it is not convincing. The English Common Law, for example, is not made by Parliament. It exists in customs which are explained, modified or expanded when the courts apply them. They are laws all the same, the courts taking cognizance of them as much as they do of Parliamentary statutes. The King-in-Parliament, as a legal sovereign, could indeed alter the common law, or could make it a statute law, thus making it a definite command of the legal sovereign. But much of the common law it could not alter without endangering the state, for to try to upset tradition and custom might lead to revolution.
3. **Inconsistent with ideas of the 'popular' and 'political' sovereignty:** Austin's theory is also criticised on the ground that it is inconsistent with the idea of popular and political sovereignty. In fact, it is an antithesis of Rousseau's doctrine that the General Will is sovereign—a doctrine which forms the basis of a modern democratic state. Again, it ignores the power of public opinion—exerted through the legislature, political parties, press, etc.—and takes no account of what we know from the term 'political sovereignty.' Thus, says Henry Maine, 'it is a historical fact that sovereignty has repeatedly been for a time in the hands of a number of persons not determinate.' He concludes: 'It is asserted by some writers that this is true of the abiding place of sovereignty in the Republic of the United States.'
4. **Absolute sovereignty is an illusion:** Another serious objection against Austinian theory is the absolutism which he attributes to sovereignty. Like Hobbes, Austin held that the source of law could not be limited by any higher law and hence sovereignty involved legal despotism. He frankly admitted that there is no escape from the conclusion that sovereignty is legally unrestrainable. Hence the sovereign is, legally speaking; a despot, however benevolent he may be in fact. Critics assert that the unlimited authority and infinite right of the sovereign power are mere abstractions of jurisprudence. J.K. Bluntschli states: 'The state as a whole is not almighty, for it is limited externally by the rights of other states and internally by its own nature and by the rights of its individual members.'

NOTES

In the external sphere, sovereignty is restricted (though not very strictly in the legal sense) by international law, and in the internal, by constitutional law. Laski, who is in favour of the limitation of sovereignty in the interests of other associations, strongly criticises the absolute sovereignty of Austin. He says that such unlimited sovereignty is not only harmful to the existence and functioning of other associations in the internal sphere, but also detrimental to world peace, as it promotes competition and rivalry among sovereign (independent) states.

5. **Too much emphasis on force:** Austin also lays too much emphasis on force. He believes that disobedience of law is visited by penalty and, therefore, it is the fear of punishment which compels the people to obey them. However, this is not a correct view. We obey laws, not because of the fear of punishment, but because we have the spirit of law abidingness. Laski states, 'The notion of command in law is contingent and indirect and the idea of penalty is, again, save in the most circuitous way, notably absent. Leon Duguit opines that we obey laws because they promote social solidarity. He goes to the extent of saying that laws are not created by the state, but it is the laws that create the state.'
6. **Difficulty of discovering the sovereign in modern states:** The sovereign in the Austinian sense cannot be easily discovered in the modern state. In England since sovereignty is located in Parliament, it may be taken as a determinate superior. However, the Parliament cannot do anything it likes and cannot afford to antagonise the people who form the political sovereign. If it does so, it cannot last long. Hence, it cannot answer to the description of Austin's sovereign. The Cabinet in England cannot be sovereign in the Austinian sense as it has to be responsible to Parliament. The king also cannot be the sovereign, as he has no real power. Similarly, it is very difficult to locate sovereignty in federal states like the USA, US and India. Sovereignty is indivisible and the sovereign body which has the power to amend the constitution cannot be described as a determinate body.
7. **The theory undermines the importance and the role of other associations within the state:** A further line of attack on the absolute and indivisible powers of the sovereign comes from the standpoint of pluralists. The traditional or monistic theory of sovereignty, says the pluralists, errs in holding that the various non-political associations created by the state, are dependent for they continue to exist upon the will of the state, and exercise only such powers as are conceded to them by the state. It is argued on the contrary, that associations grow naturally. They have a will of their own and possess personality. The pluralist contention is that the state is but one association among several associations and, therefore, cannot be invested with the unique sovereign power of the community. We are members of a university, a church, a trade union, an employers' association and so forth. All these are sovereign. The state maintains law and order as a university gives us education. Both should be independent in their spheres. As a pluralist, Laski wants sovereignty to be limited in the interest of other associations within the state. In some way, he claims, the power of other associations is as original and complete as that of the state itself. Those associations, Laski observes, are, in their sphere, not less sovereign than the state itself. Therefore, the conception that authority, ought to be limited, is fundamental to political philosophy.
8. **The theory is a hindrance to the growth of internationalism:** The sovereign of Austin is not limited by international law. However, the modern concept of internationalism has made it incompatible. In international law there is no

determinate human superior. All states are equal as well as sovereign. Where all are equal, there can be no sovereign. Thus, Austin's concept of sovereignty becomes a 'glorious myth'. If states follow the strict definition of external sovereignty given by Austin, there will be no possibility of solving world problems at the international level.

Therefore, Austin's concept of sovereignty is now regarded not only a legal fiction but a 'harmful and dangerous dogma', which should be expunged from the literature of international law. Laski has also opined that the idea of sovereign independent states, competing with one another, is inimical to world peace and world unity and may in fact prove fatal to the well-being of humanity at large.

To conclude, under the present circumstances, it is impossible to make the legal theory of sovereignty valid for political philosophy, as it gives to the sovereign such powers which cannot in fact be exercised. Hsiao King Chuan points out that it narrows down, 'the meaning of vital terms to a content which, if maintained, would be fatal to the existence of society, Austin's chief error was in unduly emphasising the purely legal aspect of sovereignty and in ignoring the forces and influences which lie at the back of formal law. Hsiao King Chuan said that law is an important factor in the life of the state and it cannot be accepted purely from the legal point of view. It must be built upon a general and social environment and to divorce it from these forces and influences is to defeat the very purpose of law. However, it must be admitted that as a conception of strict legal nature of sovereignty, Austin's theory is clear, factual, logical and free from imprecision and ambiguity.'

7.3 PLURALISTIC SOVEREIGNTY

The germ of the pluralistic theory is to be found in the work of the German jurist, O. Von Gierke (1844-1921). Emile Durkheim, Otto Von Gierke, F.W. Maitland and G.D.H. Cole are the main exponents of pluralistic theory of sovereignty. Durkheim pleads for the freedom of the vocational groups to regulate the State's economy because the State as a general scheme of life is not adequately fitted to undertake the specialized tasks of economic democratic politics, pluralism is a guiding principle which permits the peaceful coexistence of different interests, convictions and lifestyles.

These factors have been chiefly responsible for the attack on the traditional theory. First there was tremendous change in the functions of the State. So long as the State was a politics State, emphasis had to be placed on domination, command and power. However, with the growth of the social welfare idea, social service instead of power became the dominant idea. Stress was placed on the need to emphasize international co-operation rather than isolation due to the progress of science and of technique, and organization of production and marketing. The external sovereignty of the State has to be curbed in the interests of humanity. The facts is that the States of today are not as independent as were the States of the 19th century. Third, there are groups or associations to satisfy numerous needs of individuals. It came to be realized that the various groups are instinctive to man and are legal entities with a life of their own.

Gierke and F.W. Maitland thought that each group possesses a real personality and a will. Gierke states, 'The state should accept the common point of view that permanent association have rights and duties as groups whether or not the state has accepted them as corporation.'

NOTES

Check Your Progress

1. What is the etymological derivation of term 'sovereignty'?
2. Who has written *A Grammar of Politics*?

NOTES

Figgis also ascribed a real personality to the groups. He states: 'The state did not create the family nor did it create the churches, nor even in any real sense can it be said to have created the club or trade unions, nor in the Middle Ages, the guild or the religious order, hardly even the universities or the colleges with the universities; they have all arisen out of the natural associative instincts of making, and should all be treated by the supreme authority as having a life original and guaranteed, to be controlled and directed like persons but not regarded in their corporate capacity as mere names.'

Human society according to Figgis, is not a 'sand heap of individuals' related only through the State, but an 'ascending hierarchy groups'. He called the traditional theory of sovereignty 'a venerable superstition.'

In this contexts, it has normative connotations absence from its use to denote a theoretical standpoint. Pluralism is, in the general sense, the affirmation and acceptance of diversity. The concept is used, often in different ways, in a wide range of issues. In politics, the affirmation of diversity in the interests and beliefs of the citizenry, and political pluralism is one of the most important features of modern democracy.

The term 'pluralism' is also used to denote a theoretical standpoint on state and power—which to varying degrees suggest that pluralism is an adequate model of how power is distributed in societies.

The external sovereignty of the State has to be curbed in the interests of humanity. The facts is that the States of today are not as independent as were the States of the 19th century. Third, there are the groups or associations to satisfy numerous needs of individuals. It came to be realized that various groups are instinctive to man and are legal entities with a life of their own. Gierke and Maitland thought that each group possesses a real personality and a will. Gierke stated.

'The state should accept the common point of view that permanent association have rights and duties as groups whether or not the state has accepted them as corporation.'

Figgis also ascribed a real personality to the groups. Barker rejects the personality theory of groups, admits that the groups exist before there is any legal act of incorporation of creation. He regards the cause of third homogeneous character; often inspire stronger loyalties than the State. Krabbe holds that, owing to the rise of important economic associations like the labour unions, the State can no longer pretend to be the one all-powerful agency of social life.

Laski has pleaded for a system which would recognize the complete autonomy of groups and deny to the State any claim to be the absolute sovereign. Actually, the state is an association of associations with the special function of coordinating their activities. It is a public-service corporation'. His conclusion is because society is federal, authority must also be federal.'

R.M. MacIver in his work *Modern State* is a consistent pluralist. He regards the State as one association among the many associations within the community. Though exercising functions of a unique character, the State has definite limits, definite powers and responsibilities. MacIver's thinking centres around the idea of group versus State.

There are a number of other thinkers who have assailed the traditional theory of sovereignty and pleaded for the autonomy of the groups. Durkheim pleads for the freedom of the vocational groups to regulate the State's economy because the State as a general scheme of life is not adequately fitted to undertake the specialized tasks of economic control. Ernest Barker, though he rejects the personality theory of groups, admits that

NOTES

groups exist 'before there is any legal act of incorporation of creation'. He regards the cause of third homogeneous character, often inspire stronger loyalties than the State.

H. Krabbe holds that, owing to the rise of important economic associations like the labour unions, the State can no longer pretend to be the one all-powerful agency of social life. Harold J. Laski has pleaded for a system which would recognize the complete autonomy of groups and deny to the State any claim to be the absolute sovereign. His general point of view is that the group is real in the same sense as the State. According to him, the theory of 'unlimited and irresponsible state is incompatible with the interests of humanity'. He is of the opinion that the concept of sovereignty of the State will also fade away just as the divine right of kings has. The Doctrine of Absolute Sovereignty is to him a legal faction and a barren concept. He writes,

'The only state to which I owe allegiance is the state in which I discover moral adequacy; and if a given state fails to satisfy that condition, I must, to be consistent with my own moral nature, attempt experiment. Our first duty is to be true to our conscience'.

The modern State, according to him is pluralistic, constitutional, and responsible. It is limited in the force it exercises; it is directive rather than being permanent. Its power is diffused in territorial and functional groups and internally as well as externally its activities and functions are subject to limitations and review. Basically, the State is an association of associations with the special function of co-ordinating their activities. It is a public-service corporation'. His conclusion is 'Because society is federal, authority must also federal.'

MacIver in his work *Modern State* is a consistent pluralist. He regards the State as one association among many associations within the community. Though exercising functions of a unique character, the State has 'definite limits, definite powers and responsibilities'. These other associations are as native to the soil of society as the state itself; the State is not their creator. The business of the State is merely to give 'a form of unity to the whole system of social relationship'. MacIver's thinking centres round the idea of group versus State.

It is thus evident that various political thinkers have attacked the traditional theory of sovereignty from different angles. The common element in all these attacks is the belief that there are many associations in the State which have grown independently, which perform essential social functions and which are better adapted than the State to serve social needs. It is, therefore, wrong for the State to claim undivided and unlimited sovereignty for itself. The central idea of pluralism may be summed up in the words of Gettell: 'The pluralists deny that the state is a unique organisation; they argue that such associations of their purpose are as sovereign as the state is for its purpose. They emphasize the inability of the state to enforce its will in practice against the opposition of certain groups within it. They deny that possession force by the state gives it any superior right. They insist on the equal rights of all groups that command the allegiance of their members and that perform valuable functions in society. Hence sovereignty is possessed by many associations. It is not an indivisible unit; the state is not supreme or unlimited.'

7.3.1 Evaluation

What the pluralists say is true to a large extent. It cannot be denied that the different associations in society perform valuable services, and the state should not arbitrarily coerce them. Man is a member not only of the State, but also of the family, the trade union the church and the club. He owes his allegiance to all these groups which make his

NOTES

life worthy and meaningful. That the State in spite of its legal supremacy, should be subject to moral limitations cannot be disputed. Pluralists, such as Gettell remark, 'also make a timely protest against the rigid and dogmatic legalism of the Austinian theory of sovereignty. They emphasize the necessity of studying the actual facts of political life in a rapidly changing social system. They lay emphasis on the growing importance of non-political groups in social life. The danger of over-interference on the part of the State with the functioning of such groups is highlighted by them.'

In her book, *The New State*, M.P. Follett sums up the merits of pluralism as follows:

- The pluralists prize the bubble of the present State's right to supremacy.
- They recognize the value of the group and they see that most of our group life today has a significance which, must be reckoned with in political life.
- They plead for a revivification of local life.
- They believe that the interest of the State is not now always identical with the interests of its parts.
- Pluralism is the beginning of the disappearance of the crowd.
- It has seized upon the problem of identity of association and of federalism.

Despite these merits, pluralism has been subjected to much criticism. Firstly, the critics say that the pluralist theory suffers from an inner contradiction. In theory, the pluralists reduce the power of the State and make it co-equal in powers to other social groups, while in practice they are willing to concede much more power to the State. For instance, Gierke ascribed to the State the sovereign power where general interests are involved. Barker and Laski admit that the State will have to carry on the function of co-ordinating the regulating the activities of associations. The State to Follett, is a unifying agency. Paul Boncour regards the State as the sole representative of general interests and national solidarity. J.N. Figgis likewise regards the State as a community of communities and assigns to it a distinctive function and superior authority as an agency of co-ordination and adjustment. Thus, in spite of their eagerness to establish a position of equality for all associations, the pluralists are compelled by the logic of the situation to give precedence to the State.

Secondly, the pluralists do not make it quite clear what they want. As F.W. Coker points out, the pluralists fail to make clear which of the specific functions assigned to the state by the monistic theory they would deny to it. If the State is to become an association like other associations, will the pluralists still give to the State the power of compulsory taxation?

Thirdly, the logical consequence of pluralism is anarchism. Without the State there can be no order and without sovereignty there can be no State.

Fourthly, the pluralists wrongly assume that the various groups within the community run along parallel lines and that there is no overlapping of functions between them. The facts of social life reveal that the functions of the numerous independent groups are overlapping and their interests are sometimes conflicting.

Lastly, Laski, the doyen of the pluralist world, at a later stage criticizes pluralism on the ground that 'it did not sufficiently realize the nature of the state as an expression of class-relations'. He believes that the need for a sovereign State cannot be obviated unless the means of production are socialized, leading to a classless society. In his opinion, political pluralism must be tempered with the vision of a classless society.

NOTES

Thus, pluralism can hardly be accepted as a valid doctrine of sovereignty. The socio-political forces in the contemporary society have 'aggrandized the state and made the twentieth century, a century of monism'. The inauguration of an era of planning and social welfare and the need for mobilization of all human materials have immensely increased State control. It is interesting to note that, in spite of bitter criticism of the monistic theory of sovereignty, many pluralists support the supremacy of the State in one form or the other.

In this connection, it may be pertinent to refer to the view of Ernest Barker who maintains that whatever rights the groups may claim or gain, the State will still remain a necessary adjusting force. And, if the groups are destined to gain new ground, it is possible that the State will also gain, perhaps even more than it loses, because it will be forced to deal with even graver and even weightier problems of adjustment.

7.4 SUMMARY

- The term 'sovereignty' is derived from the Latin word *Superanus* which means 'supreme' or 'paramount'. The exercise of the supreme power by the state is commonly called 'sovereignty' and states are, therefore, described as 'sovereign'.
- John Austin, the famous English Jurist, stated his theory of sovereignty in his book *Lectures on Jurisprudence*, published in 1832.
- The concept of Austin's theory of sovereignty can be better understood if we first follow the legal analysis of the state presented by him. He believed that it was very essential to discover in a given society the definite superior to whom the people render habitual obedience.
- In an independent political community, that sovereign is determinate and absolute. The will of the sovereign is illimitable because, if it could be constrained to act, it would cease to be supreme.
- Sir Henry Maine, together with other historical jurists, points out that sovereignty does not reside in a determinate human superior. In his book *Early History of Institutions* he explains that in history sovereignty has never been determinate and absolute.
- Austin's definition of law, which forms the basis of his theory of sovereignty, is defective and cannot be accepted on its face value. M.J. Laski says that to think of law as simply a command is even for the jurist, 'to strain the definition to the verge of decency.'
- Austin's concept of sovereignty is now regarded not only a legal fiction but a 'harmful and dangerous dogma', which should be expunged from the literature of international law.
- The germ of the pluralistic theory is to be found in the work of the German jurist, O. Von Gierke (1844-1921). Emile Durkheim, Otto Von Gierke, F.W. Maitland and G.D.H. Cole are the main exponents of pluralistic theory of sovereignty.
- Human society according to Figgis, is not a 'sand heap of individuals' related only through the State, but an 'ascending hierarchy groups'. He called the traditional theory of sovereignty 'a venerable superstition.'

Check Your Progress

3. Who are the main exponents of pluralistic theory of sovereignty?
4. Name the author of the book *The New State*.

NOTES

- The external sovereignty of the State has to be curbed in the interests of humanity. The fact is that the States of today are not as independent as were the States of the 19th century.
- There are a number of other thinkers who have assailed the traditional theory of sovereignty and pleaded for the autonomy of the groups.
- Man is a member not only of the State, but also of the family, the trade union, the church and the club. He owes his allegiance to all these groups which make his life worthy and meaningful.
- The socio-political forces in the contemporary society have 'aggrandized the state and made the twentieth century, a century of monism'.

7.5 KEY TERMS

- **Sovereignty:** The quality of having supreme, independent authority over a geographic area, such as a territory.
- **Modern state:** An organized territory with definite geographical boundaries that are recognized by other states.
- **Anarchy:** Absence of the state or a political authority is known as anarchy.

7.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The term 'sovereignty' is derived from the Latin word *Superanus* which means 'supreme' or 'paramount'.
2. Harold J. Laski has written *A Grammar of Politics*.
3. Emile Durkheim, Otto Von Gierke, F.W. Maitland and G.D.H. Cole are the main exponents of pluralistic theory of sovereignty.
4. *The New State* is written by M.P. Follett.

7.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. Write a short note on sovereignty.
2. Give a critique of Austin's theory of sovereignty.
3. What do you understand by pluralistic sovereignty?
4. Write any two merits of pluralism.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Critically examine the monistic theory of sovereignty.
2. Describe the major features of Austin's legal analysis of the state.
3. Briefly sketch out the propositions of Austin's theory of sovereignty.
4. Discuss the major features of the pluralistic theory of sovereignty.

7.8 FURTHER READING

- Varma, S.P. 2008. *Modern Political Theory*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Miller, David. 1987. *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*. Oxford: Oxford Blackwell.
- Germino, Dante L. 1976. *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

NOTES

UNIT 8 POWER, AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

NOTES

Structure

- 8.0 Introduction
- 8.1 Unit Objectives
- 8.2 Power
 - 8.2.1 Empirical Study of Power
- 8.3 Authority
 - 8.3.1 Legitimacy
- 8.4 Summary
- 8.5 Key Terms
- 8.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 8.7 Questions and Exercises
- 8.8 Further Reading

8.0 INTRODUCTION

Power is generally understood as the possession of control, authority, or impact over others, a relationship in which a person or a group is in a position to exert influence over the thoughts and actions of others.

Arnold Woofers defines it as the skill to move others or to command them to do what you want them to do and not to do, what you do not want them to do. Authority is very closely related to power. It might take a variety of forms for example political, economic and ideological. One might say that ideas like morality, ethics, religion, customs and traditions may limit someone's power. Politics as 'authoritative allocation of values' is strongly associated with power and authority. Hegemony identifies and explains domination and the maintenance of power and how the (hegemony) leader class 'persuades' the subordinate social classes to accept and adopt the ruling-class values of bourgeois hegemony. The word exploitation is used to refer to economic exploitation; that is, the act of using another person's labour without offering them an adequate compensation.

8.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Define power and describe its various conceptual dimensions
- Review the theories of power
- Explore the ideas of bases of power

8.2 POWER

Both in the national and international arena, the notion of power is pivotal to understand and comprehend politics, political institutions and political movements of the systemic process. It is the centre of political theory. H. D. Lasswell and A. Kaplan stated that,

NOTES

'the concept of power is perhaps the most fundamental in the whole of political science: the political process is the shaping, dissolution and exercise of power.' It is the concept of power that political science primarily focuses on. Machiavelli and Hobbes were some of the thinkers who supported the study of power as the main theme of politics. Hobbes wrote: 'There is a general inclination of all mankind, a perpetual and restless desire of power after power that ceased only in death.' A few decades ago, Frederick Watkins suggested, 'The proper scope of political science is not the study of the state or of any other specific institutional complex, but the investigations of all associations insofar as they can be shown to exemplify the problem of power.' Perhaps this view was further reinforced by William A. Robson when he suggested, 'It is with power in society that political science is primarily concerned – its nature, basis, processes, scope and results. The focus of interest of the political scientist is clear and unambiguous; it centres on the struggle to gain or retain power, to exercise power or influence over others, or to resist that exercise.'

A definition in *A Dictionary of Social Sciences* says: 'Power in its most general sense denotes (a) the ability (exercised or not) to produce a certain occurrence or (b) the influence exerted by man or group, through whatever means, over the conduct of others in intended ways.' This definition of power is deeply influenced by Max Weber's famous formulation: 'power signifies any capacity to work one's will within given social relations even against opposition, independent of what that capacity is based on.' During the 1950s and 60s, this juridical conception of power was very popular among the western writers. The western concept of power as the ability to work one's will is demonstrated in the writings of Engels when he said, 'Authority, in the sense in which the word is used here, means the imposition of the will of another upon ours; on the other hand, authority presupposes subordination.'

In the 1930s, politics was seen as a system of relationship with respect to power. Both George Catlin and Charles Merriam were at the forefront of this trend. Later, other political scientists such as Harold Lasswell, M. A. Kaplan, and others followed suit. In his 'Theory of Elites', Lasswell highlighted the 'distribution of values' as the base point of the political process which became the source point of the majority of American students of politics, and political science came to be treated as the science of power. Thus, both Western Political Sociology and Marxist thinking on the growth of political systems have contributed a great deal towards the development of the concept of power.

While studying the concept of power and its various manifestations in the systemic processes, one is reminded of what Joan Woodward said in his pioneering work, *Industrial Organization: Theory and Practice*. He said, 'It seems that the sociologist cannot win in his attempts to establish a rigorous experimental framework for his research.' Thus, it has been indeed a complex process of multi-dimensional character to analyse the operational structures of power, both as an essential theme of social order and also as a factor of motivation of ambitious men, whether one looks at Hitler's Germany or Stalin's Russia.

Before moving on to discuss the several conceptual dimensions of power, it is desirable that the students of politics ought to have some basic understanding of the concept of power. Let us see what Andrew Heywood in his work, *Political Theory: An Introduction*, had to say in his introductory remarks on the concept of power. He stated that 'All politics is about power'. The practice of politics is frequently depicted as little more than the exercise of power and the academic subject is, in essence, the study of power.

NOTES

8.2.1 Empirical Study of Power

A pragmatic approach to the study and analysis of the concept of power is not an easy task.

In his pioneering work, *The Nature and Limits of Political Science* (1963), Maurice Owling says that there are real difficulties about access to the centres of power in modern society, even in a democracy. It may be easier to 'discover the truth about contemporary power than to publish it; the difficulties are greatest for those who have been participants'.

There are many difficulties involved in the methodologies to understand what the centre of power is in a political system. Kornhauser attempts to analyse them in the article, 'Power relationships and the Role of the Social Scientists' in his edited book, *Problems of Power in American Democracy* (1957). He says that raising certain questions such as, 'What social scientist are you?', 'What parts of society want what types of knowledge, to be used by whom, towards what end?' etc. can help us arrive at a somewhat definitive answer. Having compatible doctrines and models stating methods and objectives in the study of power is not feasible. The problems that one faces have been put forth in theoretical works of political scientists like Machiavelli, Hobbes, Locke, T. D. Weldon, Oakeshott, Butterfield, E. H. Carr and others.

While talking of power, it should be noted that majority of the work on power by eminent researchers simply reflect the simplified versions of politics outside their time; hence they cannot be seen as representing the real political situations of the present time.

Power is intricately related to honour, deference, respect and dignity. However, it is important to differentiate between the power of the man from the power of his office that assures him authority and legitimacy. One should also be able to distinguish between perceptible and real power.

While analysing the scope of power, Maslow would rather talk about the psycho-pathology of ambition in the context of the mental framework of some men. He says, 'Their jungle philosophy (that of authoritarians) does not change even when they grow up and come out of the jungle. It resists new facts. It is sick because it reacts to an outgrown past, rather than to the real present.' We can view such people as psychologically perverted ones because they are running after an illusion. Maslow concludes that 'Of course for those who actually live in a jungle-like world – and there are plenty who do so today – a jungle philosophy is realistic and reasonable.'

It should be kept in mind that power is multidimensional. Power and influence are often seen as inter-related. Power is viewed as 'intentionalist' and 'structuralist'. According to the intentionalist, power is a quality given to an identifiable object such as political party, social grouping or any interest group while the structuralists view power as a form of social system. Sociologists like Talcott Parsons and neo-Marxists such as Althusser belong to the structuralist school of thought.

Steven Lucas, in his book *Power: A Radical View* (1974) elaborates the three phases or dimensions of power. According to him, power can influence the pattern and the process of decision-making framework. It can also influence political agenda and control people's thoughts. In his major work *Leviathan* (1651), Thomas Hobbes said that power has the capacity to make decisions. Conventional thinking in the area of political science has mostly been based on this. Robert Dahl in his book, *A Critic of the*

NOTES

Ruling Elite Model (1958) has supported this concept of power, which according to him could be both objective and quantifiable. This approach was widely adopted by political scientists and sociologists, especially in America during the 1950s and 60s.

While talking about power as the capability to impress the process of decision making few researchers like to emphasize on non-decision making as the 'second phase of power'. In their seminal essay, *The Two Phases of Power* P. Bachrach and Baratz persist that 'to the extent that a person or group—consciously or unconsciously—creates or reinforces barriers to the public airing of policy conflicts, that person or group has power.' As said by Schattschneider, 'some issues are organized into politics while others are organized out.'

The power's third dimension is its ability to sway the thinking process of an individual or a group. The views and the ideas of the individuals or groups are basically manipulated and formed by following factors:

- Family
- Peer groups
- Schools
- Churches
- Mass media
- Political parties
- Overall environment at the work place

Vance Packard, in his study, 'The Hidden Persuaders (1960)' has studied the factors which can influence and manipulate human behaviour in a specific direction. In his book *One Dimensional Man* (1964), Herbert Marcuse, the famous neoleft theorist, describes about the characteristic of power in the advanced industrial societies in which the society's needs could be altered through modern technology. According to him it created a comfortable, smooth and reasonable democratic un-freedom.

Power – Marxist and Western Approach

The idea of power is one of the basic concepts of political theory. The examination of the nature of power in socialist and capitalist societies is necessary for comprehending the nature of politics as well as the state. Lenin said, 'The question of power cannot be evaded or brushed aside, because it is the key question determining everything in a revolution's development, and in its foreign and domestic politics'. While studying the idea of power, what frequently comes to mind is its use in a bigger sense by the Marxist thinkers. Both Marx and Lenin put emphasis on the social relations in a political phenomenon as well as the relationship between man and his environment. The millennium has changed, however, in reality; the nature has remained to be both the subject and the object of power. Initially, nature's control over man provided a different definition of power. However, with increase in the man's control over nature, due to growth in science and technology, the idea of power acquired a new definition and aspect. Power assumed multidimensional forms as a synonym of political and social domination in state structures.

In the Marxist approach and terms, the idea of power is related to the control of state power through revolts. Lenin said, 'The passing of state power from one class to another is the first principal, the basic sign of revolution, both in strictly scientific and in the practical political meaning of the term'. The essential spirit of any revolt is the question of power in the state. He said, 'The class struggle becomes real, consistent and

NOTES

developed only when it embraces the sphere of politics. In politics too, it is possible to restrict oneself to minor matters, and it is possible to go deeper, to the very foundations. Marxism recognizes a class struggle as fully developed, nationwide only if it does not merely embrace politics but takes in most significant thing in politics—the organization of state power'.

The Marxist thinkers think that the sphere of politics involves all dimensions of the state; it implies all kinds of relationship among the classes, be it economic, ideological, semi-psychological and other. Lenin said, 'It is the sphere of relationships of all classes' and strata to the state and the government, the sphere of interaction between all classes.'

Development of Power

Much of the recent political debate on 'power' revolves around the issue of the constraining and/or enabling nature of power. Thus, power can be seen as various forms of constraint on human action, but also as that which makes action possible, although in a limited scope. Much of this debate is related to the works of the French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984), who, following the Italian political philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli (1469-1527), sees power as a complex strategic situation in a given society. Being deeply structural, his concept involves both constraint and enablement.

Analysis and Operation of Power

Power manifests itself in a relational manner

Power manifests itself in a relational manner: one cannot meaningfully say that a particular social actor 'has power' without also specifying the role of other parties in the social relationship (for a discussion of this concept see Simmel's work on 'subordination' and 'superordination').

Power operates both relationally and reciprocally

Power operates both relationally and reciprocally, sociologists speak of the balance of power between parties to a relationship: all parties to all relationships have some power: the sociological examination of power concerns itself with discovering and describing the relative strengths: equal or unequal, stable or subject to periodic change. Sociologists usually analyse relationships in which the parties have relatively equal or nearly equal power in terms of constraint rather than of power. Thus 'power' has a connotation of unilateralism. If this were not so, then all relationships could be described in terms of 'power', and its meaning would be lost.

Types of Power

Power may be held through:

- Delegated authority (for example in the democratic process).
- Social class.
- Personal or group charisma.
- Ascribed power (acting on perceived or assumed abilities, whether these bear testing or not).
- Expertise (ability, skills) (the power of medicine to bring about health; another famous example would be in the land of the blind, the one-eyed man is king).
- Persuasion (direct, indirect, or subliminal).

NOTES

Theories of Power

1. Game theory of power

Game theory, with its foundations in the theory of rational choice, is increasingly used in various disciplines to help analyse power relationships. One rational choice definition of power is given by Keith Dowding in his book Power. In rational choice theory, human individuals or groups can be modelled as 'actors' who choose from a 'choice set' of possible actions in order to try and achieve desired outcomes. An actor's 'incentive structure' comprises (its beliefs about) the costs associated with different actions in the choice set, and the likelihoods that different actions will lead to desired outcomes.

2. Modern theory of power

One of the broader modern views of the importance of power in human activity comes from the work of Michel Foucault, who has said, 'Power is everywhere...because it comes from everywhere.' Foucault's analysis of power is founded on his concept 'technologies of power'.

Discipline is a complex bundle of power technologies developed during centuries as Foucault demonstrated in Discipline and Punish. For Foucault power is exercised with intention. Instead of analysing the difficult problem of who has which intentions, he focused on what is inter-subjectively accepted knowledge about how to exercise power. For Foucault, power is actions upon others' actions in order to interfere with them. Foucault does not recur to violence, but says that power presupposes freedom in the sense that power is not enforcement, but ways of making people *by themselves* behave in other ways than they else would have done.

3. Elite theory of power

Pareto, Mosca, Michel, Karl Mannheim, Schumpeter, Anthony Down, Raymond Aron, Bottomore, Robert Dahl, C. Wright Mills are the main exponents of elite theory of power. Elitism is the belief or attitude that the people who are considered to be the elite — a selected group of people with outstanding personal abilities, wealth, specialised training or experience. Alternatively, the term elitism could be used to describe a situation in which power is in fact concentrated in the hands of an elite, whether rightly or not. The elite theory of Pareto (1848-1923) is contained in his principal affirmation that 'history is a graveyard of aristocracies'.

4. Pluralist theory of power

The concept became popular in the context of community power debates in 1950s and 1960s and continued till 1970s and 1980s in America and was expressed in the writings of Floyd Hunter, Robert Dahl, and Palsy. According to Pluralists Power is an ability to influence policy outcome. Dahl responded that there are many different elites involved, who have to work both in contention and in compromise with one another.

Five Bases of Power

The five bases of power were proposed by the social psychologists French and Raven, in a now-classic study (1959). They developed a scheme of five categories of power which reflected the different bases or resources that power holders rely upon. Two additional bases (informational and connectional) were later added.

NOTES

1. Coercive power

Coercive power means the application of negative influences onto employees. It might refer to the ability to demote or to withhold other rewards. It's the desire for valued rewards or the fear of having them withheld that ensures the obedience of those under power. Coercive power tends to be the least effective form of power as it builds resentment and resistance within the targets of Coercive power.

2. Legitimate power

Legitimate power refers to power of an individual because of the relative position and duties of the holder of the position within an organization. Legitimate Power is formal authority delegated to the holder of the position.

3. Referent power

Referent power means the power or ability of individuals to persuade and influence others. It's based on the charisma and interpersonal skills of the power holder. Here the person under power desires to identify with these personal qualities, and gains satisfaction from being an accepted follower.

4. Expert power

Expert power is an individual's power deriving from the skills or expertise of the person and the organization's needs for those skills and expertise. Unlike the others, this type of power is usually highly specific and limited to the particular area in which the expert is trained and qualified.

5. Reward power

Reward power depends upon the ability of the power wielder to confer valued material rewards; it refers to the degree to which the individual can give others a reward of some kind such as benefits, time off, desired gifts, promotions or increases in pay or responsibility.

8.3 AUTHORITY

Authority exists as long as it is accepted as legitimate by the ruled. An organization thus can rule or administer only when it has legitimacy. Explaining the authority of different kinds, in various organizations, Weber concluded that all administration means domination.

Weber categorized the persons in organizations as under:

- Those who are accustomed to obey commands.
- Those who are personally interested in seeing the existing domination continue because they derive benefits.
- Those who participate in that domination in the sense that the exercise of functions is divided among them.
- Those who hold themselves in readiness for the exercise of these functions.

Weber's Theory of Authority

Weber's concept of bureaucracy can be found in his ideas on power and authority (domination). Weber defined power as 'the probability that one actor within a social

Check Your Progress

1. State the definition of power.
2. Mention any two important theories of power.

NOTES

relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance.' For Weber 'authority' was identical with the 'authoritarian power of command'. Weber identified five essential components of authority;

- Imperative control or authority, on the other hand, 'is the probability that a command with a given specific content will be obeyed by a given group of persons.'
- Power is the more inclusive terms, and extends to all combinations of circumstances in which a person might impose his will in a given social situation.
- Exercise of authority would require that a person successfully issue orders to a group of subordinates who respond because of their belief in the legitimacy of the order.
- The felt obligation of the subordinate is central in authority relationship. Where authority has become institutionalized.
- It is often associated with corporate groups, that is, with groups which use their administrative staff to enforce orders.

Authority exists as long as it is accepted as legitimate by the ruled. An organization thus can rule or administer only when it has legitimacy. Explaining the authority of different kinds, in various organizations, Weber concluded that 'all administration means domination'. One thing that needs to be noted here is that Weber defined administration as domination or exercise of authority while most other administrative scientists have defined it as service or performance of duty.

Types of Authority

Weber classified authority on the basis of its claim to legitimacy, since on this would depend largely the type of obedience, the kind of administrative staff suitable to it, and the way of exercising authority. His three pure types of legitimate authority are based respectively on his three bases of legitimacy.

1. Traditional authority

Traditional authority, to Weber, rests on "an established belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and in the legitimacy of the status of those exercising authority under them." The ruler in such a system has authority by virtue of the status that he has inherited and the extent of his authority is fixed by custom. The ruler is obeyed because the traditions so demand. The administrative staff under such an authority system has one of the two patterns, viz., either patrimonial or feudal. Under the patrimonial form, officials are personal retainers, servants and relatives of the ruler and they owe traditional loyalty to the supreme head.

2. Charismatic authority

The power exercised by a leader - may be a prophet, a hero or a demagogue - substantiating the claim by virtue of his magical powers 'or heroism or other extraordinary gift or qualities. Charisma and its acceptance - forms the basis of legitimacy in this system. The persons who receive the commands obey the leader because they believe in his extraordinary abilities rather than the stipulated rules or the dignity of a position. The charismatic leader selects his disciples or followers as his official based purely on their personal devotion to him rather than on their special qualification or status. These 'discipline officials' constitute an organization and their sphere of activity and power of command depends upon the like and dislikes of the leader.

NOTES

3. Legal-rational authority

For Weber, the rational-legal bureaucracy was a prime example of rationalization and its impact on Western political, social, and economic institutions. Legitimation of legal type of domination is based on the belief in the rightness of law, people obey the laws because they believe that these are enacted by a proper, objective procedure. The typical administrative apparatus corresponding to this kind of domination is bureaucracy. The position of the bureaucrat, his relations with the ruler, the ruled and his colleagues are regulated by impersonal rules.

Weber was the first to describe its characteristic, to attempt to explain its emergence in Western society, and to explore its positive as well as negative consequences on the basis of his extensive historical and comparative study of Western and Eastern civilizations. Weber concluded that a distinguishing traits of Western society was its cultural drive to rationalize social and economic processes; by rationalization, he meant a pervasive effort to understand and to manipulate (control) the social and material words in terms of 'cause-and-effect' relationships that do not rely on religious or mystical explanations. Intellectually, this trend was manifesting the development of 'value-neutral' science and its methods.

8.3.1 Legitimacy

Bureaucracy is also a form of control. It implies a hierarchical organization in which there are superiors and subordinates with clearly defined responsibilities and powers. Some are required to issue orders and some others to carry out those orders. In a large-sized organization, there is also the need for co-ordination of activities of the organization. All these imply control of those in the lower ranks of the hierarchy by those in the higher. Such controls become effective as well as smooth, if there is a minimum of voluntary submission to higher authority.

People voluntarily submit to authority when it is regarded as legitimate. Max Weber identified three forms of legitimacy, which derive from three kinds of social action. Thus, it can derive from traditional meanings. Legitimacy of this kind, which we may call traditional legitimacy, depends on belief in the sanctity of immemorial traditions and the right of those established, of the strength of tradition in positions of authority to exercise it. Similarly, legitimacy can derive from rational meanings. Such legitimacy may be called rational legitimacy, which reflects belief in the legality of patterns of formative rules and the right of those people designated by the rules to exercise authority command. There is another type of legitimacy called charismatic legitimacy (so termed after the Greek word for grace), which depends on the devotion of followers to an individual who according to their perception, is endowed by exceptional sanctity, heroism or other personal qualities. Charismatic legitimacy, therefore, derives from affective or emotional action.

Types of Legitimacy

Legitimacy refers to 'a value whereby something or someone is recognized and accepted as right and proper.' In the context of political science, legitimacy more often than not is taken as the well-known acceptance and recognition, by the people, of the authority of a governing establishment, whereby authority comprises political power via consent and mutual understandings, not compulsion. The three types of political legitimacy are as follows:

- Traditional

NOTES

- Charismatic
- Rational-legal

1. **Traditional legitimacy:** It is taken from societal convention and habit that stress the history of the authority of custom. Traditionalists appreciate this form of governance as previously accepted, thus its continuity, since it is the way society has always been. Thus, the institutions of conventional government commonly are historically regular such as monarchy and tribalism.
2. **Charismatic legitimacy:** It emerges from the ideas and individual charisma of the leader, a man or woman whose commanding character appeals and psychologically controls the people to accord with the government's rule. A charismatic government commonly features feeble political and administrative organizations, for they obtain authority from the persona of the leader, and generally vanish without him or her in power. However, a government obtained from charismatic legitimacy might go on if the charismatic leader has a descendant.
3. **Rational legal legitimacy:** It is obtained from a system of institutional process in which government institutions institute and enforce law and order in the interest of the people. Thus, it is through people's trust that the government will put up with the law that awards rational-legal legitimacy.

Forms of Legitimacy

Basically there are two forms of legitimacy—numinous legitimacy and civil legitimacy.

1. **Numinous legitimacy:** In a theocracy, government legitimacy is obtained from the religious authority of a god or a goddess. For example, in ancient Egypt, the legitimacy of the power of a Pharaoh (god-king) was theologically founded by the doctrine that considered the pharaoh as the Egyptian patron god Horus, son of Osiris.
2. **Civil legitimacy:** A civil government's political legitimacy is obtained from a bond among the autonomous constituent institutions such as legislative, judicial, executive, joined together for the national common good; legal government office as a public trust, is expressed by the way of general elections.

Max Weber, the German economist and sociologist, recognized three sources of political legitimacy—charismatic, traditional and rational-legal authorities.

Just like the British philosopher Thomas Hobbes, Weber suggested that societies act cyclically in ruling themselves with the various types of governmental legitimacy. That democracy was needless for setting up legitimacy, a circumstance that can be founded with codified laws, customs and cultural rules, not by the ways of well-known suffrage. A society might make a decision to lapse from the legal government of a rational-legal authority to the charismatic rule of a leader; for example, the Nazi Germany of Adolf Hitler.

Prof. Mattei Dogan, the French political scientist's modern interpretation of Weber's traditional, charismatic, legal-rational legitimacies suggests that they are theoretically deficient to comprehend the complex associations that constitute a legitimate political system in the twenty-first century. Moreover, Prof. Dogan suggested that traditional authority and charismatic authority are out of date as forms of modern government; for example, the Islamic Republic of Iran (est. 1979) ruled by means of the

NOTES

religious Quranic explanations by the Ayatollah Khomeini; that traditional authority does not exist in the Middle East; that the rule-proving exclusions include Islamic Iran and Saudi Arabia. In addition, rational-legal authority survives in so many variations that it has crossed the limits of a type of legitimate authority.

Forms of Legitimate Governments

Philosopher Walter Bryce Gallie (1912–98) suggested that political legitimacy is basically a challenged idea and offered this suggestion to aid the comprehension of the various applications and interpretations of qualitative and evaluative ideas for example 'art', 'social justice', etc., as employed in aesthetics, political philosophy, the philosophy of religion and the philosophy of history. The following are the examples of the forms of legitimate governments:

1. Constitutionalism

The contemporary political idea of constitutionalism sets up the law as supreme over the individual will, by integrating nationalism, democracy and restricted government. The political legitimacy of constitutionalism is obtained from the well-known belief and recognition that government deed is legal for abiding the law codified in the political constitution. Political scientist Carl Joachim Friedrich said that constitutionalism, by dividing power among the organs of government, successfully limits governmental action with codified law.

2. Monarchy

In a monarchy, the ruling legitimacy of the king or the queen is obtained from the popular discernment (tradition and custom) that he or she is the legal ruler, owing to the divine right of kings. In the modern, twenty-first-century world, such political legitimacy is apparent in the absolute monarchy of the House of Saud in Saudi Arabia. Its alternative, the constitutional monarchy, is based upon an amalgamation of traditional authority and legal-rational authority, to uphold nationalist unity (one people) and democratic administration (a political constitution).

3. Democracy

In a democracy, government legitimacy is obtained from the well-known outlook that government abides democratic rules in ruling, and is lawfully answerable to its people.

4. Communism

Communist countries maintained governmental legitimacy for having earned a rebellion or for having won a poll, and, therefore, their actions are legal, authorized by the public. In the beginning of the twentieth century, communist parties based their debates upon the scientific nature of Marxism.

5. Fascism

In the 1920s and 1930s, fascism, which was based upon conventional authority arguments, the German National Socialists and Italian fascism, in that order, claimed political legitimacy by theoretically refuting the political legality of elected liberal democratic governments.

Check Your Progress

3. What are the three types of legitimate authority?
4. Mention the two forms of legitimacy.

NOTES

8.4 SUMMARY

- Both in the national and international arena, the notion of power is pivotal to understand and comprehend politics, political institutions and political movements of the systemic process. It is the centre of political theory.
- A definition in *A Dictionary of Social Sciences* says: 'Power in its most general sense denotes (a) the ability (exercised or not) to produce a certain occurrence or (b) the influence exerted by man or group, through whatever means, over the conduct of others in intended ways.'
- There are many difficulties involved in the methodologies to understand what the centre of power is in a political system.
- Power is intricately related to honour, deference, respect and dignity. However, it is important to differentiate between the power of the man from the power of his office that assures him authority and legitimacy.
- The idea of power is one of the basic concepts of political theory. The examination of the nature of power in socialist and capitalist societies is necessary for comprehending the nature of politics as well as the state.
- In the Marxist approach and terms, the idea of power is related to the control of state power through revolts.
- The five bases of power were proposed by the social psychologists French and Raven, in a now-classic study (1959). They developed a scheme of five categories of power which reflected the different bases or resources that power holders rely upon.
- Authority exists as long as it is accepted as legitimate by the ruled. An organization thus can rule or administer only when it has legitimacy.
- Weber's concept of bureaucracy can be found in his ideas on power and authority (domination). Weber defined power as 'the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance.'
- Weber classified authority on the basis of its claim to legitimacy, since on this would depend largely the type of obedience, the kind of administrative staff suitable to it, and the way of exercising authority.
- Bureaucracy is also a form of control. It implies a hierarchical organization in which there are superiors and subordinates with clearly defined responsibilities and powers.
- Legitimacy refers to 'a value whereby something or someone is recognized and accepted as right and proper.'

8.5 KEY TERMS

- **Legitimacy:** It is the popular acceptance of a governing law or regime as an authority.
- **Authority:** The power to give orders to people is known as authority.
- **Hegemony:** It refers to leadership or dominance, especially by one state or social group over others

NOTES

8.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Power in its most general sense denotes (a) the ability (exercised or not) to produce a certain occurrence or (b) the influence exerted by man or group, through whatever means, over the conduct of others in intended ways.
2. Two important theories of power are elite theory of power and pluralist theory of power.
3. Three types of legitimate authority are traditional authority, charismatic authority and legal-rational authority.
4. Two forms of legitimacy are numinous legitimacy and civil legitimacy.

8.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What is power? Discuss its relevance
2. Discuss the empirical study of power?
3. Critically discuss the Marxist and western approach to power.
4. Discuss Weber's theory of authority.

Long-Answer Questions

1. Write a detailed note on theories of power.
2. Explain the bases of power. Throw light on analysis and operation of power.
3. What do you understand by authority? Discuss various types of authority.
4. What are different types of legitimacy? Explain different forms of legitimate governments.

8.8 FURTHER READING

Kretzschmar, A. and Rafal Konopka. 2003. *Oxford Dictionary of Pronunciation for Current English*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Hall, S. 1996. *The Theory and Method of Articulation in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.

Hall, S. 1996. *Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge.

UNIT 9 DEMOCRACY

Structure

- 9.0 Introduction
- 9.1 Unit Objectives
- 9.2 Liberal Approach
 - 9.2.1 Meaning of Democracy
- 9.3 Marxist Approach
- 9.4 Summary
- 9.5 Key Terms
- 9.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 9.7 Questions and Exercises
- 9.8 Further Reading

NOTES

9.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will read about democracy. Broadly speaking, the term 'democracy' means rule by the people. However, varied meanings have been associated with it over a period of time. Debates about the nature of democracy have tended to focus on three important questions.

First, to what extent should political power be distributed? Second, should the people in effect rule themselves or should the government be left in the hands of elected representatives? Third, is it appropriate to decide collectively through the use of democratic process? In direct democracy, which originated and was practised in ancient Greece, citizens used to make decisions themselves, without representative institutions. This interpretation stresses the value of public discussion, both for the participants and for the quality of decisions. This model of democracy has serious limitations and, therefore, is not a popular form of government in modern times. Democracy is not only a form of government but also an ideal, an aspiration and a standard. The core element of democracy is self-rule. The origin of the term democracy can be traced back to ancient Greece.

9.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Understand the meaning of democracy
- Discuss liberal approach to democracy
- Explain the major points of the Marxist approach to democracy

9.2 LIBERAL APPROACH

In the lexicography of political science, no word is more controversial than 'democracy'. There is no individual who does not like it but he may raise its 'question of suitability and efficacy at particular circumstances'. The suitability of democracy is related to the question of the form of government and not to that of principle. Many scholars object to the application of democracy to particular circumstances but they are not opposed to

democratic principle. Today many people ask whether the circumstances or environment will be moulded to make them suitable for democracy or democracy will be changed to mould the environment for its own development.

NOTES

9.2.1 Meaning of Democracy

As to the proper meaning of the word, there is also a controversy. As G. C. Field observes, 'In recent years controversy has arisen about the proper meaning of the word democracy.' In spite of differences of opinion, democracy is regarded as a useful form of government. Where it does not exist, men are fighting for it and where it already exists, men are striving to make it perfect.

Sukarno's Indonesia called itself a guided democracy and Ayub's Pakistan called itself a basic democracy. Even the communist and socialist countries call themselves as pure democracies. Etymologically, democracy is derived from two Greek words 'demos' and 'kratia'. *Demos* means people and *kratia* means power or rule. Therefore, democracy means the power or rule of the people. Here are some more definitions of democracy. C.D. Burns says, 'Few words have been more loosely and variously defined than democracy. It has literally meant all things to all men'.

Laski observes, 'Democracy has a context in every sphere of life; and in each of these spheres it raises its special problems which do not admit of satisfactory or universal generalization.' Prof. Burns also remarks, 'Democracy may be found both in the social, atmosphere and in political organization; and indeed it is possible to speak of democracy in every form of social life, in religion, in industry as well as in politics.' Abraham Lincoln defines democracy as 'the government of the people, by the people and for the people.' Seeley says that 'democracy is a government in which everyone has a share.' MacIver defines democracy as 'Democracy is not a way of governing whether by majority or otherwise, but primarily a way of determining who shall govern and broadly to what ends.'

According to Maxey, 'Democracy is a search for a way of life in which the voluntary free intelligence and activity of man can be harmonized and coordinated with the least possible coercion.' In the words of Sartori, 'Democracy denotes a political system characterized by the absence of personal power and more particularly, a system that hinges on the principle that no one can proclaim himself as ruler, that no one can hold power irrevocably in his own name.' Ivor Brown is right when he says that 'the word has come to mean anything; or rather so much that it means nothing at all.' UNESCO questionnaire speaks of the vagueness of democracy. Robert Dahl says that a responsible democracy can exist only if the following institutional guarantees are present:

- Freedom to form and join associations.
- Freedom of expression.
- Right to vote.
- Right to be elected and hold public offices.
- Right of political leaders to compete for support and vote.
- Alternative sources of information.
- Free and fair election.
- Institutions for making government policies depend on votes and other expression of preferences.

Democratic Government, Democratic State and Democratic Society

Democracy is not merely a form of government. Some claim it to be a form of state and some regard it as a form of society. A democratic government is one which is based on the accountability of the people; a democratic state is one which is based on popular sovereignty. Democracy, in its wider meaning, is a form of society. A democratic government implies a democratic state, although a democratic state may not imply a democratic government.

Example: The United States is a democratic state but does not have daily accountability to the Congress. For a democratic government, there must be a democratic state and democratic society.

Besides, democracy is an order of society and a way of life. It has political, social and economic implications. It has faith in the equality of all men and the recognition of the individuality of human beings. A democratic way of life is characterized by tolerance, mutual respect and fraternity. It implies equitable distribution of wealth. If the majority government suppresses the minority opinion, it is contrary to the democratic ideal.

Direct Democracy and Indirect Democracy

Democracy is of two types, viz., direct democracy and indirect democracy or representative democracy.

1. Direct democracy

Direct democracy prevailed in the city states of ancient Greece. There, the people directly participated in the affairs of the Government. All the citizens used to go to a particular place and decide matters relating to legislation, taxation and policy making. It was possible because of the small size of the city States.

Modern states are quite big in size and population. Hence, direct democracy of the types of Greek city states is not possible in any modern state. But direct democracy can be found in Switzerland in modern states. Modern states direct democracy operations through the instruments of referendum, initiative and recall.

- **Referendum:** It means to refer to the people. It means that no law passed by the Swiss legislature can be effective unless it is referred to the people in a referendum and receives their approval. Similarly, constitutional amendment can be valid when it is approved by a majority of the people and the majority of the Cantons in a referendum. It is a remedy against legislative commission.
- **Initiative:** It is a remedy against legislative omission. If the legislature does not pass an act, people can propose legislation through initiative. That law will come into force when approved by the people in a referendum. It may bring the legislators in touch with the people, but it gives the people a power, which they cannot properly utilize.
- **Landsgemeinde:** In some Cantons of Switzerland, the institution of landsgemeinde or open assembly prevails. There, like the city state people gather at a particular place and decide their own affairs. In this sense, it is similar to the direct democracy, which prevailed in the Greek city states.
- **Recall:** It means withdrawing the representatives from the Assembly or legislature if they do not work for the betterment of the people. Recall is advocated now-a-days in modern democracy to withdraw representatives

NOTES

who do not perform their duties properly. Example: Jaya Prakash Narayan suggested recall for India.

These devices are weapons in the hands of the people to check legislation and to enable them take part directly in the Government.

NOTES

Merits of direct democracy

The following are the merits of direct democracy:

- It enables the people to get the experience of government and administration.
- It makes the government responsible.
- It creates a sense of responsibility and patriotism among the people.
- It enhances the political consciousness of the people.
- It keeps the voters in touch with the government.

Demerits of direct democracy

Direct democracy has the following demerits:

- It is not suitable for large states.
- It misleads the people because the opportunists take advantage of it.
- All the people are not suitable to give their opinion under this system. They simply say 'yes' or 'no'.
- It cannot take secret decisions on war and emergencies.
- It requires a high sense of responsibility, which the people lack.

2. Indirect Democracy

In almost all countries of the modern world except Switzerland, indirect democracy prevails. Switzerland presents a blend of direct and indirect democracy. Due to the large size of the modern state, it is not possible for all the people to gather at the particular place and take decisions. Hence, people elect their representatives who sit in the parliament and make law for the people. This is called indirect democracy.

Features of indirect democracy

Indirect democracy has the following features:

- It is a representative form of government in which people's representatives take decisions.
- Sovereignty is vested in the people.
- Government works on behalf of the people.
- People do not get a chance of participate in the affairs of the state.

Merits of indirect democracy

Indirect democracy has the following merits:

- It is suitable for big countries only.
- Here, political demagogues play an important role. They can mobilize the voters in their favour.

- The Government runs on behalf of the people.
- Secrecy can be maintained where it is required.

Demerits of indirect democracy

- The voters are ignorant. So it is not possible to vest powers in their hands.
- Direct contact between the voters and representatives cannot be established under this system.
- After their election, the representatives seldom nurse their constituencies.
- It gives rise to corruption. Political parties vitiate the atmosphere of the country.
- It is very expensive. Example: The holding of an election in a country of
- India's size entails heavy expenditure.

Characteristics of Democracy

Democracy has certain characteristics. R. M. MacIver says that democracy is not a way of governing, whether, by majority or otherwise, but primarily, a way of determining who shall govern and broadly to what ends. Democracy is not a one-way traffic. It implies responsibilities both on the part of the ruler and ruled. It is based on the cooperation of both. The main characteristics of democracy are as follows:

- **Popular sovereignty:** Democracy is based on the sovereignty of the people. That is to say people exercise supreme power in a democracy. They have the right to elect the government and the government remains responsible to it. If the government does not fulfil the wishes of the people, people have a right to overthrow it and institute a new government.
- **Political, social and economic equality:** In a democracy, there is political, social and economic equality. So far as political equality is concerned, all, rich or poor, educated or uneducated, high or low, have one vote only. In the social sphere, there shall not be any discrimination against any one on grounds of religion, race, sex, caste or place of birth. In the economic sphere, there shall not be great gulf between the rich and the poor or haves and have nots.
- **Majority rule:** Democracy is rule of the majority. It is the majority that governs in a democracy. No party can govern unless it has acquired majority of seats in the legislature.
- **Respect for the opinion of the minority:** In democracy no doubt, the majority rules, but it cannot ride rough shod over the minority. The opinion of the minority should be given due consideration.
- **Rights:** Democracy provides various kinds of rights to the individuals. Example: The right to freedom of speech and expression, right to form unions or associations, religious freedom, right to free movement and educational and cultural rights are some of the rights that the people enjoy in a democracy. It upholds individual dignity.
- **Government by adjustment and compromise:** Democracy is a government by adjustment and compromise. Different opinions are likely to arise in democracy within the ruling party itself. Therefore, it has to function with adjustment and compromise of a variety of opinions. Therefore, it allows plurality of ideas.

NOTES

NOTES

- **Value system:** It is a form of government in which people can realize their best ideals and highest qualities. Therefore, it is a system of values. Three things are important in a democracy, efficiency, realization of best ideals and qualities and self-rule. If democracy lacks efficiency, it will be the worst form of government.
- **Democracy is a welfare-oriented concept:** America, which is one of the best democracies used, realized during the *great* economic depression and afterwards that democracy should be to promote the needs and welfare of the people. Most of the democratic countries today are welfare countries. They aim at promoting the welfare of the people without destroying individual freedom.
- **Rule of law:** In democracy, there is rule of law. It means the supremacy of law as against that of man. It also stands for equality of law. A. V. Dicey is the exponent of rule of law in Britain.
- **Independence of judiciary:** Democracy is characterized by independent judiciary with the exception of England. The judiciary acts without fear or favour, affection or ill will. It can declare a law as ultravires, if it violates the constitution.
- **It is opposed to coercive methods:** It based on persuasion not coercion.
- **Democracy is a theory of society as well as government:** A.D. Lindsay has explored this concept of democracy. The purpose of every democratic government is to serve the community. For this purpose, it has to remove disharmonies from the society and provide a congenial atmosphere for democratic values and principles to thrive.
- **Leadership:** Democracy provides scope for producing leaders starting from the village level to the national level. Those who have the qualities of leadership can get scope to prove their talents. **Example:** Jawaharlal Nehru was the chairman of the Allahabad Municipality. But he rose to the position of the prime minister. There are many such examples in which leaders have started their career from lower levels and proved to be efficient as national leaders. Therefore, democracy is not only a form of government, but also a way of life.

Political, Social and Economic Democracy

Democracy has political, social and economic dimensions.

- **Political democracy:** In the political sphere, it stands for liberty, freedom of speech and expression, majority rule and tolerance of the views of the minorities.
- **Social democracy:** Operates in the social sphere; it means that there shall be equality and no discrimination against any one on grounds of religion, race, sex and place of birth.
- **Economic democracy:** It means that in the economic sphere, there shall be equitable distribution of wealth. There shall not be a great gulf between the rich and poor.

Merits of Democracy

In democracy, you agree upon certain common principles. You respect one another's point of view. Democracy provides the framework within which the moral life of the individual is possible. A.D. Lindsay in his book *Essentials of Democracy*, says that 'the end of democratic government is to minister to the common life of society and remove

the disharmonies that trouble it.' Thus, democracy is an ideal, a means and a way of life. The merits of democracy are as follows:

- **A rational form government:** It is based upon the premise that no man is infallible. Every man is liable to commit mistakes. As no man is infallible, democracy adopts a process of discussion and criticism in which every man is allowed to take part. The continuous process of discussion and scrutiny acts as a necessary corrective of abuse of power.
- **It provides rights to the individual:** Democracy provides political, social and economic rights to the individuals. The right to vote, the right to life, the right to religion, the right to education, the right of minorities, the right to work, the right to a reasonable way and the right to rest and leisure are some of the rights, which the democracy provides. There has been some movements for rights, such as the American War of Independence 1776, the French Revolution 1789 and the Russian Revolution of 1917. Without these rights, life will be meaningless.
- **Equality:** Democracy not only provides right but also provides equality. All are equal in the political, social and economic spheres. All enjoy equal rights. There is no discrimination on the grounds of religion, race, sex, caste and place of birth.
- **Democracy is an efficient and responsible form of government:** The method of free election at certain intervals and the method of popular control at every stage of administration, either through criticism inside the legislature or outside through public opinion, make it extremely efficient and responsible.
- **Democracy promotes the welfare of the people:** It is clear from its definition that democracy is the government of the people. It also provides security to the individuals. Welfare is the yardstick of the security of the government.
- **It is government by the majority:** In democracy, the majority rules. In other forms of government, it is one man or a few who form the government. Hence, in democracy, majority opinion counts.
- **Tolerance:** Though the majority rules, the opinion of the minority is tolerated. There are different shades of opinion in the society. Every shade of opinion is given due consideration.
- **Checks in democracy:** MacIver justifies democracy because it is less dependent on the psychology of power. There are many checks on democracy. Hence, it cannot create a consciousness of superiority in the governing class.
- **Liberty:** Mills, classic defence of democracy is based on the argument that the rights of the individual are secured in democracy because he is able to stand up for them. Democracy offers every individual the liberty to vindicate his privileges.
- **Character-building:** Democracy has an ennobling influence on the character of the people. It is an active school for character building. Bryce says that the manhood of the individual is dignified by his political enfranchisement and he is raised to a higher level by the sense of duty, which it shows upon him.

Demerits of Democracy

Democracy has the following demerits or weaknesses:

- **Since the time of Plato and Aristotle democracy has been criticized:** Plato criticized democracy because he put his master Socrates to death. Aristotle regarded

NOTES

NOTES

it as a prevented form of government. It is the government of average men and women. The average men in the words of Maxey are sheep-minded, ape-minded and wolf-minded.

- **It is said that democracy is based on number:** It counts the heads but not the contents in the heads. So, it is based on quantity instead of quality.
- **Cult of incompetence:** The French writer Faguet describes democracy as the cult of incompetence. Bryce says that it is government by the incompetent. It is the ignorant and inefficient men who come to power. Such men are unintelligent, uninformed, prejudiced, emotional and resentful of superiority of others. They are the most numerous in society.
- **Tyranny of the majority:** The majority may impose their will on the minority. The minority view is either suppressed or ignored. The majority in the legislature walk like a colossus. Hence, it may ignore the view of the minority.
- **Expensive:** Democracy is very expensive. There are frequent elections in democracy. Besides, much money is spent on propaganda and mobilizing public opinion. There is wastage not only of money, but also time and opportunity. It is the most extravagant and indifferent system.
- **Democracy is an unscientific dogma:** The psychological study of democracy is based on the study of mass psychology. As Graham Wallas says, 'Politics is only in a slight degree the product of unconscious reason.' In a democracy, where masses are supposed to take part in government, the operation of crowd psychology is much in evidence.
- **It is characterized by indecision and instability:** In the words of Maxey, democracy government is 'prone to indecision, feebleness, instability.' Government changes so often that administrative stability is seldom possible. Discussion also results in delay.
- **Corruption:** Corruption is another demerit of democracy. It is said that power corrupts and absolute power, corrupts absolutely. When power remains in the hands of the people, it leads to corruption. Votes are bought and sold.
- **Unsuitable for emergency:** It cannot take quick action. Hence, it is unsuitable for a emergencies like flood, famine, cyclone, war etc.
- The present system of democracy, based on geographical representation, is faulty. A representative cannot represent the varied interests of the individuals. So G. D. H. Code advocates functional representations.
- Lord Bryce sums up the weakness of democracy as follows:
 - The power of money to prevent administration and legislation
 - The tendency to make politics a gainful profession
 - Extravagance in administration
 - The abuse of the doctrine of equality and failure to appreciate the value of administrative skill
 - The undue power of party organization
 - The tendency of legislators and political officials to play for votes in the passing of laws and in tolerating breaches of order

NOTES

- Faguet attacks democracy that it is a biological misfit or a biological monstrosity. Democracy is not in line with the process of evolution. He argues that the higher we descend the scale of evolution, the greater is the tendency towards centralization.

Safeguards of Democracy or Conditions for Successful Working of Democracy

Certain conditions are necessary for democracy to be successful. Aristotle pointed out to the economic basis of politics. Politics cannot succeed unless people are economically sound and there is no great gulf between the rich and the poor. If this is not to their own purposes. Sometimes, it tends towards dictatorship. Hence, it is necessary to discuss at length the safeguards of dictatorship, which are as follows:

- **Faith in democracy:** This is the most important condition for the success of democracy. People must have faith in democracy and should be ready to be governed democratically. Then they can develop qualities like majority rule, tolerance, responsibility, independent voting power etc.
- **Universal education:** Universal education is another condition for the success of democracy. Without education, people cannot distinguish the right from wrong. Therefore, J.S. Mill said that 'Universal education should precede universal franchise.'
- **Removal of poverty:** Removal of poverty is another safeguard of democracy. If half of the population remains below the poverty line, they cannot take any interest in democratic process. Their time will be spent in earning two square meals a day. Instead of exercising their conscience, they will vote for money.
- **Spirit of law-abidingness:** In a democracy, people should develop a spirit of law abidingness. It enhances discipline and builds the national character. It established and maintained political morality. In its absence, there will be anarchy and corruption.
- **Rule of law:** Rule of law is another safeguard of democracy. It means supremacy of law as opposed to supremacy of man. There should be equality before law and equal-protection of law. Then only democracy can be real.
- **Bi-party system:** Bi-party system is the best safeguard of democracy. In England and America, democracy has been successful because of bi-party system. In a bi-party system, one or the other party must secure a majority. The party that does not secure a majority sits in the opposition. In Britain, the opposition is known as his majesty's opposition and the leader of the opposition is the shadow Prime Minister. There is also a shadow cabinet in the Opposition corresponding to every minister in the government.
- **Independent media:** The media, like the press, radio, T.V. etc., should be independent and impartial. They should report news and views independently. They should not indulge in yellow or sensational journalism. If the media is free and impartial the government will function with caution.
- **Strong opposition:** The opposition should be strong. What is necessary in a parliamentary democracy is that the opposition should be equally strong. It should not oppose for sake of the opposition but offer constructive criticism.

NOTES

- **Patriotism:** People should have loyalty to their nation. They will be willing to sacrifice for the sake of their country.
- **Agreement on fundamentals:** People should have faith in the basic and fundamental principles of democracy. They should have some common programmes for the development of the country. Whichever party may come to power should strive to implement them. There should be change of government through constitutional means.
- **Wise constitution:** The constitution should ensure social, economic and political justice to the people. It will build a strong foundation for democracy. If the aim of the constitution is to create merely a police state, democracy cannot survive for long. **Example:** Pakistan's constitution led to the overthrow of democracy because of weak constitution.
- **Eternal vigilance:** It is said that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. It can also be equally applied to democracy. There may be enemies from outside the state. People should be vigilant against them. There may be danger from antisocial elements from within the state. People should keep a watchful eye on them.
- **Decentralization of power:** It is another safeguard of democracy. It gives power to the people of the grassroots. If the above safeguards are observed, democracy can work successfully in a country.

Classical Theory of Democracy

Democracy is a very old form of government and so its theory dates back to the days of the Greeks who identified it with 'people's power' (Pericles), or a system in which 'rulers are accountable to the people for what they do therein'.

Such a view saw its reaffirmation in modern times when Abraham Lincoln in his Gettysberg oration of 1863 called it 'a government of the people, by the people, and for the people'. Great liberals like John Locke and Edmund Burke developed the same theme in the direction of a 'limited government' bound by the laws of the land. Later on, the utilitarians like Bentham and James Stuart Mill justified the case of democratic government in the name of their formula of the 'greatest good of the greatest number' and Mill give the same ton to the force of his moral or ethical argument. This trend continued in the present century and saw its powerful reiteration at the hands of Dickey, Bryce and Laski. Apart from this, the idealistic argument of democracy prevailed side by side that had its brilliant manifestation at the hands of Rousseau, Green and Lindsay. All such affirmations constitute, what is now called, the classical theory of democracy.

Characteristics of Classical Theory of Democracy

The classical theory of democracy as espoused by the liberals and the idealists of the modern age has these salient features:

1. Power is vested in the people and its exercise is given to them or to their chosen representatives accountable to them for their acts of commission and omission. All decision must be based on the consent of the people. Thus, it stands on the premise that 'people are always right' (in theory), or the decision of the majority is always correct' (in practice). We may take note of the fact that, though a great idealist, Rousseau also went to the extent of laying down that, for all practical purposes, the general will should be taken as the will of the majority. So James Bryce defined democracy as 'a government in which the will of the majority of

NOTES

- qualified citizens rules, taking the qualified citizen to constitute the great bulk of the inhabitants, say, roughly, at least three-fourth so that the physical force of the citizens coincides (broadly speaking) with their voting power'.
2. The people have certain natural and inalienable rights, which the government cannot abrogate or diminish. The doctrine of 'natural rights', as it came to be known, emerged as the most powerful instrument at the hands of the democrats who struggled for the rights of the people against arbitrary power of the kings. Notably in England in the mid-seventeenth century, the 'independents', the 'levellers' and other protagonists of the commoner's set forth the ground of their resistance to the autocratic claims of the Crown, the established Church, and the entrenched hereditary nobility. Reacting against the arbitrary powers of thinking, John Milton asserted the 'all men are naturally born free' and from this principle he derived 'the liberty and right of freeborn men to be governed as seems them best.' Most powerful was the argument of John Locke coined to justify the Glorious revolution of 1688-89 that 'to understand political power right, we must begin with the recognition of natural and original freedom of all men to order their actions and dispose of their possessions as they think fit, within the bound of the laws of nature, without asking leave or depending upon the will of any other man.'
3. The doctrine of 'natural rights' lost its significance with the growth of the idea of positive liberalism that sought to reinterpret the relationship between individual liberty and state activity. Thus, Bentham offered his principle of utility that sought to give a new interpretation to the justification of democracy. The doctrine of natural rights was rejected rather replaced by the doctrine of the happiness of man measured in terms of material pleasures. He gave the formula of 'one person, one vote'. It implied that although all persons are not naturally the same in intelligence, energy, thrift, inventiveness and perseverance, yet all normal men - just as they have equal rights to life, freedom and access to the courts of law - have equal rights to a voice in government because they have equal stakes in the justice and efficiency of governmental action'. This argument implies that since political government has no other end than the well-being of the individual men and women that make up society and since each individual's well-being ought to count for as much as that of any other individual, a society is properly organized politically to the extent that its constitution and policy tend to promote the interests, conserve the rights and extend the capacities and opportunities for happiness of the greatest number of individuals in the community. Democratic government satisfies these requirements, since it is least likely to subordinate the welfare of the majority of the community to that of any part. Democracy means government by those who have the greatest concern and the greatest awareness of the interest and rights of the people generally. The natural self-interest of human being is the best security against political action that is oppressive or tolerant of oppression'.
4. If Benthamite utilitarianism displaced the line of 'natural rights', a revisionist of the utilitarian creed like Mill replaced the materialistic content of Bentham by the force of his ethical argument in favour of democracy. The argument of Bentham was based on the self-interest of the individual that ought to be harmonized with the interest of the society in the framework of the great good of the greatest number'.

The defenders of Bentham called it enlightened of benevolent hedonism. But Mill defended the case of democracy as the best form of government on moral grounds. As he says, 'The most important point of excellence which any form of government can possess is to promote the virtue and intelligence of the people themselves. The first question in respect to any political institution is how far they tend to foster in the member of the community the various qualities—moral, intellectual and active'. Highlighting this point of difference between the views of Bentham and Mill, it is well commented; 'Bentham's principle of utility in a society of wolves would exact wolfishness; in a society of saints it would exalt saintliness. Mill was determined that saint less should be the criterion of utility in any society whatsoever.'

5. The classical theory of democracy has a peculiar dimension when we examine the view of the idealists like Rousseau and Green. To Rousseau democracy alone ensures prevalence of the 'general will'. In every community, there is a section of really selfless and enlightened people who think in terms of public interest and it is the inherent force of their selfless argument that ultimately prevails in any matter under discussion before a body of the people. Through the process of cancellation good would set aside the bad; all contradictions would be resolved and in the end only 'dominant good' would emerge. This good, which would be what was left at the will emerge. This good, which would be what was left at the will of becomes integrated, would be in effect the same as the 'general will'. Influenced by the idealistic interpretations of Rousseau, Green says that 'will, not force, is the basis of the state'. As he observes;

'The sovereign should be regarded not as any abstraction as the wielder of coercive force, but in connection with the how complex of institutions of political society. It is as their sustained and thus the agent of the general will, that the sovereign power must be presented to the minds of the people. If it is to command habitual obedience and obedience will scarcely be habitual unless it is loyal and forced.'

6. Above all, democracy has no substitutes in terms of excellence from a practical point of view. Every form of government has its merits and demerits. But peculiar is the case of democracy where merits far outweigh its demerits. Hence, it is the substitutes-less form of government. Liberal democrats of the present century contend that although no form of government could revolutionize or perfect human nature and all forms had their characteristic defects. The defects of democracy had been, in recent times, less numerous than those of other 'non-democratic' or anti-democratic forms. But while doing so, the liberals keep in view the case of democracy as developed in the West based on the principle of universal adult franchise, free and fair periodic elections, multi-party system, independence of press and judiciary, basic rights of the people, freedom of dissent, tolerance of opposition and the like Bryce goes to the last extent of posing a question that if democracy 'has not brought all the blessings that were expected, it has in some countries destroyed, in other materially diminished, many of the cruelties and terrors, injustices and oppressions of former times. However, grave the indictments that may be brought against democracy, its friends can answer, 'what better alternative do you offer?'

In fact, the classical or traditional doctrine of democracy has been in part a theory of certain original rights of man – a view that government is made in virtue of those rights and must conform to them. The men have a natural right to participate equally in

political power, just as they have a natural right to be free from enslavement or to appeal on equal to judicial tribunals for protection of their lives and property against assaults, trespass or encroachment of any kind. What is known as 'democratic method' is that institutional arrangements of arriving at political decisions which realizes the common good by making the people itself decide issues through the election of individuals who are to assemble in order to carry out its will. There exists a common good, the obvious become light of policy, which his always simple to define and which every normal person can be made to see by means of rational argument.... Thus, every member of the community, conscious of that goal, knowing his or her mind, discerning what is good and what is bad, takes part, actively and responsibly, in furthering the former and fighting the latter and all the members taken together control their public affairs.'

Criticism of Classical Theory of Democracy

The classical theory of democracy has been criticized on many counts.

1. First, it is thoroughly normative. It is located with high ideals and bombastic propositions like 'general will', 'people's rule', 'people's power', 'common good', and the like that cannot be subjected to an empirical verification. All these terms are quite elusive.
2. Second, it attaches no importance to the role of numerous interest groups and organization that play their part in the struggle for power, or which compete among themselves and that all constitutes the stuff of a democratic-system in practice. The utilitarians talk about 'greatest happiness of the greatest number' without taking into consideration the powerful role of groups, functions and elites that ever strive to protect and promote their specific interests.
3. Third, the socialists and the Marxists have their own version of democracy that stretches the system of political democracy into social and economic spheres. To the Marxists, it is all like a defence of the discredited bourgeois system.

Merits of Classical theory of Democracy

The classical theory of democracy has its own salient merits, which are thus summed up by Schumpeter:

1. Though the classical doctrine of collective action may not be supported by the results of an empirical analysis, it is powerfully supported by its association with religious beliefs. The very meaning of a term like 'equality' may be doubtful, there is hardly any rational warrant for exalting it into a postulate, so long as we move in the sphere of empirical analysis. Christianity harbours a strong equalitarian element. Any celebrated word like 'equality' or 'freedom' may become a flag, a symbol of all a man holds dear, of everything that he loves about his nation whether rationally contingent to it or not.
2. It is a fact that the forms and phrases of classical democracy are for many nations associated with events and developments in their history, which are enthusiastically approved by large majority is, any opposition to an established regime is likely to use these forms and phrases whatever its meanings and social roots may be. Under these circumstances a democratic revolution has meant the advent of freedom and decency, and the democratic creed meant a gospel of reason and betterment. To be sure, this advantage was bound to be lost and the gulf between the doctrine and the practice of democracy was bound to be discovered. But the glamour of the dawn was slow to fade.

NOTES

3. It must not be forgotten that there are patterns in which the classical doctrine will actually fit facts with a sufficient degree of approximation. It provides an effective mechanism for talking and implementing decisions whether it is small and primitive society of Switzerland or a being and industrialized society of the United States. This is the case with many small and primitive societies which, as a matter of fact, served, as a prototype to the authors of that doctrines of classical theory. It may be the case with those societies also that are not primitive, provided they are not too differentiated and do not harbour any serious problems.

4. Of course, the politicians appreciate a phraseology that flatters the masses and offers an excellent opportunity not only for evading responsibility but also for crushing opponents in the name of the people.

The intrinsic merits of the democratic system cannot be defined. At the same time, some other points should be taken into account that have been stressed by the empirical theorists like role of numerous groups, factions, elites, leadership etc., so as to present a theory of democracy approximating the world of reality. However, before passing over to the study of empirical theory of democracy, this point must be stressed with any amount of force that the new interpretation is a revision, not a rejection, of the classical theory of democracy.

The spirit of liberalism informs both. As political scientist, C.B. Macpherson, author of *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*, says: 'What the addition of democracy to the liberal state did was simply to provide constitutional channels for popular pressure to which governments would have had to yield in about the same measures anyway, merely to maintain public order and avoid revolution.'

By admitting the mass of people into the competitive party system, the liberal state did not abandon its fundamental nature, it simply opened the competitive political system to all the individuals who had been created by the competitive market society. The liberal state fulfilled its own logic. In so doing, it neither destroyed nor wakened itself; it strengthened both itself and the market society. It liberalized democracy, while democratizing liberalism.'

9.3 MARXIST APPROACH

The Marxist view is basically opposed to liberal democracy in its belief that a capitalistic state which is representative of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie cannot be democratic by its nature. The Marxists view liberal democracy as an improbable utopia. According to them, in a capitalist state, all 'independent' media and most political parties are controlled by capitalists and large financial resources or the support of the bourgeoisie is needed to win an election. Lenin (1917) believed that in a capitalistic state, the focus of the system is on settling disagreements within the governing bourgeoisie class. Due to this as the interests of the proletariat or labour class is disregarded and they are not represented, the system depends on the good-will of the bourgeoisie.

'Democracy for an insignificant minority, democracy for the rich – that is the democracy of capitalist society. If we look more closely into the machinery of capitalist democracy, we see everywhere, in the 'petty' – supposedly petty – details of the suffrage (residential qualifications, exclusion of women, etc.), in the technique of the representative institutions, in the actual obstacles to the right of assembly (public buildings are not for 'paupers!'), in the purely capitalist organization of the daily press, etc., etc., – we see restriction after restriction upon democracy. These restrictions, exceptions, exclusions,

Check Your Progress

1. Define democracy in terms of Abraham Lincoln.
2. What is the full form of UNESCO?
3. Mention the different types of democracy.

NOTES

obstacles for the poor seem slight, especially in the eyes of one who has never known want himself and has never been in close contact with the oppressed classes in their mass life (and nine out of 10, if not 99 out of 100, bourgeois publicists and politicians come under this category); but in their sum total these restrictions exclude and squeeze out the poor from politics, from active participation in democracy.'

Many of these limitations now do not apply in the western world as women too exercise their vote and it is not binding to have property. Nevertheless, it is generally agreed by the Marxists that corporate interests dominate the political landscape due to the extensive practice of lobbying politicians and the associations between corporations and elected officials.

Furthermore, even if representatives of the proletariat class are elected in a capitalist country, Marxists allege they have restricted command over the country's affairs as the economic sphere is largely under the hold of private capital and therefore the representative's power to act is reduced. Basically, minarchists (only a small minority of those supporting liberal democracy) allege that in the model liberal state the functions of the elected government should be reduced to the minimum (i.e. the court system and security). Hence Marxists- Leninists feel that in order to bring power into hands of oppressed classes, it is imperative that a socialist revolution take place.

Lenin strongly advocated that bourgeois democracy, is in reality, a dictatorship of bourgeoisie. On the other hand, dictatorship of proletariat is the highest possible form of democracy and should use violence against opposing classes.

Quotes by some eminent political thinkers:

- Marx: 'Democracy is the road to socialism.'
- Marx: 'When the workers replace the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie by their revolutionary dictatorship to break down the resistance of the bourgeoisie ... the workers invest the state with a revolutionary and transitional form.'
- Engels: 'And the victorious party' (in a revolution) 'must maintain its rule by means of the terror which its arms inspire in the reactionaries. Would the Paris Commune have lasted more than a day if it had not used the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie? Cannot we, on the contrary, blame it for having made too little use of that authority?'
- Engels: 'As, therefore, the state is only a transitional institution which is used in the struggle, in the revolution, to hold down one's adversaries by force, it is sheer nonsense to talk of a 'free people's state'; so long as the proletariat still needs the state, it does not need it in the interests of freedom but in order to hold down its adversaries, and as soon as it becomes possible to speak of freedom the state as such ceases to exist.'
- Lenin: 'The revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat is ruled, won, and maintained by the use of violence by the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, rule that is unrestricted by any laws.'
- Lenin: 'A state of the exploited must fundamentally differ from such a state; it must be a democracy for the exploited, and a means of suppressing the exploiters; and the suppression of a class means inequality for that class, its exclusion from democracy.'

To all intents and purposes, communist states are widely seen as dictatorships by bourgeois critics, since the elections they held tended to be heavily manipulated.

Check Your Progress

4. What was Lenin's views regarding the capitalist state?
5. What is the Marxist approach to democracy?

9.4 SUMMARY

NOTES

- In the lexicography of political science, no word is more controversial than 'democracy'. There is no individual who does not like it but he may raise its 'question of suitability and efficacy at particular circumstances'.
- Laski observes, 'Democracy has a context in every sphere of life; and in each of these spheres it raises its special problems which do not admit of satisfactory or universal generalization.'
- Democracy is not merely a form of government. Some claim it to be a form of state and some regard it as a form of society. A democratic government is one which is based on the accountability of the people; a democratic state is one which is based on popular sovereignty.
- Modern states are quite big in size and population. Hence, direct democracy of the types of Greek city states is not possible in any modern state. But direct democracy can be found in Switzerland in modern states.
- In almost all countries of the modern world except Switzerland, indirect democracy prevails. Switzerland presents a blend of direct and indirect democracy.
- Democracy has certain characteristics. R. M. MacIver says that democracy is not a way of governing, whether, by majority or otherwise, but primarily, a way of determining who shall govern and broadly to what ends.
- Certain conditions are necessary for democracy to be successful. Aristotle pointed out to the economic basis of politics. Politics cannot succeed unless people are economically sound and there is no great gulf between the rich and the poor.
- Democracy is a very old form of government and so its theory dates back to the days of the Greeks who identified it with 'people's power' (Pericles), or a system in which 'rulers are accountable to the people for what they do therein'.
- Power is vested in the people and its exercise is given to them or to their chosen representatives accountable to them for their acts of commission and omission. All decision must be based on the consent of the people.
- The classical theory of democracy has been criticized on many counts. First, it is thoroughly normative. It is located with high ideals and bombastic propositions like 'general will', 'people's rule', 'people's power', 'common good', and the like that cannot be subjected to an empirical verification.
- Though the classical doctrine of collective action may not be supported by the results of an empirical analysis, it is powerfully supported by its association with religious beliefs.
- The Marxist view is basically opposed to liberal democracy in its belief that a capitalistic state which is representative of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie cannot be democratic by its nature.
- Furthermore, even if representatives of the proletariat class are elected in a capitalist country, Marxists allege they have restricted command over the country's affairs as the economic sphere is largely under the hold of private capital and therefore the representative's power to act is reduced.

9.5 KEY TERMS

- **Lexicography:** Lexicography refers to the activity or occupation of compiling dictionaries.
- **Referendum:** A referendum (plural *referendums*, see below) is a direct vote in which an entire electorate is asked to vote on a particular proposal.
- **Landsgemeinde:** The Landsgemeinde or 'Cantonal assembly' is a public, non-secret ballot voting system operating by majority rule, which constitutes one of the oldest forms of direct democracy.

NOTES

9.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. Abraham Lincoln defines democracy as 'the government of the people, by the people and for the people.'
2. The full form of UNESCO is *United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization*.
3. Two types of democracy are direct democracy and indirect democracy.
4. Lenin believed that in a capitalistic state, the focus of the system is on settling disagreements within the governing bourgeoisie class. Due to this as the interests of the proletariat or labour class is disregarded and they are not represented, the system depends on the good-will of the bourgeoisie.
5. The Marxist view is basically opposed to liberal democracy in its belief that a capitalistic state which is representative of the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie cannot be democratic by its nature.

9.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answers Questions

1. What are the instruments through which direct democracy can be operated?
2. Mention the demerits of indirect democracy.
3. What are the different dimensions of democracy?
4. What do you understand by classical theory of democracy?

Long-Answer Questions

1. What is the meaning of democracy? Write the merits and demerits of democracy.
2. Discuss the major characteristics of democracy.
3. What are the major conditions for successful working of democracy?
4. Write a detailed note on the merits of classical theory of democracy.

9.8 FURTHER READING

- Varma, S.P. 2008. *Modern Political Theory*. New Delhi: Vikas Publishing House Pvt. Ltd.
- Miller, David. 1987. *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Political Thought*. Oxford: Oxford Blackwell.
- Germino, Dante L. 1976. *Beyond Ideology: The Revival of Political Theory*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

NOTES

UNIT 10 POLITICAL CULTURE AND POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

NOTES

Structure

- 10.0 Introduction
- 10.1 Unit Objectives
- 10.2 Political Culture
- 10.3 Political Participation
 - 10.3.1 Political Participation Through Elections in India
 - 10.3.2 Political Participation of Women in India
- 10.4 Summary
- 10.5 Key Terms
- 10.6 Answers to 'Check Your Progress'
- 10.7 Questions and Exercises
- 10.8 Further Reading

10.0 INTRODUCTION

In this unit, you will be studying political culture and political participation as the significant operational elements in laying socio-political foundations in a country.

Political culture does not refer to the formal or informal structures of political interaction, i.e., the study of governments, political parties, pressure groups or cliques. Instead, it refers to the system of beliefs about patterns of political interaction and political institutions. It does not refer so much to what is happening in politics as much as what people believe is happening. Political culture therefore is an important link between political events and people's reactions to those events. Common examples of political culture are national pride, national identity and legitimacy of government.

Genuine and effective political participation must acknowledge the rights of non-participants to stand outside the political process, if the latter chooses to do so. It must be noted that participation does not always and necessarily imply that the political actors accept the political system. Although violent revolutions and direct political action, such as civil disobedience, are modes of political participation, democratic theorists are inclined towards structuring political participation through the constitutional framework.

This unit raises these issues from a general academic level and takes them to a specific Indian context at the operational level.

10.1 UNIT OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- Describe the evolution of the concept of political culture
- Assess the basic elements of political culture
- Explain the significance of political participation
- Evaluate the level of political participation in India
- Discuss the extent of women's political participation in India

10.2 POLITICAL CULTURE

NOTES

The concept of 'political culture' emerged from the wave of democratization studies and the seminal study was *The Civic Culture* (1963) by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. Here, they studied five democratic societies and concluded that a nation's political culture exerted an independent influence on social and political behaviour.

In 1965, a group of area specialists published their comparative study of the political systems of select countries in Africa (Egypt and Ethiopia), America (Mexico), Asia (India, Japan), Europe (England, Germany, Italy) and Eurasia (Soviet Russia and Turkey) in the form of a book *Political Culture and Political Development*. It was edited by Lucian Pye and Sidney Verba and dedicated to Gabriel Almond, who was the guiding force behind the endeavour. This work epitomized the 'political culture' approach. The concept of political culture was based on the observation on Gabriel Almond that 'every political system is embedded in a particular pattern of orientation to political actions'.

The concept of political culture thus suggests that the traditions of a society, the spirit of its public institutions, the passions and the collective reasoning of its citizenry, and the style and operating codes of its leaders are not just random products of historical experience but fit together as a part of a meaningful whole and constitute an intelligible web of relations. For the individual, the political culture provides controlling guidelines for effective political behaviour, and for the collectivity it gives a systematic structure of values and rational considerations which ensures coherence in the performance of institutions and organizations.

Political culture does not refer to the formal or informal structures of political interaction, i.e., the study of governments, political parties, pressure groups or cliques. Instead, it refers to the system of beliefs about patterns of political interaction and political institutions. It does not refer so much to what is happening in politics as much as what people believe is happening. Political culture therefore is an important link between political events and people's reactions to those events. It studies the fundamental political beliefs of the people because these are particularly relevant to understanding social change as well as political stability.

Elements of the political culture—approach of Almond, Verba et al.

- A political culture is the product of the collective history of the political system and the life histories of individuals who make up the system.
- The theories of political culture are bridges between the behavioural approaches of political science and the macroanalysis based on the variables common to political sociology.
- Political culture is a systematic study of political ideology, national ethos and spirit, national political psychology, and the fundamental values of the people.
- Political culture also studies non-political behaviour such as feelings of basic trust in human relations, orientations towards time and the possibility of progress.
- Political culture stems from explicit citizenship training and conscious learning about the workings of the political system, rational understanding and the articulation of concepts.
- Political culture includes an emotional dimension such as loyalty towards community and geography.

- The 'political culture' approach is relevant because it provides structure and meaning to the political sphere. It is the study of the total political system and includes micro and macro analysis.

(Pye and Verba, eds., *Political Culture and Political Development*)

The study of political culture has had a long history before American political scientists began studying different areas of the world. Though it could be even traced back to the Ancient Greeks, scholars such as Gabriel Almond, Sidney Verba et al. derived their inspiration from Montesquieu, Tocqueville and Walter Bagehot. Although the political culture approach provides a subjective orientation to the study of politics, it is but one aspect of the study of the political system.

The concept of political culture helps one to separate the cultural aspects of politics from other forms of culture. It ties the study of political beliefs to the sociological and anthropological works on culture and focuses attention on basic values, cognitions and emotional commitments. The study of political culture also leads to political socialization, because the manner in which political knowledge is learnt or transmitted from one generation to the next determines the political culture of a system.

Besides the work of Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba on political culture, there are others who have worked on the same theme since the decade the 1960s. The earliest is that of Eckstein, who studied how culture could play a role in political change. This tendency is known as the 'authority-culture' theory. Aaron Wildavsky analysed political culture on the basis of the grid-group approach and developed a typology of cultures. These types were based on social relations and the values they exemplified. The most recent works that update the field are those of Ronald Inglehart and Robert Putnam.

Indian Political Culture

To understand Indian political culture, it is essential to first understand the fundamental features that appear vital in determining the nature of the Indian party system. These are as follows:

- (i) The struggle for freedom and framework of parliamentary government along with politics of national reconstruction, modernization, integration and development has collectively contributed to the evolution of Indian party system.
- (ii) The national heritage of national movement formed the dimensions of national interest, national unity, political integration and national defence.
- (iii) The ideological orientation with coexistence of radical 'left' to traditional 'right' during the national movement laid down a practice of toleration and accommodation of different points of view.
- (iv) Moreover, the continental size of the country, comprising well-defined and distinct socio-cultural regions; with linguistic, ethnic and religious diversities; and specific patterns of castes, communities and tribes provided conditions for the rise of regional parties and groups.
- (v) The task to ensure social equality to remove the inequalities perpetuated by centuries of caste oppression gave birth to political parties and groups who strove to use these castes as perpetual vote-banks.
- (vi) On economic fronts, it was a mixture of feudal but emerging developed agricultural and developing industrial economy. Economic development for raising standards

NOTES

NOTES

of living in an under-developed and poverty-ridden society followed by the problems of Centre-state relations, allocation of resources and resulted imbalances paved the way for the emergence of such parties and groups whose approach was regional instead of national.

- (vii) Lack of politically conscious middle class along with regional, sectarian and personal imbalances played a vital role in the evolution of party system in India.

Evolution of the Party System in India in Post-Independence Era

The evolution of Indian party system has been from 'one-party dominance' to 'multi-party coalition system'. For the purposes of better understanding, it calls for analysis of various stages of growth.

Phase I (1947–1967): The era of one-party dominance

India had a party system characterized by dominance of the Congress and the existence of smaller opposition parties, which could not provide an alternative either at the Central or state level. In other words, opposition parties had little hope of obtaining sizeable majorities in the legislatures, despite the fact that on most occasions, the Congress did not gain a majority of the valid votes cast. The Congress votes varied from 49.17 per cent to 40.7 per cent. The socialists and the communists, during this period, were able to score around 10 per cent votes each. During this period, groups within the Congress in conjunction with opposition parties, assumed the role of opposition often reflecting the ideologies and interests of the other parties.

An important feature of this era was that the Congress occupied not only the broad centre of the political spectrum, but also dominated the 'left' and 'right' tendencies.

Phase II (1967–1971): The period of transition to a multi-party system

The second phase extended from 1967 to the fifth general elections. In the 1967 Assembly elections, Congress lost majority in eight states and was reduced to 54 per cent of Lok Sabha seats. This brought a number of opposition parties to the forefront, which intensified inter-party conflict. Competition and conflict increased as opposition parties formed coalition governments in several states.

The 1967 elections had created a situation in which the dominance OF THE Congress was strikingly reduced. Parties to the 'right' and 'left' of the Congress, the Jana Sangh (now called the Bhartiya Janata Party) and the Communist Party of India (Marxist), popularly known as CPI (M), grew stronger. The possibility that opposition parties might assume power quite substantially made the Centre-state relations an important feature of inter-party competition. The 1967 elections created conditions which led towards serious Centre-state conflicts.

Phase III (1971–1975): The period of consensus vs. inter-party conflict

The fifth Lok Sabha elections marked the beginning of yet another stage in the evolution of Indian party system, and the trend continued till the imposition of the Internal Emergency in 1975. The Congress controlled by Indira Gandhi faced a large united opposition party in the General Elections of 1971. Despite the strong opposition, Congress won with a thumping majority. It won 346 out of 510 seats with 43.5 per cent of the popular vote. A significant aspect of the election was the elimination of Congress (O) and the defeat of other political parties. The mid-term polls, thus, pre-empted the

NOTES

development of a multi-party system. It also prevented the politics of coalition building at the national level. It was followed by a strategy to establish hegemony of the Congress at the Centre backed on populist and plebiscitary elections.

The major reason for victory was the de-linking of the Lok Sabha elections from the state assembly elections. The Parliamentary election campaign was de-linked from state-level politics and the state leaders could not exercise the same influence as they had done in the past. Indira Gandhi's campaign injected a powerful element of ideology by raising the slogan of social change and by calling upon the electorate to support her endeavour to initiate new government policies for the benefit of the poor, resulting in a new consensus in political arena. The dominant party model had given way to the differentiated structure of party competition. The process gained momentum as parties aligned to form coalition governments. For its part, the Congress accepted a confrontationist posture, both towards the opposition parties at the national and the opposition-controlled governments at the state level.

Indira Gandhi's conflict with state leadership of the Congress party as well as that of the opposition parties created a style of politics, which laid great stress on centralization in decision making. The new system entailed the abandonment of intra-party democracy. Positions in the Congress organization at all levels were invariably filled by nomination rather than election. Above all, institutional decline accompanied by decline of the state-based leaders and the replacements of regional structure of support by the central leadership adversely affected the federal scheme of Indian politics. After the 1969 split, the Congress followed a broad-based strategy consisting of re-distributive policies, such as nationalization of banks, abolition of privy purses and *Garibi Hatao*, all geared towards widening its support.

Phase IV (1975–1977): The emergency period

The imposition of an authoritarian Emergency in 1975 signalled the erosion of the popular support of the Congress party, the institutional decline and the weakening of the party system by suspending civil liberties, particularly freedom of the press and representative government. Opposition leaders and activists faced imprisonment, while concentration of power in the party, the government and in the office of the Prime Minister was the striking feature of the party system during this phase. Strict discipline was imposed on the Congress party. No criticism of the government was tolerated. Any attack on the Prime Minister's authority was considered to be an attack on the party's as well as the nation's unity.

The 1971–75 period, thus, marked the decline of the party system, making parties rely more on make-shift electoral arrangements, populist symbols and rhetoric for gaining support. Personality, charisma and image have acquired greater salience than party identification and party loyalties. But this trend withered away in the post-1977 period.

Phase V (1977–1980): The Janata phase of coalition politics

The next phase in the evolution of India's party system may be considered from the defeat of the Congress in 1977 elections to the restoration of its rule in 1980. The 1977 elections provided a major step towards party institutionalization and possibilities of the emergence of a two-party system. By and large, independent candidates were rejected and 75.8 per cent votes were cast in favour of only two parties, viz., the Janata party and the Congress.

NOTES

The defeat of the Congress and the victory of the Janata Party, made up of a coalition of parties, is a significant change in the Indian politics. The Janata Party government attempted to redirect emphasis away from the industrially-oriented strategy associated with the Congress rule to rural development and small-scale industries. In general, it made attempts to decentralize the state and the economy. The government invested in programmes that created employment and generated income by relying on labour-intensive technology and distribution of productive assets. Though the Janata government's ideology and programmes were not entirely new, but it had taken certain ideological and programmatic themes of rural development from the Congress' broad-based strategy and made it more pronounced.

However, the Janata Party could not achieve its goals. Rural development did not benefit the rural poor because policy was not specifically directed to this end. Most of the policies benefited the rural rich. Moreover, the Janata Government disintegrated in mid-1979, and many of the constituents that had formed it broke away from the party. Meanwhile, the Congress split for the second time in 1978. The result was an array of fragmented parties. In this context, the Indira Gandhi-led Congress, i.e., Congress (I), appeared to be the only coherent party. This image helped the party to take advantage of the strong popular reaction against frictions and disunity of the Janata government and win 1980 General Elections.

Phase VI (1980–1989): Era of conflict between Congress and the regional parties

The 1980 Lok Sabha election was a verdict on the Janata Party's failure to consolidate the electoral alignments. Thus, in 1980s, the success of Congress (I) was mainly due to the failure of national-level non-Congress parties. The Communist parties and the Jana Sangh retained the support of important groups. They also possessed effective organizations and ideologies. Bhartiya Lok Dal had displayed its presence in the Hindi-speaking states. The 1980 elections reflected these trends. The Congress won 353 seats with almost 43 per cent of the popular vote. Janata Party was the second largest party in nine states. Lok Dal was second largest party in Haryana, UP and Orissa; CPI (M) was the largest party in West Bengal, Tripura and the second largest party in Kerala. Though support for the Congress (I) was still widespread as compared to other parties, class, community and region-wise support was on its decline. The Congress had begun to lose its base in the Hindi heartland, which makes 42 per cent of the Parliamentary seats, and its support in the Muslim-dominated constituencies was also reduced. These trends indicated an erosion of Congress' regional and minority support base.

The assassination of Indira Gandhi in 1984 and the landslide victory of the Congress (I) due to the resultant sympathy wave made opposition in Lok Sabha irrelevant in 1984 elections. During Rajiv Gandhi's regime from 1984 to 1989, there was complete absence of dialectical interaction between the government and the opposition. The new political situation that emerged from 1984 election was the one in which the Congress was dominant at the Centre, but not in most of the states.

Phase VII (1989–2004): Multi-party system and decline of THE Congress party

The 1989 elections transformed the scene at the Centre by establishing a non-Congress coalition government with a true multi-party character. People displayed a greater inclination to their caste-based parties which represented their interests. These elections

NOTES

recorded the decline of the Congress vote share, and the rise of BJP and the 'third front' of marginalized social group. The United Front, the Rashtriya Janata Dal (RJD), the BSP and the Samajwadi Party (SP) became key players.

The 1996 elections marked a decline in the position of national parties and growth of regional parties, which started playing significant role in the Central politics. This era marked increasing political awareness of people living in remote areas; assessment of national policies in terms of their local impact; mass preference for local politicians and greater demand for state autonomy within the limits of the existing federal structure. In social terms, the election results suggested a greater and more polarized role of caste in politics. Success of BSP among Dalits, consolidation of other backward classes (OBCs) in Bihar and UP, post-mandalization resulting in politics of reservation on caste basis and mushroom growth of various types of caste associations mostly in North India, indicated a positive co-relation with election outcome.

Phase VIII (2004 -2014): Coalition system and revival of the Congress

End of single-party coalition dominance was the message of 2004 elections. The elections rejected all the claims of the ruling NDA coalition and provided an opportunity to all non-NDA political parties led by Congress, named as UPA (United Progressive Alliance), to evolve an alternative political coalition. These elections also reflected significant increase in the weight of Left parties in national politics, with sixty seats in their favour.

Signifying the role of regional political parties, the outcome at the national level, to a great extent, became the sum total of the state-level verdicts. It appeared that any party wishing to win a national mandate has to weave its way through the different states and secure a verdict in each of these. The Congress' key alliances that clicked in the election were with regional parties of Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jharkhand and Maharashtra.

This, however, gave yet another message that the Congress party is not dead and if it could successfully lead the country and meticulously manage 'the rainbow coalition' in the coming years, it could well return to power circles. Comprehensive common agendas (Minimum Common Programme in case of UPA and National Agenda in case of NDA) became the guidelines of these alliances. The experiment repeated in 2009.

Phase IX (2014 onwards) Rise of the BJP

The NDA under the leadership of Narendra Modi secured victory in the 2014 elections decimating the Congress, which was reduced to historically its lowest number of seats. The scale of the BJP's victory was unprecedented; it was able to secure a simple majority for itself in the Parliament, a feat that was last achieved by the Congress in 1984 after the death of Indira Gandhi. The Congress' low tally was a result of the party becoming largely discredited in the wake of massive corruption scandals.

10.3 POLITICAL PARTICIPATION

The general level of participation in a society is the extent to which the people as a whole are active in politics—the number of active people multiplied by the amount of their action, to put it arithmetically. However, the question of what it is to take part in politics is massively complex and ultimately ambiguous. It raises the question of what constitutes politics. We would, for example, assume that activity within a political party or an organization which regarded itself as a pressure group should count as political

Check Your Progress

1. What does the concept of political culture suggest?
2. Mention the name of two philosophers who have worked extensively on political culture.

NOTES

participation. However, what about activity in other sorts of organization, such as sports associations and traditional women's organizations? Although not overtly political, these organizations set the context of politics, give their active members administrative experience and are capable of overt political action if their interests or principles are threatened. There is an opposite problem about political losers: if people act, but ineffectively, perhaps because they are part of a permanent minority in a political system, can we say they have participated in the making of decisions? One implication of this doubt is that possessing power is a necessary condition or logical equivalent of true political participation. If one is merely consulted by a powerful person who wants one's views for information, or if one is mobilized or re-educated within the control of another, one has not participated in politics in any significant sense.

Political participation is so fundamental to democracy that the latter would not exist without the widespread, regular and active participation of citizens. Liberal political philosophy believes that the rights of an individual are protected by the exercise by citizens of civil and economic rights and other constitutional guarantees. Political participation is necessary because it enables citizens to consciously fashion their conditions of existence within a political community, thus converting citizens into genuinely autonomous agents—the citizens to trust fellow beings by overcoming alienation, deracination, and many other anomalies of modern life. Political participation not only refers to engagement with government and the State but also with civil society by developing social trust and a improving communal values and benefits.

Genuine and effective political participation must also acknowledge the rights of non-participants to stand outside the political process, if the latter chooses to do so. It must be noted that participation does not always and necessarily imply that the political actors accept the political system. Although violent revolutions and direct political action, such as civil disobedience, are modes of political participation, democratic theorists are inclined towards structuring political participation through the constitutional framework. Of course, it is also important to note that it is not the quantity of political participation but the quality that is more important. It hardly makes sense to claim that India is the largest democracy if the democratic process does not efficiently protect the poor, the women and the minorities.

An effective means of political participation is the work that an individual could do within Civil Society because such political activity could range from being against the State, to being part of it, in dialogue with the State, in partnership with the State, in support of the State, or perhaps even beyond the State. In a country where the Civil Society is empowered, political participation may appear in a variety of formal and non-formal modes, where citizens and non-citizens (like refugees) could work towards social change.

The most persuasive argument in favour of political participation of the citizenry is that it complies with the comprehensive function of development. It helps an individual to exercise and develop the capacity to reason.

Milbrath's theory of political participation

Political system functions on the basis of political participation. Lester Milbrath has suggested that members of the society can be divided into four categories, in terms of their degree of political participation. Firstly, the politically apathetic who are literally unaware of the politics around them; secondly, those involved in spectator activities, which include voting and taking part in discussions about politics; thirdly, those involved

NOTES

intransitional activities, which include attending a political meetings or making financial contributions to a political party; and finally, those who enter the political arena and participate in activities such as standing for and holding public and party offices.

These levels of political participation are not uniformly distributed throughout the population. In general, the higher an individual's position in the class structure, the greater is his degree of participation. Studies have shown that political participation is directly proportional to income level, occupational status and educational qualification. It has also been associated with a variety of other factors. For example, men are likely to have higher levels of participation than women, married people than single people, middle-aged people than either young or old, members of clubs and associations than non-members, long-term residents in a community than short-term residents, etc. However, those with low levels of participation often lack the resources and opportunities to become more directly involved in politics. They lack the experience of higher education, which brings a greater awareness of the political process and knowledge of the mechanics of participation. Secondly, individuals are likely to participate in politics if they are likely to be rewarded for their involvement.

Dahl's theory of political participation

Robert Dahl argues that an individual is unlikely to participate in politics, if he feels that the probability of his influencing the outcome of events is low. Levels of political participation appear to be related to the degree of involvement and integration of an individual in the society. Thus, an individual who is not likely to be involved in local or national politics does not feel a part of either the local community or the wider society. Dahl suggests that individuals are not likely to have high levels of political participation if they believe that the outcome of events will be satisfactory without their involvement.

10.3.1 Political Participation through Elections in India

Basic to democratic polity is the concept of sovereign powers vesting in the 'people'. In modern democracies, the people govern themselves through their elected representatives. In a parliamentary system, the executive comes out of the legislature and remains part of it and responsible to it. The election of members to the houses of legislatures is conducted through an institutionalised electoral process. This electoral process therefore, no matter how it is designed and conducted, forms the foundation of a parliamentary democracy. Elections are critical to the maintenance and development of democratic tradition because at one level, these are influenced by the political culture in which they operate, but at another, they also generate strong influences that can improve or distort this political culture. As a representative parliamentary democracy, India has a well-established system of direct and indirect elections to man its institutions. A general election in India is a gigantic exercise. It is equal to holding polls in Europe, the United States, Canada and Australia all put together. General elections to Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies in India are held under the supervision, direction and control of a constitutional body—the Election Commission of India. Elections to local bodies—Panchayats and Nagarpalikas—are the responsibility of State Election Commissioners.

A general election in India is a gigantic exercise. It has been said that holding general elections in India is equal to holding polls in Europe, the United States, Canada and Australia all put together. Statistically, the number of voters in India is in excess of 600 million (60 crores). The number of polling booths all over the country adds up to about 900,000 (9 lakhs), making an average of 667 voters for each booth. However, the

NOTES

population is not so uniformly spread over unequal territorial constituencies and usually a polling booth caters to no more than 1200 voters even in highly populated metropolitan areas. Five persons are needed for each polling booth making a total of 4.5 to 5 million election personnel to be mobilized and administered. These polling personnel are drawn from the Central and State governments and other bodies. In addition to this, about 2 million security personnel need to be used to maintain law and order on polling day. These basic figures give some idea about the enormity of the exercise to elect some 545 members of parliament. Once you take state and local elections into account the figures become truly staggering. India has upwards of about 3.2 million (32 lakhs) directly elected peoples' representatives spread over various tiers of governance.

Our fifty years of experience with successive elections at various levels has highlighted that generally people are able to deliver electoral verdicts in a democratic way. But this general statement hides substantial irregularities at the micro level. In fact, our experience with elections has also brought out to fore many distortions, some very serious, that have crept in either due to loopholes in the electoral laws or due to the incapacity of the system to punish deviant and in many ways unacceptable behaviour. There have been constant references to 3 MPs (money power, muscle power and mafia power) and to 4 Cs (criminalization, communalism, corruption and casteism). Basically, all of this has vitiated the political atmosphere in the country and even compromised the legitimacy of the political process.

Merits of political participation through elections in India

- Indian political system shows a multi-party system. The democratic government is formulated on the basis of majority win in elections.
- Elections help in acquiring democracy in India.
- In India, elections are fought on party lines with different proclamations. But nowadays, the elections have just become the game of coalitions instead of majority of the single party.
- Political parties that participate in different elections all over India and are recognized in four or more states are considered as national parties. Few of the popular national parties in the country are The Congress, Bharatiya Janata Party, Janata Dal and Communist Party of India.
- Political parties that participate in different elections only within one state are referred to as state parties or regional parties. Prominent state parties in the country are as follows:
 - Shiv Sena in Maharashtra
 - National Conference in Jammu and Kashmir
 - Telugu Desam in Andhra Pradesh
 - Muslim League in Kerala
 - Akali Dal in Punjab
 - Samajwadi Party in UP
 - Bahujan Samaj Party in West Bengal
- There are many independent candidates also who participate in election constituencies independently without the support of any party.

NOTES

Problems

The main problems that have been generally recognized and debated are as follows:

- Increasingly money-centered elections leading to unethical, illegal and even mafia-funded electoral process. The terribly high cost of elections in turn has led to increased corruption, criminalization and black money generation in various forms.
- With the constituents/electors being the same for all directly elected representatives from the lowest Panchayat level to the Lok Sabha level, there are competing role expectations and conflict of perception, e.g., the constituents expect even members of the Union Parliament to attend to their purely local problems.
- With the electorate having no role in the selection of candidates and with majority of candidates being elected by minority of votes under the first-past-the-post system, the representative character of the representatives itself becomes doubtful or so to say their representational legitimacy is seriously eroded. In many cases, more votes are cast against the winning candidates than for them. One of the significant probable causes may be the mismatch between the majoritarian or first-past-the-post system and the multiplicity of parties and large number of independents.
- The question of defections and the Tenth Schedule.
- Inaccurate and flawed electoral rolls and voter ID leading to rigging and denial of voting right to a large number of citizens.
- Problems in the conduct of elections:
 - Booth capturing and fraudulent voting by rigging and impersonation.
 - Flagrant use of raw muscle power in the form of intimidating voters either to vote against their will or not to vote at all, thus taking away the right of free voting from large sections of society and distorting the result thereby.
 - Involvement of officials and local administration in subverting the electoral process
 - Engineered mistakes in counting of votes
- Criminalization of the electoral process -- increasing number of contestants with serious criminal antecedents.
- Divisive and disruptive tendencies including the misuse of religion and caste in the process of political mobilization of group identities on non-ideological lines.
- An ineffective and slow process of dealing with election petitions, rendering the whole process meaningless.
- Fake and non-serious candidates who create major practical difficulties and are also used to indirectly subvert the electoral process.
- Incongruities in delimitation of constituencies resulting in poor representation.
- Problems of instability, hung legislative houses and their relation to the electoral laws and processes.
- Last but not the least, loss of systemic legitimacy due to decay in the standards of political morality and decline in the spirit of service and sacrifice in public life.

NOTES

Suggested reforms

The suggestions for reform can generally be placed into three broad categories. The first category attempts to tackle the problems within the boundaries of the current electoral system. The second category goes a bit further and takes a stand that the present electoral system itself needs to be modified (*The emphasis is on modification or reform and not on altering the basic framework of the system*). Both of these categories have to be dealt with together because there is considerable overlapping between the two and we have to view reform suggestions as an integrated package and not piecemeal.

There is a third approach which seeks to strike at the root of the problem which is that of the terrible high costs of elections and the question of finding legitimate funds for the purpose. The suggestion is to cut down the costs drastically by following the Gandhian principles of decentralization of power down to the grassroots levels and building multitiars of Government from below in a bottom-up instead of the present topdown approach. It is stated by those advocating this approach that the only way to conduct a meaningful electoral exercise in this country is to have direct elections only at local levels with the upper tiers filled by representatives indirectly elected by an electoral college consisting of the representatives manning the lower tiers.

A true democracy as advocated by Gandhi ensures that local, state and national representatives are accountable to the people for local, State and national matters respectively through effective transparency. Such one-to-one accountability may promote responsible politics and attract patriotic and competent professionals and social workers to politics. Our present system based on diffused accountability breeds corruption and attracts self-seekers to politics. For this breed, interests of national development, welfare of the people and needs of god governance take lower priorities, if any.

The elected representative is too far removed from the people as there are an average of one million voters for each Lok Sabha constituency spread over a large geographical area. To influence the choice of such a large and geographically dispersed number of voters, social action on the part of the candidate is totally inadequate. And, this creates space and scope for using both money and muscle power. It is no surprise therefore that the candidates have to spend huge amounts of money at the time of campaigning to 'purchase' the votes of these distant voters. And this is done mostly through a host of intermediary brokers who become the link in this transaction. These huge election expenses breed huge corruption. This also means that the electors are in no position to hold the candidate accountable nor does the candidate consider himself accountable to these people.

Based on the Indian ethos, Gandhi had advocated a low-expense election system linked with watchdog councils and separate elected chief executives at each local level. He proposed a highly democratic and, what is more important, a highly accountable system. More thought out and more in keeping with the evolution of political culture in our country, many scholars have in recent years adapted these thoughts in their work and advocated a system of direct elections only at the grassroots of the Indian democracy. They propose that without in anyway interfering with the basic structure or features of the Constitution and while fully continuing the parliamentary system, some reforms be brought in the electoral system. Direct elections should be held on the basis of adult franchise at the level of Panchayats and other local bodies. Panchayats and other local bodies could elect the zila parishads and they could together elect the State legislature. These three could elect the Parliament and in the last analysis the four of these could elect the President. The Prime Minister and the Chief Ministers could be elected by the

NOTES

Parliament and the State Legislatures concerned. The President, the Prime Minister and the Chief Ministers in order to be elected should each necessarily secure no less than 50%+1 of the votes cast. Once elected, the Prime Minister or a Chief Minister should be removable only by a constructive vote of no-confidence.

The fact that the directly elected representatives are all at the grassroots level where they are in contact with their electors on a daily basis, would mean that their accountability to the people will always be high. Corruption will not get the kind of boost and inducement that it gets presently because of an unaccountable remote representative doing what he pleases.

The representatives elected at the grassroots level will also have to win on a 50%+1 vote principle so that their appeal is more universal than parochial. They would then be truly legitimate representatives of their people. In the alternative, at the lowest tier double-member or multiple member constituencies could be considered. Local elections do not entail heavy costs. The cost to political parties of indirect State and national elections will be low. Since the national and State governments will handle only higher-level infrastructure and coordination, indirect elections backed by party primaries will facilitate emergence of the best leadership. The ills in the present 'first-past-the-post' system will be eliminated because local governments will handle all social issues and State and national governments shall be accountable to local governments as advocated by Gandhi who will have elected them. This will nurture culture, education and values and gradually eliminate social discords. Also, this election process, it is claimed, has the greatest potential to bring public service spirited and sacrifice-oriented people to the fore.

10.3.2 Political Participation of Women in India

The current conditions of the women in India and their status are ironical. On one hand, she has climbed the ladder of corporate success, and, on the other, she unconditionally undergoes the violence that her own family members afflict on her. Looking at the recent past it can be certainly said that the modern Indian women have achieved a lot; however, in reality, still there are so many horizons that remain to be touched. The way to these horizons is full of roadblocks.

Coming out of the secured domain of their homes, women have entered into the battlefield of their lives, where they display the best of their latent talent.

Time and again they have proven themselves in various fields. However, in India they are still to get their dues. There are many issues, which the Indian women have to go through on everyday basis. These issues have become the part of their lives, and some of them have admitted them as their destiny. In addition, others have taken these issues as challenges and adopted certain strategy to fight against this kind of discrimination. In present day, though Indian women are struggling to cope up with the problem of malnutrition, poor health, female feticide, lack of education, dowry, rape, domestic violence, job opportunity and poor sex ratio and marital problem of divorce, they do not deter to overcome these challenges. The Government of India, since its Independence, has been trying its best to fulfill its obligation; however, it could not succeed to overcome these challenges. The women's movement of India has taken up the part, which the government has not been able to accomplish. This moment did not start in the post-liberal society; it was started during the struggle of independence and, latter on, many activists got involved in this movement. Women in India were fortunate enough that they had not to fight for equal constitutional and legal status. However, their struggle for equal social status and equal opportunity in social hierarchal system has become endless.

NOTES

A positive development is that women's issues have been taken up by women's organizations as well as by the mainstream political parties and grassroots movements. Accordingly, the more visible forms of gender injustice such as dowry deaths, rape and alcohol-related domestic violence have been given the utmost attention. From the 1970s onwards, through the 1990s, various movements have been launched in this regard. Sometimes these movements have had local nature; sometimes they had a bigger spatial reach. Therefore, the public awareness on these has increased.

Women have also played an important role in the movements of farmers, trade unions and environment and this practice has enabled them to raise women's issues along with these issues.

Example: In the late 1960s and early 1970s, there was a new political ferment in the country, which gave rise to a host of new political trends and movements such as the Naxalite movement, the JP movement, the Chipko movement and the anti-price rise movement. In the anti-price rise movement of 1973-75, which was organized by the Communist and Socialist women in the urban areas of Maharashtra, thousands of housewives joined in public rallies, and those who could not leave their houses, joined by beating thalis (metal plates) with lathas (rolling pins). The movement spread to Gujarat where it was converted into the Nav Nirman movement influenced by Jayaprakash Narayan's 'Total Revolution'.

From 1974, women in Uttarkhand very actively participated in the Chipko movement, which got its name from the actions of women who hugged trees in order to prevent them from being cut down by timber contractors. It became famous as the first major movement for saving the environment.

The Bhopal Gas Peedit Mahila Udyog Sangathan played the leading role in the effort to secure justice for the victims of the chemical gas leak in the Union Carbide factory in Bhopal in 1984.

Another stream of the women's movement took the form of what have been called 'autonomous' women's groups. These mushroomed in the urban centres from around the mid-1970s. Many of these comprised women who had been active in or influenced by the Maoist or Naxalite movement, and its decline in the early 1970s triggered off a process of debate and rethinking in which the issues of gender relations and the place of women in political organizations were prominent. Among the earliest of these were the Progressive Women's Organization in Osmania University in Hyderabad in 1974, the Purogami Stree Sangathana in Pune and the Stree Mukti Sangathana in Bombay in 1975. The 1975 declaration of the UN, in which the year was declared as the International Women's Year, probably contributed to a flurry of activity in Maharashtra in that year. There, the party-based and autonomous organizations celebrated 8th March as the International Women's Day for the first time. In addition, women from all over the state belonging to the Maoist groups, the Socialist and Republican parties, the Communist Party of India (CPM) and Lal Nishan Party attended a women's conference in October 1975 in Pune.

After the Emergency in 1977, another kind of activity began. A women's group in Delhi began the publication of a journal, which turned out to be one of the most enduring institutions of the women's movement. The name of the journal was *Manushi*. It documented and analysed the women's movement, told its history, presented literature of women, and much else, has continued until today under the able leadership of Madhu Kishwar, undoubtedly among the most original, self-reflective and fearless voices in the women's movement.

NOTES

The anti-dowry and anti-rape agitations seemed to have spent the energies of the movement for some time, and while there were protests around the Shah Bano case in 1985-86, there was not the same enthusiasm or unity. The issue was also less clear. It was complicated largely by the communal atmosphere in the country that dissolved the issues of Muslim identity with the basic issue of women's rights, and the Hindu communalists' keenness to attain the Muslim women's rights has frequently left women's rights activists confused and vulnerable.

The agitation against Sati (burning of the Hindu widow), which followed what looked like the murder of Roop Kanwar, a young woman in Deorala in Rajasthan, was also based on the same lines. It was entangled with the issues that were muddled by the Hindu communal groups portraying it as an attack on Indian tradition and putting women on to the streets to defend their right to Sati. In Hyderabad, Anveshi was set up as a platform for theoretical studies of women's issues, and in Delhi, the Centre for Women's Development Studies promoted research and documentation, including, in later years, the launching of a journal for gender studies. Many more university-based centres also came up in the 1990s. By that time, sufficient matter related to research and writing on Women's Studies began to appear in the university curricula.

Another factor, which is very important in improving gender justice, is the provision of free primary health facilities at the grassroots level. As in the case of education, if health facilities are not easily accessible or are expensive, women and female children lose out equally. In fact, unequal access to improved facilities as well as improved living standards is the major cause of the sharp decline in the female-male ratio in India from 972 (1901) to 927 (1991). It does not mean that the chances of survival of women have decreased in absolute terms. In recent times, the sex ratio has seen an improvement, rising to 940 in the 2011 census.

Compared with men, women have gained less from the improved access to health facilities and better living standards and, therefore, their proportion has declined. To correct this imbalance, health facilities have to be brought within the reach of women. This has been done in Kerala, where over 90 per cent of women deliver their babies in medical institutions and the results are dramatic within the family. Second, absence of knowledge about contraceptives or lack of family planning facilities can also be a significant source of vulnerability. The lack of family planning facilities, in fact, leads to women's deprivation. Third, there are cultural, or even religious factors, which give a passive position to young women, making them agree to bear and rear children as and when their husband or the parents-in-law wish. These inequities may not even be physically enforced, as women's subservient role and repeated child bearing may appear 'natural', because these practices have been sanctified by a long past that generates their unsuspecting acceptance.

Open and informed public discussion, promotion of women's employment opportunities, female literacy and family planning facilities can improve the voice and decisional role of women in the affairs of their families and bring about fundamental changes in the differentiation of just and unjust practices.

In present day Indian society, there is unanimity at the government and institutional level that women empowerment is essential for the overall development of nation. Nevertheless, the irony of fact is that whenever the issue of women empowerment is brought before our apex law-making intuition of (i.e., the Parliament), the real character of man chauvinism comes at fore. A number of initiatives taken until date to remove gender inequality from sociopolitical sphere are as follows:

NOTES

- Fifty per cent of reservation for women in the Panchyati Raj system
- Legislation for 33 per cent reservation for women in the legislative body
- Job reservation for women in many states
- Recruitment of women officers in the field of defence
- Constitution of women commission
- Free education to women child; in this case, many states increased the upper limit up to the graduation level
- Establishment of gender sensitization committee against sexual harassment
- Protection of victimized women from public eye

However, from the above analysis, it can be concluded that gender differences exist in the Indian society. How to overcome them and how to give women equal social and political statuses along with social dignity are the main challenges for gender debate in the Indian context.

The Constitution (Seventy-Third Amendment) Act, 1992 and its provisions

Though the Panchayati Raj Institutions have been in existence for a long time, it has been observed that these institutions have not been able to acquire the status and dignity of viable and responsive people's bodies due to a number of reasons including absence of regular elections, prolonged super sessions, insufficient representation of weaker sections like Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and women, inadequate devolution of powers and lack of financial resources.

Article 40 of the Constitution which enshrines one of the Directive Principles of State Policy lays down that the State shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government. In the light of the experience in the last forty years and in view of the short-comings which have been observed, it is considered that there is an imperative need to enshrine in the Constitution certain basic and essential features of Panchayati Raj Institutions to impart certainty, continuity and strength to them.

The provision provided to women under the 73rd amendment of the Indian constitution is that not less than one-third (including the number of seats reserved for women belonging to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes) of the total number of seats to be filled by direct election in every Panchayat shall be reserved for women and such seats may be allotted by rotation to different constituencies in a Panchayat.

Another provision provided to women is that no less than one-third of the total number of offices of Chairpersons in the Panchayats at each level shall be reserved for women.

10.4 SUMMARY

In this unit, you have learnt that:

- The concept of 'political culture' emerged from the wave of democratization studies and the seminal study was *The Civic Culture* (1963) by Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba. Here, they studied five democratic societies and concluded that a nation's political culture exerted an independent influence on social and political behaviour.

Check Your Progress

3. What do you understand by general level of participation in a society?
4. Mention the name of any two prominent state parties in India.
5. What does a true democracy ensure?

NOTES

- The concept of political culture thus suggests that the traditions of a society, the spirit of its public institutions, the passions and the collective reasoning of its citizenry, and the style and operating codes of its leaders are not just random products of historical experience but fit together as the part of a meaningful whole and constitute an intelligible web of relations.
- The concept of political culture helps one to separate the cultural aspects of politics from other forms of culture. It ties the study of political beliefs to the sociological and anthropological works on culture and focuses attention on basic values, cognitions and emotional commitments.
- The general level of participation in a society is the extent to which the people as a whole are active in politics—the number of active people multiplied by the amount of their action, to put it arithmetically. However, the question of what it is to take part in politics is massively complex and ultimately ambiguous. It raises the question of what constitutes politics.
- Political system functions on the basis of political participation. Lester Milbrath has suggested that members of the society can be divided into four categories, in terms of their degree of political participation.
 - (i) The politically apathetic who are literally unaware of the politics around them
 - (ii) Those involved in spectator activities, which include voting and taking part in discussions about politics
 - (iii) Those involved in transitional activities, which include attending a political meetings or making financial contributions to a political party
 - (iv) Those who enter the political arena and participate in activities such as, standing for and holding public and party offices.
- Robert Dahl argues that an individual is unlikely to participate in politics, if he feels that the probability of his influencing the outcome of events is low. Levels of political participation appear to be related to the degree of involvement and integration of an individual in the society. Thus, an individual who is not likely to be involved in local or national politics does not feel a part of either the local community or the wider society.
- A general election in India is a gigantic exercise. It has been said that holding general elections in India is equal to holding polls in Europe, the United States, Canada and Australia all put together. Statistically, the number of voters in India is in excess of 600 million (60 crores). The number of polling booths all over the country adds up to about 900,000 (9 lakhs), making an average of 667 voters for each booth.
- The current conditions of the women in India and their status are ironical. On the one hand, she has climbed the ladder of corporate success, and, on the other, she unconditionally undergoes the violence that her own family members afflict on her. Looking at the recent past, it can be said that the modern Indian women have achieved a lot; however, in reality, still there are so many horizons that remain to be touched. The way to these horizons is full of roadblocks and can be realized through more effective political participation.

NOTES

10.5 KEY TERMS

- **Political culture:** The product of the collective history of the political system and the life histories of individuals who make up the system
- **Political participation:** The general level of participation or the extent to which the people as a whole are active in politics, i.e., the number of active people multiplied by the amount of their action
- **Liberal political philosophy:** The philosophy which believes that the rights of an individual are protected by the exercise by the citizens of civil and economic rights and other constitutional guarantees
- **Politically apathetic:** The individuals who are literally unaware of the politics around them
- **Parliamentary system:** The system wherein the executive comes out of the legislature and remains part of it and responsible to it

10.6 ANSWERS TO 'CHECK YOUR PROGRESS'

1. The concept of political culture suggests that the traditions of a society, the spirit of its public institutions, the passions and collective reasoning of its citizenry and the style and operating codes of its leaders are not just random products of historical experience but fit together as a part of a meaningful whole and constitute and intelligible web of relations.
2. Two philosophers who have worked extensively on political culture are Gabriel Almond and Sidney Verba.
3. The general level of participation in a society is the extent to which the people as a whole are active in politics- the number of active people multiplied by the amount of their action, to put it arithmetically.
4. Two prominent state parties in India are Shiv Sena in Maharashtra and Samajwadi party in UP.
5. A true democracy ensures that local, state and national representatives are accountable to the people for local, state and national matters respectively through effective transparency.

10.7 QUESTIONS AND EXERCISES

Short-Answer Questions

1. What are the main elements of political culture?
2. Write the merits of political participation through elections in India.
3. Write a short note on the Constitution (Seventy-Third Amendment) Act, 1992.
4. What is the condition of political participation of women in India?

Long-Answer Questions

1. Define the concept of political culture. Write a note on the historical evolution of this concept.

2. What do you understand by political participation? Explain the various means of effective political participation.
3. State the basic features of the theories of political participation propounded by Milbrath and Dahl.
4. Discuss the state of political participation in India. Also find the problems faced by the political system in India.
5. Evaluate the various types of solutions as suggested by experts to remove the problems faced by the Indian electoral system.

10.8 FURTHER READING

- Ashraf, Ali and L.N. Sharma. 2010. *Political Sociology: A New Grammar of Politics*. Hyderabad: Universities Press (India) Private Limited.
- Bhargava, Rajeev. 2008. 'What is Political Theory?' in Rajeev Bhargava and Ashok Acharya, eds., *Political Theory: An Introduction*. New Delhi: Pearson Longman.
- Easton, David. 1971. *The Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science*. Kolkata: Scientific Book Agency.
- Gupta, Dipankar. 1996. *Political Sociology in India: Contemporary Trends*. New Delhi: Orient Longman.
- Heywood, Andrew. 2003. *Politics*. New Delhi: Palgrave India.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin. 1972. 'Introduction' to Seymour Martin Lipset, ed., *Politics and the Social Sciences*. New Delhi: Wiley Eastern Private Limited, pp. vii-xi.
- Nash, Kate (ed.). 2000. *Readings in Contemporary Political Sociology*. New York: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rush Michale and Philip Althoff. 1971. *An Introduction to Political Sociology*. London: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd.