

**CENTRE FOR DISTANCE & ONLINE EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF JAMMU
JAMMU**



SELF LEARNING MATERIAL

B.A. Semester- I

Subject - Political Science

Unit - I to IV

Course No. : PS-101

Dr. Jaspal Singh

COURSE CO-ORDINATOR

<http://www.distanceeducationju.in>

Printed and Published on behalf of Centre for Distance & Online Education,
University of Jammu by the Director, CDOE, University of Jammu, Jammu.

INTRODUCTION TO POLITICAL SCIENCE

Course Contributors:

Dr Diwakar Singh Jamwal

Dr. Vidhya Bhushan

Dr. Kulwant Kour

Dr. Anurag Gangal

Dr. V. Nagandera Rao

Dr. Seema Jamwal

Shashi Kumar

Rita Munshi

Bhawana Khajuria

Editing and Proof Reading

Dr. Mamta Sharma

Centre for Distance & Online Education, University of Jammu, Jammu, 2025

- All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced in any form, by mimeograph or any other means, without permission in writing from the CDOE, University of Jammu.
- The script writer shall be responsible for the lesson/script submitted to the CDOE and any plagiarism shall be his/her entire responsibility

POLITICAL SCIENCE

Course No. PS-101

Title: Introduction to Political Science

Duration of Exam: 3 Hrs

Total Marks 100

End Semester Exam: 80

Internal Assessment: 20

There shall be two written papers of 80 marks and of three hours duration each. 20 marks shall be reserved for internal assessment. Each paper will be set for 80 marks. In case of regular students, internal assessment received from the colleges will be added to the marks obtained by them in the University examination and in case of private candidates, marks obtained by them in the University examination shall be increased proportionately in accordance with the Statutes/Regulations.

Unit-I: Political Theory and Political Science

- 1.1 Introduction to Political Science, Politics and Political Theory
- 1.2 Nature and Scope of Political Science
- 1.3 Traditional Approaches: Philosophical, Historical, Legal and Institutional
- 1.4 Modern Approaches: Behavioural and System

Unit-II: State: Origin & Nature

- 2.1 Meaning and Elements of State : Difference between State, Society and Nation
- 2.2 Theories of Origin of State : Divine, Historical/Evolutionary and Social Contract
- 2.3 Theories of Nature of State : Origin, Liberal and Marxist
- 2.4 Sovereignty and its Theories : Austin's Theory and Pluralistic Theory

Unit-III: Basic Concepts

- 3.1 Right and Justice: Liberal and Marxist Perspectives
- 3.2 Liberty and Equality
- 3.3 Power, Authority and Legitimacy
- 3.4 Democracy : Meaning, Evolution and Types

Unit-IV: Major Ideologies

- 4.1 Liberalism : Classical, Modern and Contemporary
- 4.2 Socialism : Evolutionary (Fabian) and Revolutionary (Marxist)

4.3 Secularism : Western and Indian Perspectives

4.4 Feminism : Meaning and Issues

Note for Paper Setter

- Section I: It will carry 20 marks. There will be total questions in this section. Students will attempt any five questions. Each questions will be of 4 marks
- Section II: It will consist of 8 questions of which students will have to attempt four questions on the basis of Within Unit Choice. The Upper limit of each question will be 1000 words. Each question will carry 15 marks.

Suggested Readings

Aggarwal, R.C.	<i>Political Theory</i> , S. Anand, New Delhi, 2004
Heywood, Andrew	<i>Political Ideologies</i> : An Introduction, Palgrave, N. York, 1992
Jain M.P.	<i>Political Theory</i> , Guild, Delhi, 1989
Johri, J.C.	<i>Contemporary Political Theory</i> : Basis Concepts and Trenderers, Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1987
Joad, C.E.M.	<i>Modern Political Theory</i> , Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1924
Kapoor. A.C	<i>Principles of Political Science</i> , Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, 1985
Laski, Harold	<i>Grammar of Politics</i> , Yale University Press, Michigan, 1925
Ray, Amal :	<i>Political Theory : Ideas and Institutions</i> , Battacharya, Mohit Eastern Publishers, New Delhi, 1962
Vermani, R.C.	<i>An Introduction to Political Theory</i> , Gitanjali Publishing House, New Delhi, 2001
OP Gauba	<i>An Introduction to Political Theory</i>

Political Science

	Title	Writer	Page
UNIT I	Political Theory and Political Science		
	1.1 Introduction to Political Science, Politics and Political Theory	V Nagandra Rao	
	1.2 Nature and Scope of Political Science	Seema Rohmetra	
	1.3 Traditional approaches: Philosophical, Historical, Legal and Institutional	Rita Munshi	
	1.4 Modern Approaches: Behavioural and System	Kulwant Kour	
UNIT II	State: Origin and Nature		
	2.1 Meaning and Elements of State: Difference between State, Society and Nation	Bhawana Khajuria	
	2.2 Theories of origin of State: Divine, Historical/ Evolutionary and Social Contract	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
	2.3 Theories of Nature of State: Organic, Liberal and Marxist	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
	2.4 Sovereignty and Its Theories: Austin's Theory and Pluralistic Theory	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
UNIT III	Basic Concepts		
	3.1 Rights and Justice: Liberal and Marxist Perspectives	Shashi Kumar, Seema Rohmetra & Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
	3.2 Liberty and Equality	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
	3.3 Power, Authority and Legitimacy	Vidya Bhushan	
	3.4 Democracy: Meaning, Evolution and Types	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
UNIT-IV	Major Ideologies		
	4.1 Liberalism: Classical, Modern and Contemporary	Deepak Choudhary & Seema Rohmetra	
	4.2 Socialism: Evolutionary (Fabian) and Revolutionary (Marxist)	Anurag Gangal	
	4.3 Secularism: Western and Indian Perspectives	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	
	4.4 Feminism: Meaning and Issues	Diwakar Singh Jamwal	

B. A.

**1.1 INTRODUCTION TO POLITICS, POLITICAL SCIENCE, AND
POLITICAL THEORY**

V Nagendra Rao

STRUCTURE

1.1.0 OBJECTIVES

1.1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.2 DEFINING POLITICS

- 1.1.2.1 Different conceptions of politics
- 1.1.2.2 Politics as art of government
- 1.1.2.3 Politics as public affair
- 1.1.2.4 Politics as compromise and consensus
- 1.1.2.5 Politics as power

1.1.3 POLITICAL THEORY

- 1.1.3.1 Meaning
- 1.1.3.2 Major Aspects of Political Theory
- 1.1.3.3 Nature of Political Theory
- 1.1.3.4 Political Science as History
- 1.1.3.5 Political Science as Philosophy
- 1.1.3.6 Political Science as Science
- 1.1.3.7 Political Theory: Growth and Evolution
- 1.1.3.8 Decline of Political Theory

1.1.4 POLITICS/POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A DISCIPLINE

- 1.1.3.1 History
- 1.1.3.2 The Rise and fall of Roman Empire
- 1.1.3.3 The Middle Ages
- 1.1.3.4 Indian-Sub Continent
- 1.1.3.5 East Asia

1.1.3.6 The Renaissance

1.1.3.7 The Enlightenment

1.1.3.8 Modern Political Science

1.1.3.9 Behavioural Revolution and New Institutionalism

1.1.5 LET US SUM UP

1.1.6 EXERCISES

1.1.7 SUGGESTED READINGS

1.1.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, student should be able to understand:

- The different conceptions of politics.
- The evolution of political science from Greek city state to modern era.
- The changing meaning and nature of political science.
- The relation between politics, political science and political theory.
- The nature, evolution and decline of political theory

1.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Politics is exciting because people disagree. They disagree about how they should live. Who should get what? How should power and other resources be distributed? Should society be based on cooperation or conflict? And so on. They also disagree about how such matters should be resolved. How should collective decisions be made? Who should have a say? How much influence should each person have? And so forth. For Aristotle, this made politics the ‘master science’: that is, nothing less than the activity through which human beings attempt to improve their lives and create the Good Society. Politics is, above all, a social activity. It is always a dialogue, and never a monologue. Nevertheless, the disagreement that lies at the heart of politics also extends to the nature of the subject and how it should be studied. People disagree about what it is that makes social interaction ‘political’, whether it is where it takes place

(within government, the state or the public sphere generally), or the kind of activity it involves (peacefully resolving conflict or exercising control over less powerful groups).

1.1.2 DEFINING POLITICS

Politics, in its broadest sense, is the activity through which people make, preserve and amend the general rules under which they live. Although politics is also an academic subject (sometimes indicated by the use of ‘Politics’ with a capital P), it is then clearly the study of this activity. Politics is thus inextricably linked to the phenomena of conflict and cooperation. On the one hand, the existence of rival opinions, different wants, competing needs and opposing interests guarantees disagreement about the rules under which people live. On the other hand, people recognize that, in order to influence these rules or ensure that they are upheld, they must work with others hence Hannah Arendt's definition of political power as ‘acting in concert’. This is why the heart of politics is often portrayed as a process of conflict resolution, in which rival views or competing interests are reconciled with one another. However, politics in this broad sense is better thought of as a search for conflict resolution than as its achievement, as not all conflicts are, or can be, resolved. Nevertheless, the inescapable presence of diversity (we are not all alike) and scarcity (there is never enough to go around) ensures that politics is an inevitable feature of the human condition.

1.1.2.1 Different Conceptions of Politics

Politics may be treated as an ‘essentially contested’ concept, in the sense that the term has a number of acceptable or legitimate meanings. On the other hand, these different views may simply consist of contrasting conceptions of the same, if necessarily vague, concept. Whether we are dealing with rival concepts or alternative conceptions, it is helpful to distinguish between two broad approaches to defining politics (Hay, 2002; Leftwich, 2004). In the first, politics is associated with an arena or location, in which case behaviour becomes ‘political’ because of where it takes place. In the second, politics is viewed as a process or mechanism, in which case ‘political’ behaviour is behaviour that exhibits distinctive characteristics or qualities, and so can take place in any, and perhaps all, social contexts. Each of these broad approaches has spawned alternative definitions of politics, and helped to shape different schools of political analysis. Indeed, the debate

about ‘what is politics?’ is worth pursuing precisely because it exposes some of the deepest intellectual and ideological disagreement in the academic study of the subject.

1.1.2.2 Politics as the Art of Government

‘Politics is not a science . . . but an art’, Chancellor Bismarck is reputed to have told the German Reichstag. The art Bismarck had in mind was the art of government, the exercise of control within society through the making and enforcement of collective decisions. This is perhaps the classical definition of politics, developed from the original meaning of the term in Ancient Greece. The word ‘politics’ is derived from polis, meaning literally ‘city-state’. Ancient Greek society was divided into a collection of independent city-states, each of which possessed its own system of government. The largest and most influential of these city-states was Athens, often portrayed as the cradle of democratic government. In this light, politics can be understood to refer to the affairs of the polis in effect, ‘what concerns the polis’. The modern form of this definition is therefore ‘what concerns the state’. This view of politics is clearly evident in the everyday use of the term: people are said to be ‘in politics’ when they hold public office, or to be ‘entering politics’ when they seek to do so. It is also a definition that academic political science has helped to perpetuate. In many ways, the notion that politics amounts to ‘what concerns the state’ is the traditional view of the discipline, reflected in the tendency for academic study to focus on the personnel and machinery of government.

To study politics is, in essence, to study government, or, more broadly, to study the exercise of authority. This view is advanced in the writings of the influential US political scientist David Easton (1979, 1981), who defined politics as the ‘authoritative allocation of values’. By this, he meant that politics encompasses the various processes through which government responds to pressures from the larger society, in particular by allocating benefits, rewards or penalties. ‘Authoritative values’ are therefore those that are widely accepted in society, and are considered binding by the mass of citizens. In this view, politics is associated with ‘policy’: that is, with formal or authoritative decisions that establish a plan of action for the community. However, what is striking about this definition is that it offers a highly restricted view of politics. Politics is what takes place within a polity, a system of social organization centred on the machinery of government. Politics is therefore practised in cabinet rooms, legislative chambers, government

departments and the like; and it is engaged in by a limited and specific group of people, notably politicians, civil servants and lobbyists. This definition can, however, be narrowed still further. This is evident in the tendency to treat politics as the equivalent of party politics. In other words, the realm of 'the political' is restricted to those state actors who are consciously motivated by ideological beliefs, and who seek to advance them through membership of a formal organization such as a political party.

The link between politics and the affairs of the state also helps to explain why negative or pejorative images have so often been attached to politics. This is because, in the popular mind, politics is closely associated with the activities of politicians. Put brutally, politicians are often seen as power-seeking hypocrites who conceal personal ambition behind the rhetoric of public service and ideological conviction. Such an image of politics is sometimes traced back to the writings of Niccolò Machiavelli, who, in *The Prince* (1532), developed a strictly realistic account of politics that drew attention to the use by political leaders of cunning, cruelty and manipulation. Such a negative view of politics reflects the essentially liberal perception that, as individuals are self-interested, political power is corrupting, because it encourages those 'in power' to exploit their position for personal advantage and at the expense of others. This is famously expressed in Lord Acton's (1834-1902) aphorism: 'power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely'. Without some kind of mechanism for allocating authoritative values, society would simply disintegrate into a civil war of each against all, as the early social contract theorists argued. The task is therefore not to abolish politicians and bring politics to an end but, rather, to ensure that politics is conducted within a framework of checks and constraints that guarantee that governmental power is not abused.

1.1.2.3 Politics As Public Affair

A second and broader conception of politics moves it beyond the narrow realm of government to what is thought of as 'public life' or 'public affairs'. In other words, the distinction between 'the political' and 'the non-political' coincides with the division between an essentially public sphere of life and what can be thought of as a private sphere. Such a view of politics is often traced back to the work of the famous Greek philosopher Aristotle. In *Politics*, Aristotle declared that 'man is by nature a political animal', by which he meant that it is only within a political community that human beings

can live the 'good life'. From this viewpoint, then, politics is an ethical activity concerned with creating a 'just society'; it is what Aristotle called the 'master science'. However, where should the line between 'public' life and 'private' life be drawn?

The traditional distinction between the public realm and the private realm conforms to the division between the state and civil society. However, where should the line between 'public' life and 'private' life be drawn? The traditional distinction between the public realm and the private realm conforms to the division between the state and civil society. The institutions of the state (the apparatus of government, the courts, the police, the army, the social security system and so forth) can be regarded as 'public' in the sense that they are responsible for the collective organization of community life. Moreover, they are funded at the public's expense, out of taxation. In contrast, civil society consists of what Edmund Burke called the 'little platoons', institutions such as the family and kinship groups, private businesses, trade unions, clubs, community groups and so on, that are 'private' in the sense that they are set up and funded by individual citizens to satisfy their own interests, rather than those of the larger society.

An alternative 'public/private' divide is sometimes defined in terms of a further and more subtle distinction; namely, that between 'the political' and 'the personal'. Although civil society can be distinguished from the state, it nevertheless contains a range of institutions that are thought of as 'public' in the wider sense that they are open institutions, operating in public, to which the public has access. One of the crucial implications of this is that it broadens our notion of the political, transferring the economy, in particular, from the private to the public realm. A form of politics can thus be found in the workplace. Nevertheless, although this view regards institutions such as businesses, community groups, clubs and trade unions as 'public', it remains a restricted view of politics. The view of politics as an essentially 'public' activity has generated both positive and negative images. In a tradition dating back to Aristotle, politics has been seen as a noble and enlightened activity precisely because of its 'public' character. This position was firmly endorsed by Hannah Arendt, who argued in *The Human Condition* (1958) that politics is the most important form of human activity because it involves interaction amongst free and equal citizens. It thus gives meaning to life and affirms the uniqueness of each individual. Theorists such as Jean-Jacques Rousseau (see p. 97) and John Stuart Mill who portrayed political participation as a good in itself have drawn similar conclusions.

Rousseau argued that only through the direct and continuous participation of all citizens in political life can the state be bound to the common good, or what he called the 'general will'. In Mill's view, involvement in 'public' affairs is educational, in that it promotes the personal, moral and intellectual development of the individual

1.1.2.4 Politics as a Compromise and Consensus

The third conception of politics relates not to the arena within which politics is conducted but to the way in which decisions are made. Specifically, politics is seen as a particular means of resolving conflict: that is, by compromise, conciliation and negotiation, rather than through force and naked power. This is what is implied when politics is portrayed as 'the art of the possible'. Once again, this view of politics has been traced back to the writings of Aristotle and, in particular, to his belief that what he called 'polity' is the ideal system of government, as it is 'mixed', in the sense that it combines both aristocratic and democratic features. One of the leading modern exponents of this view is Bernard Crick. In his classic study *In Defence of Politics*, Crick offered the following definition:

Politics is the activity by which differing interests within a given unit of rule are conciliated by giving them a share in power in proportion to their importance to the welfare and the survival of the whole community. (Crick, 1962)

In this view, the key to politics is therefore a wide dispersal of power. Accepting that conflict is inevitable, Crick argued that when social groups and interests possess power they must be conciliated; they cannot merely be crushed. This is why he portrayed politics as 'that solution to the problem of order which chooses conciliation rather than violence and coercion'. This view of politics has an unmistakeably positive character. Politics is certainly no utopian solution (compromise means that concessions are made by all sides, leaving no one perfectly satisfied), but it is undoubtedly preferable to the alternatives: bloodshed and brutality. In this sense, politics can be seen as a civilized and civilizing force

1.1.2.5 Politics As Power

The fourth definition of politics is both the broadest and the most radical. Rather than confining politics to a particular sphere (the government, the state or the 'public' realm), this view sees politics at work in all social activities and in every corner of human

existence. As Adrian Leftwich proclaimed in *What is Politics? The Activity and Its Study* (2004), 'politics is at the heart of all collective social activity, formal and informal, public and private, in all human groups, institutions and societies'. In this sense, politics takes place at every level of social interaction; it can be found within families and amongst small groups of friends just as much as amongst nations and on the global stage. At its broadest, politics concerns the production, distribution and use of resources in the course of social existence. Politics is, in essence, power: the ability to achieve a desired outcome, through whatever means. This notion was neatly summed up in the title of Harold Lasswell's book *Politics: Who Gets What, When, How?* (1936). From this perspective, politics is about diversity and conflict, but the essential ingredient is the existence of scarcity: the simple fact that, while human needs and desires are infinite, the resources available to satisfy them are always limited. Politics can therefore be seen as a struggle over scarce resources, and power can be seen as the means through which this struggle is conducted.

Advocates of the view of politics as power include feminists and Marxists. The rise of the women's liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s, bringing with it a growing interest in feminism, stimulated more radical thinking about the nature of 'the political'. Not only have modern feminists sought to expand the arenas in which politics can be seen to take place, a notion most boldly asserted through the radical feminist slogan 'the personal is the political', but they have also tended to view politics as a process, specifically one related to the exercise of power over others. This view was summed by Kate Millett in *Sexual Politics* (1969), in which she defined politics as 'power-structured relationships, arrangements whereby one group of persons is controlled by another'.

Marxists, for their part, have used the term 'politics' in two senses. On one level, Marx used 'politics' in a conventional sense to refer to the apparatus of the state. In the *Communist Manifesto* (1848), he (and Engels) thus referred to political power as 'merely the organized power of one class for oppressing another'. For Marx, politics, together with law and culture, are part of a 'superstructure' that is distinct from the economic 'base' that is the real foundation of social life. However, he did not see the economic 'base' and the legal and political 'superstructure' as entirely separate. He believed that the 'superstructure' arose out of, and reflected, the economic 'base'. At a deeper level, political power, in this view, is therefore rooted in the class system; as Lenin put it,

‘politics is the most concentrated form of economics’. As opposed to believing that politics can be confined to the state and a narrow public sphere, Marxists can be said to believe that ‘the economic is political’.

1.1.3 POLITICAL THEORY

1.1.3.1 Meaning

The meaning of political theory necessitates the meaning of theory: to know what political theory really is to know, first, what is theory? Originating from the Greek word “theoria”, theory means or at least, may mean a well-focussed mental look taken at something in a state of contemplation with the intention to grasp or understand it. Arnold Brecht (“What is Theory?”) refers to both the broad and the narrow meaning of the word “theory”. In the broader sense, he says, theory means “A thinker's entire teaching on a subject”, including the description of facts, his explanation, his conception of history, his value-judgements, and the proposals of goals, policies and principles. In the narrow sense, he says, theory means “explanatory” thought only or at least primarily.

Political theory is a theory about what is “political”, the science and philosophy of what is political. George Sabine says, “It is anything about politics or relevant to politics”. This being the broader meaning, he refers to its narrow meaning, saying that it is “the disciplined investigation of political problems” (A History of Political Theory, 1973). David Held defines political theory as “a network of concepts and generalizations about political life involving ideas, assumptions and statements about the nature, purpose and key features of government, state and society and about the political capabilities of human beings” (Political Theory Today, 1991) A very elaborate definition of political theory has been given in Political Science Dictionary, describing it as "a body of thought that seeks to evaluate, explain and predict political phenomena. As a sub-field of Political Science, it is concerned with political ideas, values and concepts, and the explanation of prediction of political behaviour. In its broad sense, it has two main branches: one is political philosophy or normative theory, with its value, analytic, historical and speculative concerns. The other is empirical theory, with its efforts to explain, predict, guide, research and organize knowledge through the formulation of abstract models, and scientifically testable propositions."

Political theory is all about politics. It is an overview of what the political order is about. It is a symbolic representation of what is “political”. In its nature, it is a formal, logical and systematic analysis of processes and consequences of political activity. It is, in its method, analytical, expository, and explanatory. It is, in its objective, an attempt to give order, coherence and meaning to what may be referred to as “political”.

1.1.3.2 Major Aspects of Political Theory

The major aspects of political theory can be stated as under:

1. The area in which political theory works extends to the realms of politics only - political life of the citizen, his political behaviour, his political ideas, the government that he seeks to establish, and the tasks expected from such a government.
2. The methods, which political theory adopts, include description, explanation and investigation of the political phenomenon.
3. Though political theory is all about what is ‘political’, yet it attempts to understand ‘political’ in relation to ‘social’, ‘economic’, ‘psychological’, ‘ecological’, ‘moral’, and the like.
4. The objective which political theory seeks to achieve is to build a good state in a good society, and in the process, create processes, procedures, institutions and structures historically tested and rationally attained.
5. As a body of thought, political theory attempts to explain, evaluate and predict political phenomena, and in the process builds not only scientifically testable models, but suggests values as rules of human conduct.
6. Political theory is both prescriptive and explanatory.

1.1.3.3 Nature of Political Theory

To know clearly as to what political theory really is, is to know its nature. Political theory is not all history, but it is history in the limited sense; it is not all philosophy, but

it is philosophy in some degree; it is not all science, but it is science in so far as it responds to reason. A political theorist has to be a part historian, a part philosopher, and a part scientist.

1.1.3.4 Political Theory as History

That political theory is history has been emphatically advocated by scholars like George Sabine, but all history is not political theory just as all political theory is not history. Political theory without history is a structure without a base. In studying and analysing politics, what we learn to understand is a political tradition, and a concrete way of behaviour. It is, therefore, proper that the study of politics should essentially be a historical study. Political theory as history defies what has lost its value. No one cries now that the state has been a divine creation or the result of a contract in the state of nature. As history, political theory conserves what has significance and helps posterity to cherish it for a long time to come. In the attempt to divorce itself from history, political theory loses its own significance, for there can be no fruits without roots as Seeley had said long ago. It is through history that political theory explains what is what. One can never understand a text without its context.

1.3.3.5 Political Theory as Philosophy

That political theory is a philosophy has been very well enunciated by scholars like Leo Strauss, ("What is Political Philosophy?" *Journal of Politics*, XIX, August 1967), but all philosophy is not political theory as all political theory is not philosophy. Philosophy, as an abstract study encompassing the whole universe in general, and morals, norms, and values in particular, is the sum-total of general laws governing the whole world. It has served political theory well through the ages as its valuational factor, as Sabine has said. Philosophy, as Kant says, has answered three questions: "What can I know?" "What must I do?" and "What can I hope for?" and this is what makes philosophy a lodestar of life. Without philosophy, no political theory can ever hope to exist; without an eye on future, no present can ever afford to stay as no present stands without its past.

1.3.3.6 Political Theory as Science

Political theory is a science in so far as it can, and in fact, is applied to a social gathering and

the definitive rules of the exact sciences are applicable within the limitations as in any social science. Political theory as a science is only a social science. It is a science in its methodology, in its approach and in its analysis. To that extent, it is a science, a prime science as Aristotle had described it. It is a science in so far as its conclusions are drawn after 'study', 'observation', 'experiments', features which go along with any normal definition of science. There is no need to go a long way to make a 'science' of politics, and to find 'techniques', and 'tools' to make politics an exact science.

1.3.3.7 Political Theory: Growth and Evolution

Political theory has, in the West, passed through different stages. There was a time when, during the ancient Greek and the medieval period, political theory would concern itself with identifying the ethical goals of the state, i.e., the objectives which the state would cherish to achieve. The medieval political theory associated as it was with religion, demanded of the state to prepare and train the individual to seek a place with god. The early modern age political theory sought to discuss theories of the origin of the state, followed by philosophers with whom the organisation and functions of the state were major concerns of the state. The mid twentieth century political theory dealt largely with the institutions of the state, making the concept of power to be the basic theme of the state.

The growth and evolution of political theory can be elaborated in three major streams. These are: (i) classical political theory, (ii) modern political theory, and (iii) contemporary political theory. The classification of political theory into classical, modern and contemporary is, indeed, thematic. What divides the classical or the traditional from the modern is the element of science in the latter and its absence in the former. Philosophy dominates the classical tradition of political theory whereas science and its methodology dominate the modernist. As an exception, there may be an Aristotle and a Thomas in the ancient and the medieval periods of the West who might have emphasised the science element while discovering the laws of public life, and there may be a Strauss in our times who might see the utility of philosophy in the study of politics. Likewise, modern political theory and contemporary political theory are somewhat different, at least in their essence. Modern political theory is empirical and scientific, whereas contemporary political theory is philosophical and historical. Contemporary political theory attempts to synthesise the essence of both the classical and modern political theory.

1.1.3.8 Decline of Political Theory

Political theory implies an intellectual effort to attain a systematic knowledge about the goals and methods of politics. In this sense it has a long tradition spreading over two-and-a-half milleniums. However, in mid twentieth century David Easton, an American political scientist, in his *Political System: An Inquiry into the State of Political Science* (1953) asserted that the traditional political theory was based on mere speculation. It was devoid of acute observation of the political reality. In order to lay scientific foundations of the study of politics, it was necessary to rescue it from the study of classics and the history of political ideas. Easton, therefore, appealed for building up a behavioural political science, closer to other social sciences, to take its due place in the decision-making process. He suggested that while traditional political theory was primarily concerned with evolving suitable values for society, modern political science need not make efforts in this direction.

Check Your Progress 1

1. What is meant by the word 'theory'?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2. What is political theory?

.....

.....

.....

.....
.....

3. What, in your opinion, should be the subject-matter of political theory?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

4. Distinguish between political theory, political philosophy and political science.

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

5. Can we understand political theory without history?

.....
.....
.....
.....
.....

1.1.4 POLITICS/POLITICAL SCIENCE AS A DISCIPLINE

Political science is a social science concerned with the theory and practice of politics and the analysis of political systems and political behaviour. Political scientists see themselves engaged in revealing the relationships underlying political events and conditions. And from these revelations they attempt to construct general principles about the way the world of politics work. Political science intersects with other fields; including public policy, national politics, economics, international relations, comparative politics, psychology, sociology, history, law, and political theory.

Political science is commonly divided into three distinct sub-disciplines which together constitute the field: Political Philosophy, Comparative Politics and International Relations.

Political science is methodologically diverse and appropriates many methods originating in social research. Approaches include positivism, rational choice theory, behavioural, structuralism, post-structuralism, realism, institutionalism, and pluralism. Political science, as one of the social sciences, uses methods and techniques that relate to the kinds of inquiries sought: primary sources such as historical documents and official records, secondary sources such as scholarly journal articles, survey research, statistical analysis, case studies, and model building.

‘As a discipline’ political science, possibly like the social sciences as a whole, “lives on the fault line between the ‘two cultures’ in the academy, the sciences and the humanities.” Thus, in some American colleges where there is no separate School or College of Arts and Sciences per se, political science may be a separate department housed as part of a division or school of Humanities or Liberal Arts. Whereas classical political philosophy is primarily defined by a concern for Hellenic and Enlightenment thought, political scientists are broadly marked by a greater concern for "modernity" and the contemporary nation state, and as such share a greater deal of terminology with sociologists (e.g. structure and agency).

Political scientists study matters concerning the allocation and transfer of power in decision

making, the roles and systems of governance including governments and international organizations, political behaviour and public policies. They measure the success of governance and specific policies by examining many factors, including stability, justice, material wealth, and peace. Some political scientists seek to advance positive (attempt to describe how things are, as opposed to how they should be) theses by analyzing politics. Others advance normative theses, by making specific policy recommendations.

1.1.4.1 History

Political science is a relatively late arrival in terms of social sciences. However, the discipline has a clear set of antecedents such as moral philosophy, political philosophy, political economy, political theology, history, and other fields concerned with normative determinations of what ought to be and with deducing the characteristics and functions of the ideal state. The antecedents of Western politics can trace their roots back to Plato (427-347 BC) and Aristotle (The Father of Political Science) (384-322 BC), particularly in the works of Homer, Hesiod, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Euripides. Later, Plato analyzed political systems, abstracted their analysis from more literary- and history oriented studies and applied an approach we would understand as closer to philosophy. Similarly, Aristotle built upon Plato's analysis to include historical empirical evidence in his analysis. Plato wrote *The Republic* and Aristotle wrote *the Politics*.

1.1.4.2 The Rise and Fall of The Roman Empire

During the height of the Roman Empire, famous historians such as Polybius, Livy and Plutarch documented the rise of the Roman Republic, and the organization and histories of other nations, while statesmen like Julius Caesar, Cicero and others provided us with examples of the politics of the republic and Rome's empire and wars. The study of politics during this age was oriented toward understanding history, understanding methods of governing, and describing the operation of governments. In the interim, there is a manifest translation of Hellenic culture into the Roman sphere. The Greek gods become Romans and Greek philosophy in one way or another turns into Roman law e.g. Stoicism. The Stoic was committed to preserving proper hierarchical roles and duties in the state so that the state as a whole would remain stable.

1.1.4.3 The Middle Ages

With the fall of the Western Roman Empire, there arose a more diffuse arena for political studies. The rise of monotheism and, particularly for the Western tradition, Christianity, brought to light a new space for politics and political action. Works such as Augustine of Hippo's *The City of God* synthesized current philosophies and political traditions with those of Christianity, redefining the borders between what was religious and what was political.

During the Middle Ages, the study of politics was widespread in the churches and courts. Most of the political questions surrounding the relationship between church and state were clarified and contested in this period.

1.1.4.4 Indian Sub-Continent

In ancient India, the antecedents of politics can be traced back to the Rig- Veda, Samhitas, Brahmanas, the Mahabharata and Buddhist Pali Canon. Chanakya (350-275 BC) was a political thinker in Takshashila. Chanakya wrote the *Arthashastra*, a treatise on political thought, economics and social order, which can be considered a precursor to Machiavelli's *The Prince*. It discusses monetary and fiscal policies, welfare, international relations, and war strategies in detail, among other topics. The *Manusmriti*, dated to about two centuries after the time of Chanakya is another important political treatise of ancient India.

1.1.4.5 East Asia

Ancient China was home to several competing schools of political thought, most of which arose in the Spring and Autumn Period. These included Mohism (a utilitarian philosophy), Taoism, Legalism (a school of thought based on the supremacy of the state), and Confucianism. Eventually, a modified form of Confucianism (heavily infused with elements of Legalism) became the dominant political philosophy in China during the Imperial Period. This form of Confucianism also deeply influenced and was expounded upon by scholars in Korea and Japan.

1.1.4.6 The Renaissance

During the Italian Renaissance, Niccolò Machiavelli established the emphasis of modern political science on direct empirical observation of political institutions and actors. For Machiavelli, nothing seems to be too good nor too evil if it helps to attain and preserve

political power. Machiavelli shatters political illusions, reveals the harsh reality of politics and could be considered the father of the politics model. Like Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, well-known for his theory of the social contract, believed that a strong central power, such as a monarchy, was necessary to rule the innate selfishness of the individual but neither of them believed in the divine right of kings. John Locke, on the other hand, who gave us Two Treatises of Government and who did not believe in the divine right of kings either, sided with Aquinas and stood against both Machiavelli and Hobbes by accepting Aristotle's dictum that man seeks to be happy in a state of social harmony as a social animal.

1.1.4.7 The Enlightenment

Religion would no longer play a dominant role in politics. There would be separation of church and state. Principles similar to those that dominated the material sciences could be applied to society as a whole, originating the social sciences. Politics could be studied in a laboratory as it was, the social milieu. In 1787, Alexander Hamilton wrote: "...The science of politics like most other sciences has received great improvement." (The Federalist Papers Number 9 and 51). Both the marquis d'Argenson and the abbé de Saint-Pierre described politics as a science.

1.1.4.8 Modern Political Science

Like all social sciences, political sciences faces the difficulty of observing human actors that can only be partially observed and who have the capacity for making conscious choices unlike other subjects such as non-human organisms in biology or inanimate objects as in physics. Despite the complexities, contemporary political science has progressed by adopting a variety of methods and theoretical approaches to understanding politics and methodological pluralism is a defining feature of contemporary political science. The advent of political science as a university discipline was marked by the creation of university departments and chairs with the title of political science arising in the late 19th century. In fact, the designation "political scientist" is typically reserved for those with a doctorate in the field. Integrating political studies of the past into a unified discipline is ongoing, and the history of political science has provided a rich field for the growth of both normative and positive political science, with each part of the discipline sharing some historical predecessors. The American Political Science Association was founded in 1903 and the

American Political Science Review was founded in 1906 in an effort to distinguish the study of politics from economics and other social phenomena.

1.1.4.9 Behavioral Revolution And New Institutionalism

In the 1950s and the 1960s, a behavioural revolution stressing the systematic and rigorously scientific study of individual and group behaviour swept the discipline. A focus on studying political behaviour, rather than institutions or interpretation of legal texts, characterized early behavioural political science, including work by Robert Dahl, Philip Converse etc. The late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed a take off in the use of deductive, game theoretic formal modelling techniques aimed at generating a more analytical corpus of knowledge in the discipline. This period saw a surge of research that borrowed theory and methods from economics to study political institutions. This trend toward formalization has continued and accelerated, even as the behaviouralist revolution has subsided. At the same time, because of the interdependence of all social life, political science also moved towards a closer working relationship with other disciplines.

Increasingly, political scientists have used the scientific method to create an intellectual discipline involving quantitative research methods, as well as the generation of formal economics-style models of politics to derive testable hypotheses followed by empirical verification. Over the past generations, the discipline placed an increasing emphasis on relevance and the use of new approaches to increase scientific knowledge in the field and provide explanations for empirical outcomes.

Check your Progress II

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient

1 What is politics?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

2 Explain politics as a public affair and conflict resolution process?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

3. Give a brief account of power view of politics?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

4 Define political science with two definitions?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

6 Explain the evolution of political science as a discipline?

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

1.1.5 LET US SUM UP

The term politics can be traced back to the Greek city state. With the passage of time different definitions have been put forward to define politics. It is also important to note that political science has been used interchangeably with different terms like politics, political theory etc. To define political theory, it is a theory that is related to what is 'political'. Political theory is history in so far as it is based on facts; it is philosophy in so far as it evaluates phenomenon; it is science in so far as it explains things scientifically. Political theory has grown from its normative past to its scientific present. It looks forward to being a synthesis of history, philosophy and science, and of normativism and empiricism. Political theory is not merely an illusion; it is not dead. Its relevance lies in its being a practical activity. It not

only gives us a theory of man, society or history, but also gives us a theory of action - reform, revolution or conservation.

1.1.6 EXERCISES

1. "Politics is essentially the activity through which human beings attempt to create a good society." Discuss this view with reference to the ideas of Aristotle and modern political thinkers.
2. Compare and contrast the arena-based and process-based conceptions of politics. Which approach offers a more comprehensive understanding of political activity?
3. Critically evaluate the view that politics is best understood as the art of government.
4. Discuss Bernard Crick's argument that politics is the alternative to violence. What are the implications of this view for democratic governance?
5. What is the debate between normative and empirical political theory? How did the rise of behaviouralism mark a shift in the study of politics?

1.1.7 SUGGESTED READINGS

- Barry, Norman, *An Introduction to Modern Political Theory*, London: Macmillan, 1981.
- Farrelly, Colin, *An Introduction to Contemporary Political Theory*, London: Sage, 2003.
- Gaus, Gerald F., *Political Concepts and Political Theories*, Boulder: Westview Press, 2000.
- Goodin, Robert E. and Klingemana, Hans-Dieter, *A New Handbook of Political Science*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Greenstein, Fred I. and Pelsby, Nelson W., *Handbook of Political Science*, Addison Wesley Longman, Reading, 1975.

- Held, David, *Political Theory and the Modern State*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.
- Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.
- Heywood, A., *Political Theory - An Introduction*, Third Edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- Hoffman, John and Graham, Paul, *Introduction to Political Theory*, Harlow: Longman, 2006.
- Mackenzie, I., *Political Concepts: A Reader and Guide*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2005,
- Marsh, David and Stoker, Gerry, *Theory and Methods in Political Sciences*, Houndmills: Macmillan, 1995.
- Mohanty, Memoranda, *Contemporary Indian Political Theory*, New Delhi: Sanskrit, 2002.
- Plant, R., *Modern Political Thought*, Oxford, 1991.
- Varma, S. P., *Modern political Theory*, New Delhi: Vikas, 1983.
- Vincent, A., *Modern Political Ideologies*, Oxford, 1992.

1.2 NATURE AND SCOPE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

Seema Rohmetra

STRUCTURE

1.2.0 OBJECTIVES

1.2.1 INTRODUCTION

1.2.2 NATURE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

1.2.3 Definitions of Politics

1.2.4 Political Science : As Art or Science

1.2.5 Is it a Science

1.2.6 Is Politics an Art

1.2.7 SCOPE OF POLITICS (TWO DIFFERENT VIEWS)

1.2.8 The Traditional View

1.2.9 Modern view

1.2.10 Politics as Power

1.2.11 Other views Regarding the scope of Politics

1.2.12 Liberal Views

1.2.13 Marxist view of Politics

1.2.14 Role of Politics according to Marxists

1.2.15 POINTS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LIBERALS AND MARXISTS

1.2.16 LET US SUM UP

1.2.17 EXERCISES

1.2.18 SUGGESTED READINGS

1.1.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit concerns itself with nature and scope of Political Science. After going through this unit, we shall be able to discuss:

- The different views regarding the nature of Political Science?
- The scope of Political Science?
- The new dimensions added to the scope of Political Science?
- The liberal and Marxist views regarding the nature of politics?
- The role Politics play according to Marxists

1.1.0 INTRODUCTION

The origin of Political Science can be traced back to the kind of ‘Empiricism’ which formed an essential feature of seventeenth century. The term ‘science’ which is used in Political Science refers to a method as a result of which the knowledge is acquired. This method proceeds through different steps like observation, experiment and measurement. To understand the Political Science, it is important to first of all to explain, what the two words ‘Political’ and ‘Science’ mean. The word politics has been in use since the time of Greeks, ‘*polis*’ was the term used by the Greeks to define the city-state. The title of Aristotle’s famous book was *Politics*. As Aristotle observed “man is by nature a political animal”. What

was implied by Aristotle was that to live in social existence is a natural instinct of man. According to Aristotle it is through social life that individual capabilities can be maximised. Higher form of social life is the state where political infractions taken place in an institutional setting. The state seeks to resolve the social conflicts. Contrast to this broader definition of politics, during the modern period politics was defined narrowly. Thinkers like Bodin and Montesquieu offered a formal and restricted scope of politics – which remained limited to function of government special organisation and operation of legal issues. This narrow definition of politics continued till the 20th century. It was in 1950s that an attempt was made to broaden the scope of politics to include “political processes.” It was recognised that besides formal agencies of governance like legislature, executive and judiciary, there are a number of non-formal organisations that influence the political decision-making. These non-formal organisations include political parties interest or/and pressure groups. It is the combination of these formal and non-formal organisations that constitute the political system.

By now politics had come to be defined as a “complex process involving citizen attitudes and interests, group organisation, lobbying, as well as the formulation, implementation and interpretation of law. Now politics has again acquired a broader dimension. Any aspect of society that directly or indirectly affects the state is understood as a subject matter of Political Science.

The final question that needs to be asked is whether Political Science is a science? Is there really a science of politics? In other words are there laws of political behaviour, in the same way as there are laws of, for instance, motion (in physics) or is Political Science as precise as for instance Physics, Mathematics, Chemistry etc.? Perhaps the word science that is attached to the term Political Science is not to be understood in this way.

1.2.1 NATURE OF POLITICAL SCIENCE

‘Political Science’ is a progressive science which proceeds in consonance with the scientific method. It proceeds by following the processes mentioned below.

- 1. Observation:** It means that perceptions through senses are the only admissible basis of knowledge. It includes all the metaphysical assumptions.
- 2. Generalization:** Generalization is based upon the observation. It finds its basis in observation in the sense that regularities need to be observed for achieving a Generalized

view. As a result of Generalization, the relation and co-relation between the various factors can be developed. Generalization can be obtained by two methods, either inductive or deductive. Whereas the inductive makes a reference to proceeding from 'particular to general', on the other hand deductive generalization is achieved as a result of proceeding from 'general to particular.'

3. Explanation: After the observation and generalization is made the next step is to provide an explanation as to how and why the generalized opinion is achieved. Reasoning is very essential for any kind of explanation because without such reasoning any observation of correlation might be a co-incidence.

4. Prediction and prescription: Because the facts are known, the general rules have been discovered, so the next step is prediction and prescription.

It is pertinent to note that Political Science has been used interchangeably with different terms like-politics, political theory, political philosophy etc. we shall be using the terms politics for discussing the nature and scope of Political Science. The term politics has been derived from a Greek word 'polis' which means the city-state that is an independent community. So politics in ancient Greek language stands for a science of the 'city-state' pertaining to state and government. So science which deals with the political affairs of the community came to be known as 'politics'.

1.2.2 DEFINITIONS

Different definitions have been put forward to define politics.

FAIRLEY: Politics...includes a study of the organisation and activities of states, and of the principles and ideals which underlie political organisation and activities.

PAUL JANET: Politics is ... that part of social science which treats of the foundation of the state and the principles of government.

JENKS: Politics is the study that deals with the state and the government.

BIERCE: Politics is the conduct of public affairs for private advantage.

S. HILLMAN: Politics is the science of who gets what, when and why.

J.W. GARNER: *The meaning of the term 'politics' is confined to that of the business and activity which has to do with the actual conduct of the affairs of the state.*

1.2.3 POLITICAL SCIENCE: AS ART OR SCIENCE

Political science is a social science. Its nature is different than physical sciences like physics and chemistry. Whenever we study the origin, evolution and development of Political Science; we find various aspects of the nature of Political Science. The definitions and meaning of Political Science shows that it is a systematic study of Political theory, Political Institutions, Political forces and processes. When we call Politics as 'Political Science?', we have to see how far this subject stands to the tests of science in the strict sense of the term. In this unit we discuss the nature of Political Science as a social science.

1.2.4 IS IT A SCIENCE?

Very often a question is raised whether the discipline of Politics can be regarded as a science? There is no unanimity among Political thinkers whether the subject is a Science. What is a Science? "Science is a systematic body of knowledge, the facts of which have been accurately and impartially collected, arranged and classified through the use of various scientific methods of observation, comparison and experimentation". Various arguments are forwarded for and against the discipline being a science.

Arguments That It Is Not A Science:-

Political Scientists like Maitland, Burke, Gettel do not think that Politics is really a Science. Their arguments are as follows:-

- 1. Disagreement in definition, terminology and methods :-** There is no general agreement among Political thinker's regarding definition, scope, terminology etc. There is no exactness or precision in the political science, as a result, they cannot be accepted and applied universally. This does not happen in case of natural sciences like physics and chemistry.
- 2. Lack of Precision :-** Principles of Political Science are not precise, clear and they lead to many controversies. Where as a formula in physics or chemistry is clear and universally accepted. e.g. The laws of gravity or the principles of arithmetic i.e. Two plus two equals four everywhere. However Political Science like pure and natural

sciences such as physics and Mathematics does not possess any such universally relevant principles.

3. **Human Beings:** - Politics deals with human beings whose minds are unpredictable. Political scientists have to deal with man (human beings) who are not under their control. Human behaviour is unpredictable and not always logical. Whereas physics and chemistry deal with matter or inanimate objects (non living objects). Natural scientist work in laboratories and the objects are perfectly under their control. Hence their rules and laws are absolute, and universal.
4. **Limited Experimentation:** - Experimentation in laboratory or in an isolated environment is not possible in Politics like natural sciences.
5. **Lack of Objectivity:** - Political Science lacks objectivity but subjective element is very strong. Political-science is subjective and relative because political scientist has to deal with human beings in relation to society, State, Government etc.
6. **Difficult to Predict Future:** - Political phenomena do not follow proper sequence like exact science. At times, the effects are contrary and therefore the results cannot be predicted.

In spite of the above arguments, the subject is regarded as a science because:-

Arguments That It Is A Science:-

1. Political Science is not a pure science but a social Science - Politics is a systematized body of knowledge. Its facts are collected and organized through proper observation, comparison and experimentation, etc. example Studies on election. Science is a systematic and formulated knowledge of a specified subject. In that sense Political Science is certainly a science.
2. Political Experiments are not completely ruled out. The government itself is a continuous experiment. The application of Marxist principles in the USSR was one such experiment.
3. Broad Conclusions can be drawn in Political Science example Independent impartial judiciary, free press is essential for democracy.

4. Empirical studies are based on careful observation and classification:- Political Science puts hypothesis to empirical verification. Theories are not built on speculation. Political Scientists today employ survey methods, graphs, charts etc. to arrive at their research conclusions.

Thus political science is not a pure science, but a social science.

1.2.5 IS POLITICS AN ART?

The term 'Art' refers to the practical application of knowledge. Political Science applies the knowledge about political events for creating a good social and political order. Hence it is an art.

Robert Dahl States that "Political Science is both - Science and Art. Whenever students of Political Science test their theories against the data of experience by observation, the political analysis can be regarded as scientific. When this political analysis is applied for the working of political institution it is an art".

Politics or political science?

What should the subject be called Politics or Political Science? Aristotle called his studies in Political Phenomena as 'Politics'. Prof Laskis work was named as a "Grammar of Politics". However, most of the modern writers prefer the subject to be called as "Political Science" and not as Politics. Because Political Science is a systematic study of Political theory, political institutions, political forces and processes. The term 'Politics' indicates the current political problems or issues. Many times common people use the term of Politics as a dubious, messy, rotten affairs. Study of politics is a part of the study of political Science. Politics is an activity and that what it analyses as a political science is only a part of it. The term 'Politics' is not precise to give us whole range of knowledge pertaining to state and other political institutions. There is distinction between a politician and political scientist. A politician is a person who actively participates in the political affairs. Whereas a political scientist is an expert in the subject. He studies the subject systematically. Hence it is preferable the subject be called a "Political Science and not Politics".

Check Your Progress I

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient

1. What are the various steps to be followed in a scientific method ?

2. With which terms can the Political Science be used interchangeably?

3. Define politics and give some definitions?

1.2.6 SCOPE OF POLITICS (Two different views)

On the basis of above definitions, we can safely say that there are two different views of politics – the Traditional view and the Modern view.

In order to discuss both these views, it is important to note that these views should be analysed keeping in mind two important parameters. These parameters are the scope and objectives of politics.

1.2.7 The Traditional View

Those who are adherents of this traditional view stress upon the state as the central point of politics. For instance Garner says: 'politics begins and ends with the state.' Similarly Dr. Appadorai opines: "Politics deal with the state as political society." According to this traditional view of politics, the focus is mainly upon the personnel and machinery of the government. To study politics is in essence to study government or, more broadly, to study the exercise of authority. This view further gained momentum with the writings of David Easton, a US Political Scientist. He defined politics as 'an authoritative allocation of values.' As per this definition, politics stresses upon all the processes as a result of which 'governments respond to the pressures from the larger society. This response of the government is affected in the allocation of different benefits, rewards penalisation among the different sections of the society. It is important to note here that these allocations are authoritative in nature. Also these authoritative allocations are binding upon the citizens. So in this traditional view, politics is 'associated with policy', that is, with formal or authoritative decisions that establish a plan of action for the community.

This traditional view of politics is considered to be a narrow view of politics in the sense that it stresses upon a system which is centered upon the machinery of government. Politics according to this view is 'practised in cabinet rooms, legislative chambers, government departments and the like, and it is engaged in by a limited and specific group of people, notably politicians, civil servants and lobbyists.'

While placing too much emphasis on government, the Traditional view of politics placed the role of common people, the institutions and most of the social activities outside the area of politics. This traditional view which concentrates upon state bound activity however ignores different influences upon life, especially the impact of transnational technology and multinational corporations.

1.2.8 Modern View of Politics

A number of thinkers like Michael Curtis and Lipson have come forward with the modern view of politics. They regard the traditional view of politics as very narrow and restricted. For them, the scope of politics is much wider than the traditional view. "The study of

politics”, according to Michael Curtis, “is concerned with the description and analysis of the manner in which power is obtained, exercised, and controlled; the purpose for which it is used, the manner in which decisions are made, the factors which influence the making of these decisions, and the context in which those decisions take place.”

This view therefore stresses upon the notion that politics comprises of different facets of life, whereas government deals with only those aspects which are associated with the governing process of the society.

According to Lipson, Politics is wider than the state. He says: “The point that politics is broader than the state can be easily demonstrated; wherever the state exists, there is also politics. But the converse is not true – that wherever politics exists, so does the state. We can rightly speak of international politics, but we know that there is not as yet a supranational state. We can talk of politics within Churches or municipal corporations or trade unions, although none of these is a state.”

It is important to note here, that this view of politics can be traced back to the works of famous philosopher Aristotle. In politics, Aristotle declared that ‘man is by nature a political animal,’ by this he meant that only within a political community can man lead in ‘good life’. Even Cataline also supports the viewpoint of Aristotle and stresses upon all those things of which Aristotle had made a mention. The scope of politics according to Catalin should include organisation of the family, control over slaves, analysis of revolutions, and pure democracy – national, civil and international politics, religions congregations and labour unions and organisations of employees – all activities which fall under the domains of society.

As far as the scope of politics is concerned a new dimensions has been added to the contemporary notion of politics.

1.2.9 POLITICS AS POWER

This new dimensions finds its essence in ‘politics as power’. The chief advocates of this view are C.E. Marrian, H. D. Lassevell, Kaplan, Max Weber, Bertrand Russel and Hans Margenthau, also a number of feminists as well as Marxists. According to them the concept of power is most essential to politics. According to Lasswell and Kaplan, “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.”

The above view has been justified on certain grounds. According to the advocates of this view, politics concerns itself mainly with the production, distribution and the utilisation of the resources. So power constitutes the essence of politics. The term ‘power’ has been excellently summed up in the title of Harold Lasswell’s book *Politics: who Gets what, when, how?* So in this context, politics is intrinsically linked to the diversities and conflict of interests. But it is important to note that, the essential ingredient is the existence of scarcity, the fact is that the needs and desires of individuals are infinite, but the resources at the disposal of these individuals are scarce. So politics is considered to be a struggle over these scarce resources. Consequently power is assured to be an important means as a result of which this struggle is conducted.

Check Your Progress II

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What are the two different views regarding nature and scope of politics?

2. How is a traditional view of politics is different from the modern notion of politics?

3. The new dimension has been added to the concept of politics. Discuss.

4. The philosopher Aristotle is associated with which view of politics? How?

1.2.10 LIBERAL AND MARXIST VIEWS OF POLITICS

Liberals and Marxists have given their own viewpoints regarding the nature of politics. The liberals stress upon the conflicting interests existing within a society. While Liberals consider politics to be an instrument for the reconciliation of the conflicting interests, on the other hand, Marxists especially the classical ones focus upon politics “as a product of the conflicting interests of the two main classes in society – the ‘dominant’ and the ‘dependent’ classes”.

1.2.11 THE LIBERAL VIEW

This view conceives of politics in a pluralistic society. In this plural society different individuals have their varied interests. Every individual tries to seek his own interest. Consequently, the interest of one individual or group is not in consonance with the interest of other individual or a group. With the result the conflict arises. So in the process of seeking ones own interest, the individuals or groups organise themselves differently, for instance a workers’ union seeks the interest of its workers; similarly producers and consumers, landlords and tenants, suppliers and customers etc., try to seek their own

interest through their own organisations. So in this context, 'politics has been described as a group activity'. Since the authoritative allocations are made by the state, so liberals also stress upon state activity as important constituent of politics.

a) Politics as Compromise and Consensus

According to liberals, no doubt there is always a conflict of interests among the various groups existing in a plural society, but it is important to note that there is always a common point or common interest which exists to reconcile the contradictory interests. So politics is also seen as a particular means of resolving conflict, that is, by compromise, conciliation and negotiation, rather than through force and naked power. It is in this context that politics is termed as 'the art of the possible'. This view of politics can be traced back to the writings of Aristotle which stress upon the belief that 'polity' is an ideal system of government, as it is 'mixed' in the sense that it combines both aristocratic and democratic features. So, politics according to this view is essentially an instrument of conflict resolution.

b) Politics as an Instrument for Promoting Common Good

As politics is an instrument of conflict resolution, according to liberals, there exists a scope for some common interest within in a pluralistic society. So politics is basically an 'effect to discover and pursue that common interest'. Therefore politics is an important means of promoting the common good. This common good adjusts and reconciles the conflicting interests existing within the society. Politics according to this view is considered to be an instrument of progress. This consideration can be attributed to the fact that politics not only makes different groups/individual aware of the conflicting interests, but also the interaction among the various groups/individuals leads to an awareness of some 'common interest'.

1.2.12 MARXIST VIEW OF POLITICS

a) Primacy of economic Interest

According to the Marxian view, politics which encompasses a number of political institutions and activities is basically an outcome of existing economic system. This can be attributed to the profound belief of Marxists that 'All social relations, including political relations, are

shaped by the prevailing economic relations in society.' So Marxists stress upon the conflicting economic interests as the root cause of all politics. Whereas liberals stress upon varied factors such as economic, linguistic cultural, religious, ethnic, etc. playing an important role in culmination of politics, Marxists emphasise upon the contradictory economic interests as the most fundamental issue. Other issues like social, cultural or ideological are superficial in nature according to them.

b) Politics as an Instrument of Class Domination

Politics, according to Marxists, emanates because the system of production is not organised on any 'rational basis'. Organisation of the system of production on rational basis implies a number of things. It means that technology should reach the maximum heights, so as to achieve maximum production. It also means 'social ownership of the means of production and distribution'. Social ownership implies that the entire production must cater to the requirements of the whole society rather than the chosen few. Therefore one of the important factors contributing to the emergence of politics in a society is the lack of any rational basis of the system of production.

Referring to the capitalist societies, Marxists believe that production and distribution in a capitalist system is the monopoly of chosen few, that is the means of production and distribution are not socially controlled but are in private hands (economically dominant sections). Therefore the emergence of private property has led to the division of the society into "two classes – haves and have-nots, the 'masters and servants', the 'exploiters and the exploited' – whose interests are irreconcilable." It is in this division, where the Marxist finds the roots of politics and consequently the state. Fredrick Engels elaborates this in his *The origin of the family, private property and the state*:

Because the state arose from the need to hold class antagonisms in check ... it is, as a rule, the state of the most powerful, economically dominant class, and thus acquires new means of holding down and exploiting the oppressed class. Thus, the state of antiquity was above all the state of the slave-owners for the purpose of holding down the slaves, as the feudal state was the organ of the nobility for holding down the peasant serfs and bondsmen, and the modern representative state is an instrument of exploitation of the wage labour by capital.

1.2.13 ROLE OF POLITICS ACCORDING TO MARXISTS

According to the Marxists, the politics has an important role to play. As the society is divided into two antagonistic classes – the haves and the have-nots, there always exists a clash of interests between the two classes results in a class struggle. So Marxists say that politics ensues from this class struggle. According to Karl Marx (in his communist manifesto),

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles – freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guild-master and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed stood in constant opposition to one another, carried on uninterrupted, now hidden, now open fight, a fight that each time ended either in a revolutionary reconstitution of society at large, or in common ruin of the contending classes.

According to Marxists this class conflict can not be reconciled. Even politics cannot resolve this conflict. On the other hand politics is used as an instrument by the dominant sections of the society to suppress this conflict. Consequently it appears that a compromise is achieved between the two classes but in actual practice this compromise is forced upon by the dominant sections on the dependent classes.

Marxists feel that the role of politics can never come to an end. This unending role of politics can be attributed to the belief of Marxists that ‘so long as the society is divided into ever irreconcilable classes, state politics would continue to be used as an instrument for the exploitation of the have-nots’. The same process would continue, according to the Marxists, even after the ‘social revolution’. But, this continuation of the system would then take place in ‘reverse gear’.

1.2.14 POINTS OF DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE LIBERALS AND MARXISTS

The important points of differences between the liberal and Marxist views of politics rest

upon the nature of politics. Both have discussed the basis of politics, the source of conflict from which politics emerges and the prospects of the resolution of the conflict. According to Raiph Miliband (in his *Marxists and politics*),

'In the liberal view of politics, conflict exists in terms of 'problems' which need to be 'solved', the hidden assumption is that conflict does not, or need not, run very deep; that it can be managed by the exercise of reason and good will and a readiness to compromise and agree.... the Marxist approach to conflict is very different. It is not a matter of 'problems' to be solved' but of a state of domination and subjection to be ended by a total transformation of the conditions which give rise to it'.

Check Your Progress III

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient

1. How do liberals perceive 'politics'?

2. Politics is considered to be an instrument for promoting common good? How?

3. Discuss the Marxist view of politics?

4. What are the important points of differences between the liberal and Marxist views of politics?

1.2.15 LET US SUM UP

The term Political Science can be traced back to empiricism which formed an important feature of 17th century. It is important to note that Political Science has been used interchangeably with different terms like politics, political theory etc. Consequently different definitions have been put forward to define politics. The two important views regarding the scope and objectives of politics include the traditional view and the modern view. Likewise liberals and Marxists have also perceived of politics differently. As a result they have come out with different sources of ‘politics’ and therefore the different forms.

1.2.17 EXERCISES

1. Explain the evolution of Political Science from its empirical origins to its modern interpretations. How has the definition and scope of politics changed over time?
2. Discuss whether Political Science qualifies as a science. What arguments support and oppose this classification?
3. Compare and contrast the traditional and modern views of politics. Which view do you find more relevant in today’s world and why?
4. What do thinkers like Lasswell, Kaplan, and Max Weber mean by defining politics as power? How does this concept relate to the broader study of Political Science?

5. Describe the scientific method used in Political Science. How do processes like observation, generalization, explanation, and prediction apply to political studies?

1.2.18 SUGGESTED READINGS

Gabba, O. P., *An introduction to Political theory*, New Delhi: Macmillan , 2009

Gupta, R. L. *Political Theory New Concepts and New Perspectives*, New Delhi: 1997.

Held, David, *Political Theory and the Modern State*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*; Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Heywood, A., *Political Theory - An Introduction*, Third Edition, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.

Varma, S. P., *Modern political Theory*, New Delhi: Vikas, 1983.

1.3 TRADITIONAL APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF POLITICAL SCIENCE (PHILOSOPHICAL, HISTORICAL, LEGAL INSTITUTIONAL)

Rita Munshi

STRUCTURE

1.3.0 OBJECTIVES

1.3.1 INTRODUCTION

1.3.2 TRADITIONAL APPROACHES

1.3.3 The Philosophical/ Normative Approach

1.3.4 Historical Approach

1.3.5 Institutional Approach

1.3.6 Legal Approach

1.3.7 CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADITIONAL APPROACH

1.3.8 LET US SUM UP

1.3.9 EXERCISES

1.3.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

1.3.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to understand:

- The various approaches fall within the scope of Traditional Approach
- The major trends in the traditional approach
- Basic characteristics and limitations of these trends
- Criticism against these trends

1.3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the sphere of social sciences the terms ‘method’ and ‘approach’ are applied rather loosely, and sometimes even interchangeably. But a distinction can be drawn between two. Method is a more general term which denotes a particular way of doing something. In a systematic study, method may be defined as the procedure of inquiry by which reliable knowledge could be obtained and reliable conclusions could be drawn. Examples of method are: scientific method, inductive method, deductive method, comparative method, etc. On the other hand, approach is a wider term which comprehends not only the method (i.e. how to inquire) but also the focus of our study (i.e. what to inquire) in order to understand the given phenomenon. In brief, approaches consist of criteria for selecting problems and relevant data, whereas methods are procedures for getting and utilizing data.

Great thinkers past and present have made an attempt to understand the true nature of political reality in their own way with their own approaches. Thus some thinkers like Plato have found their base in ethics and philosophy and some like Maine have studied political phenomenon from historical standpoint. Hegel drew his inspiration from metaphysics, Marx treated economics as a base of studying and understanding politics. These approaches can be broadly divided into two categories:

1. Traditional Approaches
2. Modern/Contemporary Approaches

Broadly speaking, the approaches which remained largely in vogue till the end of the Second World War (1939) are described as traditional approaches while those which were developed thereafter are known to be modern or contemporary approaches. It is not possible to furnish any comprehensive lists of the traditional or contemporary approaches. Truly speaking, they do not represent watertight compartments, although some of their distinctive features might be identified. A few decades ago it was argued that the contemporary approaches focus on facts while traditional approaches focus on values. This view is no longer upheld. Hence the distinction between empirical and normative approaches cannot be treated as coterminous with the distinction between traditional and contemporary approaches.

Although contemporary political science gives prominence to empirical approach and traditional study of politics was dominated by normative approach, it cannot be assumed that the distinction between empirical and normative approaches reflects the distinction between contemporary and traditional approaches. In fact some features of empirical as well as normative approaches are found both in the traditional and contemporary approaches.

1.3.2 TRADITIONAL APPROACHES

The traditional approach is value based and lays emphasis on the inclusion of values to the study of political phenomena. The adherents of this approach believe that the study of political science should not be based on facts alone since facts and values are closely related to each other. Since the days of Plato and Aristotle, the great issues of politics have revolved around normative orientations. Accordingly there are a large number of traditional approaches like legal approach, philosophical approach, historical approach, institutional approach etc.

1.3.3 THE PHILOSOPHICAL/NORMATIVE APPROACH

Probably the oldest approach to the study of politics is philosophical. It is also known as speculative, ethical or metaphysical approach. The chief exponents of this approach have been political idealists like Plato, Rousseau, Hegel, Bradley, Bosanquet and Sidgwick, Leo Strauss, Oakeshott, etc. A study of politics in this approach assumes speculative character. The word Philosophy refers to thought about thought. Philosophical approach to the study of political science could be traced in the writings of ancient philosophers like

Plato and Aristotle. Leo Strauss who was one of the ardent supporters of this approach believed that "the philosophy is the quest for wisdom and political philosophy is the attempt truly to know about the nature of political things and the right or good political order." This approach lays stress on ethical and normative study of politics and is idealistic in nature. It deals with the problems of nature and function of state, issues of citizenship, rights and duties etc.

a) Characteristics

The major characteristics of this approach are the following:

1. In the first place, the philosophical approach is concerned with the clarification of concepts used in a particular discipline.
2. Secondly, the philosophical approach aims at evolving "standards of right and wrong" for the purpose of a critical evaluation of the existing institutions, laws and policies
3. Values are an indispensable part of this approach hence it is also called normative or value laden. According to Strauss a political scientist must necessarily possess the knowledge of good life and also of good society. Its motivating concern is what ought to be or should be.
4. The study of politics gets converted into political philosophy with the use of this method. The objective of philosophy is the subjective reality. It is an attempt to replace opinion about the nature of political things by the knowledge of the nature of political things. To quote S.P. Verma "Political Philosophy in this comprehensive form has been cultivated since its beginning almost without any interception till very recently when the behaviouralists started raising disputes about its subject-matter, method as well as functions and challenging its very possibility."
5. Philosophical approach is not narrowly focussed but includes all human activities and has as its goal a statement of underlying principles concerning these activities. To quote Wasby "For centuries the interest in the actual political activities of man was principally derived from a desire to find out why he did not live up to ideals postulated in National Law, or to postulate utopias such as Plato's *Republic*, Hobbes' *Leviathan* or like Locke's Postulate *The existence of State of nature* which intended

to portray ideal human nature”.

6. The philosophical approach has revived interest in political ideologies which encompass not only ideas and their impact but the inter-relationship between ideas and political activity as well.
7. Critics of the historical approach point out that it is not possible to understand ideas of the past ages in terms of the contemporary ideas and concepts. Moreover, ideas of the past are hardly any guide for resolving the crises of the present-day world which were beyond comprehension of the past thinkers.

Of the contemporary champions of the philosophical approach to the study of politics, Leo Strauss is the most outstanding. According to Strauss, political science and political philosophy are coterminous. They denote an attempt to obtain true knowledge of political things as well as the standards of the right and the good. Political philosophy is a product of our quest for good life and good society. Values as well as facts are indispensable part of political philosophy which enables us to undertake a critical and coherent analysis of political institutions and activities. Without such analysis, assumptions regarding the political things take the character of opinions. Political philosophy seeks to replace opinion by knowledge, as originally postulated by Socrates. Strauss has severely criticized the contemporary behavioural approach which insists on 'value-free analysis' and thus destroys the essence of true knowledge of politics.

b) Limitations

- 1) This approach shuts its eyes to political reality and seeks to build castles in air and hence is unrealistic. Instead of examining things as they are it seeks to examine things in their abstract nature and purpose, the result is that politics becomes incomprehensible to a man of average intelligence.
- 2) There is no place of morals in politics. Moreover a common man is interested more in the solution of his problems than in ideals.
- 3) The traditional approach is unscientific as the premises of this approach cannot be put to empirical investigation. In order to be scientific or dependable Political Science must table only facts into consideration because the facts of human behaviour shape

events and values. However the importance of values cannot be undermined.

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1 Examine the main characteristics of the Philosophical approach to the study of Political Science ?

- 2 What are the main objections levelled against the philosophical approach?

1.3.4 HISTORICAL APPROACH

The Historical approach is as old as Aristotle. It is an approach which puts stress on the study of origin and development of political institutions and ideas. This method was followed by Herodotus and Thucydides in the past. Machiavelli also relied on this method. In recent times Seely, Laski, Sabine, Dunning followed this methods. These writers emphasised that political and social institutions, ideas and process are products of growth and development and to understand them properly we must study them historically.

Historical approach believes that political phenomena could be understood better with the help of historical factors like age, place, situations etc. Political thinkers like Machiavelli, Sabine and Dunning believe that politics and history are intricately related and the study of politics always should have a historical perspective. Sabine is of the view that Political Science should include all those subjects which have been discussed in the writings of

different political thinkers from the time of Plato. Every past is linked with the present and thus the historical analysis provides a chronological order of every political phenomenon.

Characteristics:

1. The term 'historical approach' to politics may be used in two senses. Firstly, it may denote the process of arriving at the laws governing politics through an analysis of historical events that is events of the past, as exemplified by the theories propounded by Hegel and Marx. Karl Popper has described this approach as 'historicism'
2. In the second place, historical approach stands for an attempt at understanding politics through a historical account of political thought of the past, as exemplified by George H. Sabine's 'A History of Political Theory'.
- 3) Historical approach helps us to understand political life in a better way as history is a store house of knowledge which not only gives us information about what happened in the past but also about the utility and decay of various institutions at various times.
- 4) Historical study also helps us to be wiser for the future because we learn by past failures. It is only through this method that a student can draw safe conclusions.
- 5) This approach leads to dynamic results. To quote Watkins "By studying political thought as an integral part of a total historic context it sits ideologies in meaningful relations to all other political and social forces operating at a given time and place. By placing events in a moving train of historical development it provides the basis for an estimation of the possibilities of future change".
- 6) Political thinkers do not merely deal with their age but with all ages and for a full understanding of political phenomena it is imperative for us to understand the political activity of men in all ages.
- 7) Historical approach has been used by different scholars for different purposes. Machiavelli used it to glorify the achievements of Romans and setting them up as an example for his rulers. Burke and Oakeshott used historical approach to justify conservatism. Marx has used the historical approach for an altogether different purpose. Under his conception men are pictured as relatively helpless creatures

who can do little more than slow down or speed up a pre-destined course of development.

- 8) The historical approach is chronological and descriptive. Here a scholar treats history as a genetic process – as the study of how men got to be, what man once was and now is. This approach to the study of politics emphasises the role of individual motives, actions, accomplishments and failures and contingencies in historical continuity and Change.

Limitations of Historical Approach

1. We must be careful while applying this method and should avoid superficial resemblances. Lord Bryce says “so-called historical parallels are usually interesting and sometimes illuminating but they are often misleading.”
2. There can be the possibility of being carried away by our own emotional preferences. We might mix up facts with fiction by distorting history. We must beware of this danger of Historicism.
3. The primary aim of Political Science is to determine what ought to be so far as the constitution and government actions are concerned, this end cannot be discovered by a historical study of forms and functions. History does not deal with values it only deals with facts.
4. All information of past political life is not relevant today as present political activity has totally different features and problems.
5. According to S.P. Verma “By emphasising the historical aspect of Political Science too much, the historicists have divorced it from its scientific character”.
6. Historical method studies only the state. It excludes the study of society. Historical approach thus may neither be comprehensible nor impartial.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1 Explain the historical approach

2 What are the limitations of historical approach

1.3.5 INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH

Institutional approach is closely related to legal approach, yet it is different. Significantly, this approach does not solely bank on other disciplines-philosophy, history or law-for understanding politics. Amongst the traditional approaches it alone gives independent identity to the systematic study of politics.

The Institutional approach puts emphasis on the study of the structures of a political system or the political institutions. Roots of this approach can be traced back in time to Aristotle's description and classification of constitution of Greek city-states. In recent times, writers like Laski, Finer, Bentley Truman, Key, Strong, Bagehot, Ogg etc. belongs to this approach. In the past the advocates of this approach studied only formal structures of a political organisation like legislature, executive and judiciary, but modern writers like Buntley, Truman, Beer etc. include infrastructure of a political system like pressure groups in their study. Thus politics covers formal as well as informal political structures. It is also known as structural approach.

Characteristics:

- 1) The emphasis of institutional approach is on the study of state or of governmental or related institutions. The advocates of this approach are not unaware of people who inhabit institutions but they put emphasis on the rules and structures and not the people. To quote Wasby “Individuals, in effect, are treated, as undifferentiated, as constant units, and different effects which the rules might have on different individuals are not examined, on the ground that the institutions must be understood before its effect can be understood.”
- 2) In the works of modern theorists the study of politics covers formal as well as informal institutional structures of a political system. They also make a comparative study of the major governmental systems of certain advanced countries as well as Afro-Asian and Latin American countries.
- 3) The institutionalists emphasize the study of constitutions, basic documents, rules and regulations. Somit and Tanenhans describe it as “routine description and pedestrian analysis of formal political structures, and processes, based on the more readily accessible official sources and records”.
- 4) Modern writers include Party system as the ‘fourth estate’ in the structures of a political system and numerous interest groups which constitute the infrastructure of a political system in their study.
5. Classification of governments, starting from Aristotle (monarchy, tyranny, aristocracy, oligarchy, polity and democracy) to modern classification (democracy and dictatorship, parliamentary and presidential, unitary and federal, etc.), identification of levels of government (federal, state and local) as well as branches of government (executive, legislative, judicial), composition and powers of each of these and their interrelationships (largely in legal terms), etc. are the chief concerns of this approach.
6. It aims at giving an elaborate description of facts. Hence it exemplifies a shift from normative to empirical approach and from a historical to a contemporary concern within the sphere of traditional approaches. However, it relies heavily on description

rather than explanation. Hence it fails to qualify as a contemporary approach.

LIMITATIONS

1. The approach is criticised for being too narrow as it ignores the role of the individuals who constitute and run the structures, formal as well as informal.
2. No political institution can be studied in isolation. Different institutions have different rules which have varying effect on different individuals.
3. Behaviourlists criticise the approach for putting too much emphasis on the formal institutions. They reject the institution as the basic unit of analysis and concentrate their attention on the individual and group behaviour.
4. The institutionalist study is the study of state, government and other structures but they seem to have completely ignored international politics, international institutions and organisations.
5. The approach has no standard to decide which institutions are to be included or discarded in the study of this approach.
6. The approach has no techniques to study the political views, problems and issues and the various methods of resolving conflicts that may occur in politics. The structural functionalists have however made an improvement upon this approach as they have supplemented the study of political process with the study of political institutions. New terms have been coined to describe political reality in a scientific way as far as possible.
7. With its preoccupation with the institutions, it neglected the individual; hence during the ascendancy of this approach, the study of voting behaviour and political attitudes of the individual was left to sociologists
8. In the absence of overarching institutions governing international politics, it practically neglected the study of international politics; it confined its attention to international relations and description of the United Nations and its associated agencies and left

the study of international politics to historians and students of international law

9. Being concerned with the established institutions alone, it neglected the role of violence or threat of violence, political movements and agitations, war and revolutions, etc.; and finally
10. It neglected the role of informal groups and processes in shaping politics.

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1 Explain briefly the Institutional approach

- 2 What are the shortcomings of the Institutional approach?

1.3.6 LEGAL APPROACH

Legal approach stands for an attempt to understand politics in terms of law. It focuses its attention on the legal and constitutional framework in which different organs of government have to function, inquires into their respective legal position, their powers and the procedure which makes their actions legally valid. Legalistic and institutional interpretations of politics

are complementary and interrelated. The approach studies legal power, functions and positions of government institutions. Governments establish by law, exist in accordance with constitutional law and they formulate, enforce and apply laws. The primary function of the state is to maintain law and order. To quote Garner, the legal approach “treats the state primarily as an organisation for the creation and enforcement of law. Cicero, Grotius, Bodin, Hobbe, Bentham, Austin and Dicey regarded the state as a juridical person and politics was conceived by them as being a science of legal norms.

Characteristics:

1. The legal approach is also called as juridical approach. It links the study of politics with the study of legal or juridical processes. It seeks an explanation of political affairs in legal terms.
2. It treats organised society, not as social or political phenomena but as a purely juridical regime, “an ensemble of public law, rights and obligations, founded on a system of pure logic and reason.”
3. Matters relating to both domestic and international politics are generally related with law frequently prescribes the action to be taken, forbids action and fixes the limits of permissible action hence judicial matters pertaining both to law as well as to legal institution are very important part of study of Political Science.
4. Among the writers who adopted this approach, Bodin gave us the conception of sovereignty. Hobbes freed the concept of all limitations and exalted it to mystical heights. His sovereign is the highest law maker and disobedience is met with punishment or else there is the danger of relapsing into the state of nature. Austin gave us a conception of legal sovereign whose commands are laws and whose power is absolute.
5. The approach is based on the premise that knowledge of law provides an important basis of the people. To quote Jellinek “state and institutions connected with it cannot be understood without a consideration of those forces and factors which constitute the domain of law and justice.”

6. All political processes to become effective and stable must culminate in legal provisions whether it is an independence movement in a colonized country or an agitation for civil rights or certain concessions for any sections of society.
7. Besides, the study of constitutional law and international law, etc. in spite of its limited use in understanding politics, continues to play a pivotal role in the social and political life of almost every country

Limitations:

1. This approach is narrow, as law embraces only one aspect of man's life does not cover the entire behaviour of a political being.
2. The legal approach focusses attention on formal institutions of government to the detriment of informal arrangements of society and their role in formation of decisions and exercise of power.
3. Just as the philosophical approach treats the state as nothing else but a moral entity the jurists commit the mistake of reducing every aspect of political system to a juridical entity. To quote Garner "any view which conceives the state merely as a public corporation is as narrow and fruitless as the Hegelian doctrine which goes to the opposite extreme and considers it merely as moral entity."
4. The political institutions are the product of growth and development. In order to understand them properly we must study the forces which contributed in the process of their growth and development.
5. The individual is totally neglected in this approach.
6. The legal approach may prove inadequate in understanding the complex political forces, processes and behaviour which might operate outside legal-formal framework.

Check Your Progress IV

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Write an essay on the legal approach.

2. What are the limitations of the legal approach?

1.3.7 CHARACTERISTICS OF TRADITIONAL APPROACH

On the basis of above discussion, the following features of traditional approach could be deduced

1. **Accent on large questions:** the issues of larger concern such as how the authority should be organised, what should be the criteria for citizenship, what should be the functions of state etc. are the subject matter of traditional approach and appear with greater degree of regularity.
2. **Normative overtone:** normative orientation or statement of preferences (value questions) occurs frequently in traditional thinking. The traditional thinkers as such do not make a distinction between political and ethical questions. Therefore thinkers like Plato have raised questions like what should be the size of state, what should be

an ideal state etc.

3. **Philosophical orientation:** an important feature of traditional political thought has been its philosophical orientation. In the words of Wasby, “the philosophical approach takes in all aspects of man’s political activities and has as its goal a statement of underlying principles concerning those activities”. Actual political activities have often been judged against ideals postulated as state of nature?, natural law, ideal polity and so on. Plato’s Republic and Hobbes Leviathan will always be remembered as treatise which searched for deeper general principles underlying the actual political activities.
4. **Legal institutional bias:** formal aspects of government such as constitution, the organs of government, the laws of election and so on have been the concern of traditional political thought. The institutional approach has legal orientation as emphasis is placed on laws, rules and regulations that determine the structure and processes of governmental institutions.
5. Thus traditional approach with all its intrinsic feature has made tremendous contribution to the understanding of political problems. Even now political researchers adhere to traditional approach for understanding issues of government and politics which shows significance of traditional approach.
- 6.

1.3.8 LET US SUM UP

As we explained in this lesson, traditionally politics were studied mainly with four approaches: Philosophical/Normative, Historical, Institutional and Legal. As their names indicate, Philosophical approach studies politics with an emphasis on morals and ethics, the Historical approach studies the past developments to understand the present, the Institutional approach concentrates on institutions to study the political phenomena and finally the Legal approach studies politics in terms of laws and their implementation. All of these approaches have their own merits and drawbacks. The Behaviouralists are more critical about the approaches used traditionally to study politics. Their major criticism is that the traditional approach, which looks into

politics narrowly, ignores the developments outside the political arena.

1.3.9 EXERCISES

1. Distinguish between 'method' and 'approach' in political science. Why is this distinction important in the study of political phenomena?
2. Discuss the key features, significance, and criticisms of the Philosophical (Normative) Approach in political science.
3. Examine the historical approach to the study of politics. How does it help in understanding modern political systems? What are its limitations?
4. Explain the Institutional Approach to the study of politics. How has it evolved over time, and what are its strengths and weaknesses?
5. Why can't the traditional and contemporary approaches be strictly divided into normative and empirical categories? Illustrate your answer with examples.

1.3.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Johri J. C. , *Contemporary Political theory*, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1995.
2. Appadorai, A. *The Substance of Politics*, Oxford University Press, 1985.
3. Asirvathan, Eddy *Political Theory*, New Delhi: S Chandra Company, 1993.
4. Agarwal, R.C. *Political Theory*, New Delhi: S Chandra Company, 1999.
5. Srinivas L. N. and Mukhi, H. R. *Political Science Theory*, Delhi: S B D Publishers, 2000
6. Gauba, O P, *An introduction to Political Theory*, New Delhi: Macmillan Ltd., 1995.

B. A. POLITICAL THEORY AND POLITICAL SCIENCE UNIT – I

1.4 MODERN APPROACHES (BEHAVIOURAL AND SYSTEM)

Kulwant Kour

STRUCTURE

1.4.0 OBJECTIVES

1.4.1 INTRODUCTION

1.4.2 MODERN APPROACH

1.4.3 Behavioural Approach

1.4.4 Rise & Growth of Behaviouralism Movement

1.4.5 Meaning and Nature of Political Behaviouralism

1.4.6 Behaviouralism : Salient Characteristics

1.4.7 Limitations and Critical Appreciation

1.4.8 SYSTEM APPROACH

1.4.9 Origin and Growth

1.4.10 Meaning , Concepts and types

1.4.11 Systems analysis of David Easton (Input and Output Model)

1.4.12 Critical Appraisal

1.4.13 LET US SUM UP

1.4.14 EXERCISES

1.4.15 SUGGESTED READINGS

1.4.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, students should be able to :

- Understand the concept of behaviouralism.
- Know Growth of behavioural movement in politics and its nature;
- Grasp salient characteristics of political behaviouralism; and
- Understand Limitation and critical appreciation of this movement.
- Concept of System, meaning, definition and types of systems;
- Origin and Growth of General Systems theory in Political Science;
- System analysis of David Easton – Input-Output analysis and critical appraisal.

1.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Between two World Wars and after World War II till mid-fifties, it had been realised by the new generation of Political Scientists that to understand politics in the most comprehensive manner, study of roles and behaviour of the groups, institutions and political actors is most essential. There was a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the achievements of traditional Political Science through the historical, legal, philosophical and institutional approaches. Consequently more systematic, new and scientific methods have been emphasized for the study of political events.

1.4.2 MODERN APPROACHES

Normative methods generally refer to the traditional methods of inquiry to the phenomena of politics and are not merely concerned with, ‘what is’ but ‘what ought to be’ issues in politics. Its focus is on the analysis of institution as the basic unit of study. However with the advent of industrialisation and behavioural revolution in the field of political science, emphasis shifted from the study ‘what ought to’ ‘to what is’. Today political scientists are

more interested in analysing how people behave in matters related to the state and government. A new movement was ushered in by a group of political scientists in America who were not satisfied with the traditional approach to the analysis of government and state as they felt that tremendous exploration had occurred in other social sciences like sociology, psychology, anthropology etc. which when applied to the political issues could render new insights. They now collect data relating to actual political happenings. Statistical information coupled with the actual behaviours of men, individually and collectively, may help the political scientists in arriving at definite conclusions and predicting things correctly in political matters. The quantitative or statistical method, the systems approach or simulation approach in political science base their inquiry on scientific data and as such are known as modern or empirical method.

1.4.3 BEHAVIOURAL APPROACH

Until the middle of the 20th century, political science was primarily concerned with qualitative questions which had a philosophical, legalistic and descriptive orientation. The discipline was in fact transformed by the behavioural revolution in the 1950's which laid stress on scientific and empirical approach to the understanding of political phenomena. The revolution got an impetus with the establishment of the journal *Experimental Study of Politics* in 1970's. The central focus of behavioralism is its emphasis on the study of political behaviour which refers to acts, attitudes, preferences and expectations of man in political context. In the words of Barrow, 'behavioralism's main methodological claim was that uniformities in political behaviour could be discovered and expressed as generalizations but such generalizations must be testable by reference to observable political behaviours such as voting, public opinion or decision making'.

1.4.4 RISE AND GROWTH OF BEHAVIOURAL MOVEMENT

Behaviouralism in politics is mainly a contribution of the American Political Scientists. However, the inspiration came from several European thinkers, Psychologists and Social theorists. The credit of being the intellectual father of the movement goes to Charles E. Merriam of the Chicago University. His contribution was enriched by his students and colleagues like V. O. Key, David Truman, Herbert Simon and Gabriel A. Almond. A good number of European scholars shifted to the United States in the 1920s and 1930s who brought with them the messages of Psychologists like S. Freud and Sociologists like Max

Weber. The result was that Political Science moved closer to Psychology and Sociology.

The trend of political behaviouralism became the order of the day in the period after the Second World War. Focussed upon the behaviour of individual in political situations, this approach called for the examination of political relationships of man – as citizens, voters, administrators, legislators etc. The causes, which are responsible, and factors that influenced the rise and growth of behaviouralism are :

- a) The growth and popularity of communism, particularly after Second World War, had given a challenge to the American Political Scientists, who tried to beat Marxism with the stick of behaviouralism.
- b) The need to provide a scientific explanation for the failure of preventing wars by democratic and liberal states.
- c) The zeal for science and scientific methods of research.
- d) Availability of huge financial assistance and grants.

1.4.5 MEANING AND NATURE OF POLITICAL BEHAVIOURALISM

The term ‘political behaviour’ represents an approach and a challenge, an orientation and a reform movement. Behaviouralists urge the adoption of the scientific method in the study of social and political phenomena. Contrary to the traditional political theory, behaviouralism focus pursuit of facts, actualities, inter-relationships, observation, statistical data, measurement and new concepts etc.

An eminent American Political Scientist Robert Dahl defines Political Behaviouralism as a “protest movement within political science” associated with a number of political scientists, mainly American who shared a strong sense of dissatisfaction with the achievements of conventional Political Science particularly through historical, philosophical and descriptive- institutional approaches. Behaviouralists shared a belief that additional methods and approaches either exists or could be developed that would help to provide Political Science with empirical propositions and universal theories. In other

words, the Behavioural approach is an attempt to improve understanding of politics by means of new methods, concepts and theories, or what can be called ‘scientific outlook’.

With a view to explain the essential nature of political Behaviouralism, Dahl stated that it aims at studying all the phenomena of government in terms of observed and observable behaviour of men and groups. The ultimate goal of student of political behaviour is the development of a science of the political process. David Truman, an advocate of this approach denied that the political behaviour orientation implied a rejection of historical knowledge. In fact, he contended that it is an essential supplement to contemporary observation of political behaviour.

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What is Political Behaviouralism? Define and discuss political Behaviouralism.

- 2 Explain the Rise & Growth of Behavioural movement ?

1.4.6 BEHAVIOURALISM: SILENT CHARACTERISTICS

A correct description of political Behaviouralism is contained not in the formulation of a precise definition but in the enumeration of certain characteristics that may be designated its “intellectual foundations”, according to David Easton. According to him, the movement

of political behaviouralism has the following characteristics:

a) REGULARITIES: There are certain uniformities in the political behaviour of human beings that can be expressed the generalisations or theories. These theories can explain and predict political and social phenomena. As such, political scientists should engage themselves in an unrelenting search for regularities of political behaviour and for variables associated with them.

b) VERIFICATION: Knowledge must be based on facts or evidences, which can be verified by the concrete realities of the situation. As such generalisation must be testable with reference to human behaviour.

c) TECHNIQUES: What really distinguishes the behaviouralists from 'traditionalists' is the emphasis on the adoption of correct techniques for acquiring and interpreting data, the use of research methods, which generate valid data. In other words, the techniques should be refined, used for observation, recording, analyzing and testing data.

d) QUANTIFICATION: As in other social sciences, so in the field of Political Science, data for research should be quantified so that the conclusions or impressions of the researcher may be verified on the basis of quantified evidence. It is, however, necessary that data should be revalidated from time to time.

e) VALUES: Scientific enquiry in order to be valid must be free from ethical or moral aspects. Therefore, the behaviouralists want to separate facts from values. The two should be distinct in an analytical investigation. Scientific enquiry in order to be valid must be free from ethical or moral aspects. Normative dimensions of the concepts like those of liberty, equality, rights and justice can not be testified in a scientific manner. So approach should be value-free.

f) SYSTEMATISATION: Study and research in the field of political science should be systematic-theory-oriented or theory-directed. Theory should be of a casual nature that does not consist of speculation and introspection but of analysis, explanation and prediction. It is on the basis of well-organised, logically inter-related structure of concepts and propositions.

g) PURE SCIENCE: The Behaviouralists contend that both theory and its application are parts of a scientific enterprise. The understanding and explanation of political behaviour

logically precedes and it alone provides the basis for efforts to utilize that knowledge in the solution of urgent practical problems of society. Research should be of a pure type, that is, it should be perfectly verifiable by evidence.

h) INTEGRATION: Behaviouralists subscribe to the inter-disciplinary approach. They do not treat Political Science as a separate or distinct discipline. To them Political Science is one of the social sciences, hence it should be integrated with other social sciences like Economics, Psychology and Sociology. Man is a social being. As such if an effort is made to detach the political man from the economic, social or cultural man, it would not be possible to understand his political behaviour in a correct perspective. Hence, the emphasis is on inter-disciplinary approach.

Easton had contended that his list probably includes “*all the major tenets of a behavioural credo and represents the major differences between the behavioural and traditional modes of research.*”

A leading American writer E. Kirkpatrick underlines four characteristics of the ‘behavioural movement’ as :-

- (a) a rejection of political institutions as the basic conceptual unit and a substitution of individual and group behaviour;
- (b) an emphasis on the unity of the social sciences, hence an increased willingness to cross –disciplinary lines;
- (c) a greater attention to precision, measurement and quantitative techniques; and
- (d) the development of systematic empirical theory.

The most important characteristics of behaviouralism in Political Science can be summarized as :-

- a) The political behaviour approach specifies the behaviour of persons and social groups rather than events, structures, institutions or ideologies as the unit.
- b) This approach cultivates a belief in the unity of the Social Sciences. It is in view of the fact that all Social Sciences have a common subject matter – human behaviour.

Of course, Political Scientist is concerned with a particular or specific role of the individual or their groups. Any act which involves the use of power is a political act and as such is a part of the province of Political Science.

- c) In order to construct a systematic theory of politics, behaviouralists ignore ‘values’ and rely only on ‘facts’.
- d) Behaviouralists stress upon the inter-disciplinary approach and precise methods of analysis.

In fact, what really distinguishes the behavioural approach from other approaches is the advocacy of the development of more precise techniques of observing, classifying and measuring data and the employment of the most sophisticated available means of mathematical analysis.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Discuss the main characteristics of Political Behaviouralism.

2. Trace the growth of Behavioural movement in Political Science. Also explain its nature.

1.4.7 LIMITATIONS AND CRITICAL APPRECIATION

a) Limitations and Shortcomings

The traditionalists and the classical political theorists had been very critical of the behaviouralists. The main objections raised by them are as follows :-

- a) Political phenomenon by its very nature cannot be subjected to any rigorous study. We cannot conduct experiments on these. Hence generalisations and construction of theories may not be possible in Political Science.
- b) Human behaviour, whether individual or social, cannot be studied with the objectivity which is necessary in the acquisition of scientific knowledge.
- c) The behaviouralists attempt to make the study of Political Science as value free or value-neutral is not possible. Subjectivity or some values are bound to influence the study of political behaviour or phenomena. Though behaviouralists had thoroughly opposed value-laden studies and theories, yet Easton himself, later on, emphasized the significance of values. Behavioural political theory is, therefore, inadequate as it ignores values and value-judgements.
- d) It is based on a false conception of Scientific method. Even after collecting facts and doing their measurement and quantification, the writer cannot free himself from the limitations of subjectivity while making observation or proving explanations to these facts. Thus certainty and definiteness of a natural science cannot be infused in the discipline of a social science.
- e) Another criticism levelled the behavioural approach is that it circumscribes the scope of Political Science by advising us to study only those aspects of political life which can be measured and quantified. In this ways, the significance of speculative political theory is sacrificed at the altar of a dry and barren craze of 'mad scienticism'.

- f) Behaviouralists ignore the study of philosophy, law and history. However, no generalisations can be made without the knowledge of past and right and wrong.
- g) Finally, it make Political Science a handmaid of Sociology by laying down that all political activity and institutions reflect the nature of society and are determined and patterned to a large extent by divisions within society.

By way of clarification, it should be remarked that the behaviouralists realised the shortcomings of their own obsessions and a great behaviouralist like David Easton himself pointed out that a “mad craze for scienticism” should be abandoned. Reaffirmation of norms and values demonstrated that rigid behaviouralists had conceded to the existence of fact-value dichotomy. In other words, behaviouralists themselves realised that fact-value distinction had encouraged ‘an undesirable foreshortening of vision and a moral insensitivity’ and that some sort of reconciliation of facts and values is necessary. This usurped in an era of post-behaviouralism.

b) Critical Appreciation

It is true that as a result of behavioural approach, the scope of political science has widened and the nature of the discipline improved in understanding and explaining political reality. Notwithstanding the attacks and criticism levelled against the behaviouralists, it may be conceded that this movement in Political Science has emphasised the need and importance of systematic study, new methods and techniques. A new scientific outlook based on the study of facts and evidences has been emphasised. The study of behaviour of actors, individuals and groups of individuals rather than merely of institutions has certainly enriched this subject.

On the other hand, a student of political behaviouralism is at a loss to know what the advocates of this theory means by the word ‘political’ that precedes the word ‘behaviour’. If we examine the views of eminent political behaviouralists in this direction, we find that all of them have defined the term ‘politics’ in their own way. It is at least doubtful whether it is possible to define the term ‘political’ without reference to the purposes or goals of groups engaged in the struggle for power. Moreover, the behavioural political theory may also be accused of being reactionary or an intellectual exercise in the direction of justifying and

preserving the status-quo. Instead of working in the direction of analysing the forces of social change or offering the principles of a social revolution, the aim of behaviouralists was to collect data and analyse it in order to defend and protect democracy in the world. So it is alleged that the behaviouralists have been biased in favour of a particular form of political system. In short the contributions of the behaviouralists may be treated as ‘methodologies’ and not the ‘theories.’

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Briefly discuss the shortcomings/limitations of political Behaviouralism.

2. Make a critical appreciation/evaluation of Behavioural movement in political science.

1.4.8 SYSTEMAPPROACH

System analysis in Social Sciences finds a very significant place and it draws its main inspiration from Natural Sciences. It flows through the discipline of Sociology in as much as it argues that all social phenomena “are part of discernible, regular and internally consistent

patterns of behaviour”. The advocates of the General Systems theories believed that there were a number of common things in various disciplines and if there could be given an abstract form, a general theory could emerge which might help each discipline to understand its problems better. This line of thinking grew into a definite movement by the mid fifties.

1.4.9 ORIGIN AND GROWTH

The General Systems Theory is traced to Natural Sciences, particularly to Biology. The theory in Social Sciences is said to have been developed first in Anthropology, from where it was adopted in Sociology a little later in Psychology and still later in Political Science. The origins of the Systems approach in political analysis can be more correctly traced directly from social Anthropology implicit in the works of Emile Durkheim and A. R. Radcliffe Brown. The influence of social Anthropology percolated to Political Science through two Sociologists – Robert K. Merton and Talcott Parsons. By the middle of the sixties, it had become the dominant mode of enquiry or explanation in Political Science. Some very influential Political Scientists had started regarding it as the best possible approach to the development of theory in the field. Among the important Political Scientists who played the leading role in developing the theory in the field of Political Science are David Easton and Gabriel Almond in the field of national politics and Morton Kaplan in the field of International Politics. The Systems Theory thus, came to Social Sciences from Biology through Anthropology and Sociology. Robert K. Merton and Talcott Parsons are the two Sociologists, who have exercised the greatest influence on the use of System Theory for political analysis.

1.4.10 MEANING, CONCEPTS AND TYPES

a) System : Concept and Meaning

The central and guiding notion is the concept of Systems which has become the basic conceptual asset of the general systems theory. The word ‘system’ has been used and defined differently by different writers from different disciplines. Ludwig Von Bertalanffy describes system as “a set of elements standing in interaction.” Collin Cherry says that a system “is a whole which is compounded of many parts – an ensemble of attitudes.” According to Morton A. Kaplan, “a brief and non-technical description of the object of systems analysis would include: the study of a set of interrelated variables, as distinguished

from the environment of the set, and of the ways in which this set is maintained under the impact of environmental disturbances”.

According to David Apter, the characteristics of systems may be put as follows:

1. Systems have boundaries within which there are functional inter-relationships mainly based on some of the communications;
2. Systems are divided into sub-systems which have links and exchanges, for example between a city, a tehsil, a district, a state and a world; and
3. Systems have a capacity for coding, that is they take informational inputs and translate inputs into some kind of output.

An examination of various definitions shows that while each one of them “embodies the idea of a group of objects or elements standing in some characteristic structural relationship to one another and interacting on the basis of certain characteristic processes.” While dealing with a proper definition of the term, the following points should be kept in mind:

1. A system is not to be taken as a mere random aggregation of elements; it is composed of elements all at a level of inter-dependence.
2. Whereas systems may differ in terms of size, time, scale and specific substances, they may yet resemble one-another closely in regard to certain basic structures and processes.
3. General system theory constitutes a record of efforts to elaborate basic principles relevant to a wide range of systems and to develop techniques for applying these principles to the specific and concrete systems of interest to various fields of research. A study of systems analysis thus forms a significant part of an inter-disciplinary approach.
4. The use of systems theory in social sciences should be made with certain precautions. As social objects lack the fixed and definite character of the natural objects, social sciences must likewise avoid extreme particularisation in social and political formulations. The researcher of a social science should, for this reason, adopt the middle course-the golden mean. He should bank upon the models of a natural science; he should also be aware of the limitations of a social science.

5. This approach is against far too rigid compartmentalisation of disciplines and is in favour of a comparative method.

b) Type of Systems

There are several types of systems. There can be Open and Closed systems. Open systems are characterised with qualities like transparency, democracy, liberty, responsibility, stability, equilibrium and balance and effectiveness etc. Closed systems are comparatively unstable and authoritative. Disruption and break down of political systems are quite frequent in closed systems.

Systems can also be classified between organic and non-organic systems. These can also be classified in a hierarchical manner organic system is a living system; for example human body is a living system. On the other hand, we have non-organic systems like social and political organisations. State, for example, is a non-organic system. Systems can be divided into a hierarchical order like we can have Global or international system at the top and village or city at the lowest level of organisation. So a system can have many subsystems, which can be systems also in themselves.

1.4.11 SYSTEMS ANALYSIS OF DAVID EASTON: INPUT-OUTPUT MODEL

David Easton is the first major Political Scientist who has developed a systematic framework on the basis of the systems analysis approach for the study of politics. His monumental work *A System Analysis of Political Life* was published in 1965. Following the course of Natural Scientists, he set out to develop a theory that would help to explain behavioural reality. He has provided an original set of concepts for arranging at the level of theory and interpreting political phenomena in a new and helpful way. Easton has selected the political system as the basic unit of analysis and concentrated on the intra-system behaviour of various systems as principal areas of research. He believes that beyond the political system, there are other systems or environments— physical, biological, social, psychological etc. what then distinguishes the political system from the physical, biological, social and other systems? Easton's answer is that a political system is "that system of interactions in any society through which binding or authoritative allocations are made and implemented."

As such, it is the making of binding or authoritative allocation which distinguishes the political system from other systems both within and outside the overall society that form the environment of the political system. The political system must have the capacity to respond to disturbances and thereby to adopt itself to the conditions under which it has to function. Easton emphasised on the adoptive character of the political system, which would be different from its just reacting passively to the environmental influences. The system's capacity to survive depends on its adaptability and demands for adaptability may be the result either of indigenous or exogenous change. Easton is basically concerned with the issue of survival or persistence of the political system. The purpose of an empirical political scientist, according to him, is to conditions under which political systems are maintained over a period of time. The main features of the system analysis by David Easton are given below :-

1. A political system is a set of interactions abstracted from the totality of social behaviour, through which values are allocated for a society. Easton has coined a new definition of the terms like 'politics' and 'political system' by stressing the element of "authoritative allocation of values". The word 'authoritative' signifies the decision of those who are in power as only they can make something binding that gives to their decisions the character of being authoritative. The term 'value' has been used by Easton not as an ethicist, but as an empirical political scientist.
2. There are certain properties common to both natural and social systems. Like natural systems, social system possesses properties that enable them to cope with the worst types of disturbances to which they may be subjected. Like a living system, the political system has 'responding' and 'self-regulating' mechanism by which it can change, correct and re-adjust its processes and structures.
3. If so, political system is not a static but a dynamic affair. This is due to the 'feedback' mechanism – a mechanism capable of transmitting information of a positive or negative character to the system. It is on account of the feedback mechanism that the system persists.
4. A political system is an open system and is influenced by environmental factors. It means that outside and beyond the political system, there are other systems or environments physical, biological, social, economic, and psychological etc. that may be distinguished from each other.


5. The environment of a political system may be intra-societal as well as extra-societal. That is, the conditions affecting the process of the authoritative allocation of values may be having their place within the political system itself or outside of it.
6. A political system always remains subject to challenges from forces operating in the environment, which it is required to cope with. Easton calls such forces as stresses that constitute the response mechanism of the political system. The stresses are of two kinds – demand stress and support stress. Demand stress may result either from the failure of the system to successfully cope with the information feedback from its original output or from the incapability of the system to deal with the particular range of demands made upon it. It may be termed as ‘demand-input’ overload. There may be factor of support stress which means that the system may suffer a loss or at least an erosion of the support given to it by the members of the system itself.
7. Political system may be in a steady state if there is proper balance between inputs and outputs. Inputs are the demands made upon the political system and the support of the system itself; supports are those processes or structures which give it the capacity to cope with the demands made upon it. Outputs are the results of the processing of demands.
8. A political system lives in a critical range. It is possible that the inputs and outputs are properly balanced; it is also possible that the inputs have an overload and the outputs are not there in sufficient measure to save the political system from disintegration or breakdown.
9. The survival of a political system requires certain structural bases that may be in the form of institutional arrangements like electoral machinery and political parties and non-institutional arrangements in the form of political beliefs and attitudes of the people. Both types of structural bases may be termed objects of support of the system.
10. The objects of the support of the political system are three – political community, regime and authorities. The political community means a group of people living together with willingness to cooperate in solving the problems of


their political system. The community continues to exist even though the regime and authorities may change from time to time. The regime or the 'constitutional order' implies written and unwritten rules of the constitution that determine the structure of the political organisation and also the values and norms on which the entire organisation of government is based. Finally, the authorities mean people who are entrusted with the work of allocating values authoritatively. In simple words, they are the rules who convert the inputs into outputs by taking decisions in response to the impact of environmental conditions.

11. The political system, apart from being a system in itself, consists of subsystems such as mediating groups that are involved in the decision-making process. There are several organisations and groups that play their part in the political process without having the character of a political organisation.

Whole system analysis of Easton can be explained through the help of his model-

MODELS OF EASTON'S POLITICAL SYSTEM





BLACK BOX MODEL

Here 'inputs' means all demands and supports through which a wide range of activities in the environment can be channelled and brought to bear upon political life. They are the key indicators of the way in which environmental influences and conditions modify and shape the operations of the political system. 'Outputs' are decisions of the authorities. Thus, the decisions taken by the legislative, executive and judicial departments may be termed as 'political outputs'. Moreover, these are 'authoritative' as they are taken by the men in power. In between, the 'inputs' and 'outputs', there is a 'feedback', the identification of which helps us to explain the processes through which the system may cope with stress. Through it the system may take advantage of what has been happening by trying to adjust its future behaviour. The 'feedback loops' consist of the production of outputs by the authorities, a response by the members of the society to these outputs, the communication

of information about the response to authorities and finally, possibly succeeding actions by the authorities giving rise to a new round of the same activities. The ‘feedback’ is thus crucial in determining the capacity of the system to cope with stress.

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Explain David Easton’s Input- Output Model.

2. Define the concept ‘System’ and discuss its major characteristics.

1.4.12 CRITICAL APPRAISAL

Several points of criticism against system analysis of David Easton have been made in spite of the fact that his analysis appears like a very neat conceptual framework. Some of these points are :-

1. Easton’s definition of terms like politics’ and political system based on a set of interactions are so broad that one fails to apply the line of distinction between an

abstract and a concrete political system. Sometimes, it appears that Easton is concerned with a concrete political system alone; sometimes it also appears that his concern is with a system in an abstract form as well. A close study of Easton's analysis "makes it very clear that his continuous efforts to move from the abstract to the concrete only land him into a great deal of confusion.

2. His promise of a conceptual framework with 'high empirical relevance' has not been fulfilled.
3. He has looked at the individual from outside, from the point of view of the role he might be playing in the preservation and persistence, or disruption and destruction of the analytic political system, he has in mind.
4. Because of his obsession with facts and behaviour, his critics alleged that he has given a politics without substance. His critics go to the length of saying that a theory 'so respectful of facts' should be so lacking in substance' and thus presenting us like an 'empty vision of politics'.
5. System analysis in politics, like general systems theory, is much too broad a framework for political analysis to take note of the complex psychological aspects of the interaction. It may not be able to answer questions concerning such matters as perception, expectation, formation or cognition etc. or the scope and weight of power as it was being used.

Moreover, the fact cannot be denied that the entire approach is rooted in conservatism and reaction, which colours most of the studies in Political Science carried out with the help of methodological tools evolved under the general frame-work of the systems theory.

Despite these points of criticisms, however, it cannot be denied that the system analysis as given by Easton, besides being useful for operational research, it can be used for normative or deductive purposes. It can help in laying down what remedial steps taken in time may save a system from collapse. Still another use of the system analysis is that it helps us in understanding one kind of system with the help of the knowledge and insight we might have developed from our study of another kind of system. Our understanding of a system is sharpened not only by our understanding of other systems but also by applying our understanding of one system level to another or of a sub-system to the system or vice-

versa. It also gives us an excellent opportunity for fusing micro-analytical studies with macro-analytical ones.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Make a critical appraisal of Easton's System approach.

2. Briefly discuss the drawbacks and limitations of Easton's System approach.

1.4.13 LET US SUM UP

The framework of systems approach has been found very useful for the comparative analysis of diverse political units, such as modernized as well as developing polities. It has also been extensively used for an analysis of the international political system. The model of political system has also served as a basis for Gabriel Almond's model of structural-functional analysis as also for Karl Deutsch's model of communications theory.

1.4.14 EXERCISES

1. Why did political scientists shift from traditional approaches to modern and behavioural approaches in the study of politics after World War II?
2. What are the key features and goals of the behavioural approach in political science, and how does it differ from traditional methods?
3. What are the key intellectual foundations of political behaviouralism as identified by David Easton, and how do they distinguish behaviouralism from traditional political science approaches?
4. Critically evaluate the major criticisms leveled against the behavioural approach in political science. To what extent did post-behaviouralism address these limitations?
5. Explain David Easton's systems theory of political analysis. How does his input-output model help in understanding the functioning and survival of political systems?

1.4.15 SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Varma S. P. , *Modern Political Theory* Delhi : Vikas, 1975.
2. Wood David M. , *Comparative Government and Politics*, in Stephen L. Warby, ed., *Political Science: The Discipline and Its Dimensions* Calcutta, Scientific Book Agency, 1970.
3. Johari J. C. *Contemporary Political Theory* Delhi, Sterling, 1987.
4. Easton, David *The Political System: An Enquiry into the State of Political Science* New York, Alfred Knopf, 1933.
5. Blondel Jean , *An Introduction to Comparative Government* London, 1969.
6. Cahosh, P. K. *Studies in Contemporary Political Theory* Calcutta, Mineave, 1970.
7. Apter, David *Introduction to Political Analysis* New Delhi, Prentice, 1978.

8. International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. 15.
9. Meehan Eugeve *The Theory and Method of Political Analysis* Homewood, Hlinois: The Dorsey Press, 1965.
10. Brecht,Arnold *Political Theory* Bombay, The Times of India Press, 1965
11. Easton David , *A System Analysis of Political Life* New York, John Wiley, 1965.
12. Easton,David “*The Current Meaning of Behaviouralism,*” in James C. Charlesworth, ed., *Contemporary Political Analysis* New York, Free Press, 1967.
- 13 Varma,V. P. “*The Behavioural Research and Political Philosophy: Some Aspects*”, in *The Indian Journal of Political Studies* :Jodhpur, Vol. 1, No. 1, 1976.

**2.1 MEANING AND ELEMENTS OF STATE:
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN STATE, SOCIETY AND
NATION**

Bhawana Khajuria

STRUCTURE

2.1.0 OBJECTIVES

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

2.1.2 STATE

2.1.3 Meaning and definitions of state of State

2.1.4 Elements of the State

2.1.5 THE STATE AND OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

2.1.6 State and Society

2.1.7 State and Nation

2.1.8 LET US SUM UP

2.1.9 EXERCISES

2.1.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

2.1.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, you should be able to:

- Understand the significance and meaning of the concept of state

- The meaning and definitions of the State
- The major elements of the state
- Differentiate between the state and other Associations particularly the distinction between State and Society, and State and Nation.

2.1.1 INTRODUCTION

The concept of state occupies a central place in Political Science. No discussion on political theory is complete without reference to the word 'state'. The state, indeed, touches every aspect of human life, and this is why it has, very rightly, captured the attention of all political philosophers since the days of Plato. To understand the state as an administrative machinery ordering public life is to know its one aspect. Important though this aspect is, it is not the only aspect which explains as to what it is. The state is where it operates on. Its real meaning together with its other related implications emerges more clearly when it is understood in relation to the domain of its area of operation, which is what society is.

2.1.2 STATE

James W. Garner in his *Introduction to Political Science* (1910) starts with the proposition that “Political Science begins and ends with the state”. The idea that the state alone can provide the basis for a truly political behaviour can be traced back to the ancient Greeks. For Plato and Aristotle, the “Polis” or city-state was the ultimate expression of the intrinsic capacity of humans for social action. Only the city-state was large enough as well as small enough to provide suitable conditions for social communication and hence for a truly lawful and human form of social life. Other social units like family were too small and those like the vast Eastern empires were too large to fulfil this condition. That is why Political Science to the Greeks began and ended with the *Polis*.

Modern political thought is also clearly influenced by this tradition, even though the modern state is quite different from the Greek *Polis*. The modern state is characterised by greater territorial extent, thus restricting the scope for intimate social life rather than a close-knit

community of citizens, it often appears as an external agency of control over a more or less random and heterogeneous collection of people and groups. However, like the ancient *Polis*, the modern state is a form distinguishable from others by its unique capacity for achieving integrative action. The idea that Political Science begins and ends with the state is a manifestation of the belief that only this type of action is essentially political.

Contemporary Political Science, however, no longer regards state and sovereignty as central

to the discipline. The tendency is to regard politics not merely as a function restricted to any particular social organisation – the state – but as a type of particular functional aspect of social life in general. Accordingly, power relationships within professional associations and trade unions are no less “political” than those existing within a generous and no less deserving of attention.

The state has acquired its present form through a long historical process extending over centuries. It all started with the institution of family which represented humankind emergence from savagery and the creation of social, emotional and moral bonds amongst humans. The family in turn gave rise to larger social organisation, blood-relationship. Subsequently, there emerged some consistent patterns of behaviour and relationships of domination and subordination. Social life came to be regulated by custom and authority. This eventuality led to the evolution of the state.

The historical evolution of the state is usually classified into six staged viz. the tribal state, the oriental empire, the Greek city-state, the Roman empire, the feudal state and the modern nation-state.

2.1.3 MEANING AND DEFINITIONS OF THE STATE

The word State as a generic term for a body politic was, for the first time, fixed by the Italian philosopher Niccolò Machiavelli in his book *The Prince* in early 16th century. At that time the term ‘state’ seems to have been in usage. Its origin can be traced to the Latin word ‘status’ – the particular form of ‘stare’ i.e. ‘to stand’. Its earliest use in English in this context appears in Thomas Starkley’s *England* (1538). The meaning became common in France and England during the 16th century. The employment of the term (state) has been

carried beyond its state of origin to cover terms such as ‘*Polis*’ or ‘*republica*’ and forward to the modern state.

The term ‘state’ has been variously interpreted and defined by various scholars. According to MacIver, the conflicting definitions of state are largely due to the fact that

“some writers define the state as essentially a class structure ... while others regard it as one organization that transcends class and stands for the whole community. Some interpret it as a power-system, others as welfare-system, some view it entirely as a legal construction – as a community organised for action under legal rules. Some identify it with the nation, others regard nationality as incidentally or unnecessary or even as a falsifying element which perverts the nature and function of the state. Some regard it as no more than a mutual insurance society, others as the very texture of the life. To some extent it is unnecessary, which to others it is the world the spirit has made for itself. For some the state as one in the order of ‘corporations’, and others think of it as indistinguishable from society itself.

One of the earliest definitions of state was given by Aristotle who described it as “a union of families and villages having for its end a perfect and self sufficiency life by which we mean a happy and honourable life.” This definition emphasised on the end of the state and was advanced in the context of the Greek *Polis* and one must keep in mind the fact that for the Greeks there existed no distinction between the state and the society.

Machiavelli defines the state as “the power which has authority over men.” This definition, unlike those put forward before it, was mainly concerned with the nature of the state, rather than its end. Max Weber defined it as a human community that claims the “monopoly of the legitimate use of physical force.” Similarly R M MacIver and C H Page have pointed out that “the state is distinguished from all other associations by its exclusive investment with the final power of coercion.” Both these definitions rather than emphasising the ends of the state, describe the State in terms of specific means peculiar to it.

One of the most comprehensive definitions of State, however, had been put forwarded by Garner. According to him, “the state is a community of persons more or less numerous, permanently occupying a portion of territory, independent of internal control and possessing an organised government to which the great body of inhabitants render habitual obedience.”

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. “Political Science begins and ends with the state.” Comment.

2. Trace the origin of the term State.

3. Define the term ‘State’ and bring out its meaning.

-
4. Bring out the distinctions in terms of emphasis laid on ends and means of the state in the definitions advanced by Aristotle, Machiavelli and MacIver.

-
-
-
5. Discuss Garner's definitions of state.
-
-
-

2.1.4 ELEMENTS OF THE STATE

In the light of the above mentioned definitions, we can identify the following elements of the state as:

- I) Population
- II) Territory
- III) Government
- IV) Sovereignty

I POPULATION

The state is a human institution. Thus it is impossible to envisage a state without people.

However, a population can constitute a state only when it is united by the condition of interdependence, consciousness of common interest and general regard for a set common rule of behaviour and institutions.

The ideal size of the population for a state, however, cannot be fixed exactly. Whereas Plato fixed the number for an ideal state at 5040, Rousseau fixed the population of an ideal state at 10,000. However, in modern times scholars have not attempted to fix any upper or lower limits of the population of a state. According to Garner, “population must be sufficient to provide a governing body and a number of persons to be governed, and of course sufficient to support a state organisation.” In other words, the population must be self sufficient to meet all the needs of life. Moreover, homogeneity is no longer considered to be an essential feature of a modern state population. The population of a state need not belong to a single race, religion, language or culture. A homogeneous population is no longer considered an essential feature of the modern state. The modern state claims to reconcile the interests of various groups of its citizens.

II TERRITORY

Territory is an essential attribute of the state which distinguishes it from other associations. Even though some writers like John Seely have argued that a fixed territory is not an essential element of the state, a state essentially comes into existence only when its population is settled in a fixed territory. The nomadic tribes characterised by some kind of political authority drawing legitimacy from custom and traditions constitute what political sociologists describe as a ‘political system’ but not a state. Within a state, citizens enjoy rights and duties irrespective of any tribal identity within a fixed territory. Moreover, international law regards the possessions of fixed territory as an essential attribute of the state. All this makes the demarcation of physical boundaries extremely essential in order to establish the identity of a state.

Territory symbolises the sphere of sovereignty of the state – where its authority is accepted without dispute or challenge. The territory of a state provides for natural resources for the substance and economic development of a state. It provides for a sense of belonging what we commonly refer to as patriotism, a sense of security and opportunity for a fuller and better life for its residents.

The territory of a state includes not only land but also water within its physical boundary and the air space above it. The territorial matters of a state usually extend up to three miles

into sea from its coast. Territories may be demarcated either by geographical features such as sea or mountain ranges or other natural barriers. However, it is generally demarcated on political consideration.

As in the case of population, there is no unanimity among scholars regarding the size of a territory which a state should possess. Many like Aristotle have favoured small size of territory. This perception, however, has undergone a sea change and larger territories are preferred today in the context of modern nation-states.

Some writers, like John Seeley (1834-95), hold that a fixed territory is not an essential aspect of a state. The nomadic tribes, who do not possess fixed territory, do constitute a state. This view is, however, no longer held valid. The nomadic tribes do have the institution of authority, or even government with custom based law, but not a state. Political sociologists concede the existence of a 'political system' in such communities, but their organization still does not qualify to be a state. Moreover, the modern state is not a matter of internal organization; it needs international recognition as well, so as to enjoy its rights and perform its duties as a member of the comity of nations. International law regards possession of a fixed territory as the essential attribute of the state. Demarcation of physical boundaries is, therefore, essential for establishing the real identity of a state.

III GOVERNMENT

Another essential element of the state is an agency or organisation through which the state can express itself and regulate the affairs of the population that resides within the territory. According to J W Garner the “government is the agency or machinery through which common policies are determined and by which common interests promoted.” He further argues that “without government the population would be an incoherent, unorganized anarchic mass with no means of collective union.”

A state without government is inconceivable, for the state wills and acts through the government. The authority of the state is exercised and its functions are performed by the government. The state represents an abstract concept, the government is its concrete form.

There is, however, no formal rule regarding the form of government which a state should possess. The form of government depends upon the nature of the state which in turn

depends largely upon the political thought and character of the people.

Government and state should not be treated as co-terminus. Governments may rise and fall without disturbing identity of the state, so long as they are formed and dissolved according to the established custom, procedure or constitution of the state. But a state will lose its identity if it is suppressed by an alien power so much so that the established procedure of forming a government is also suspended. When the people of a state lose their right to have a government according to the established procedure, i.e. a legitimate government enjoying customary respect and obedience of the people, the state is reduced to a colony of the imperial power which suppressed it.

IV SOVEREIGNTY

Sovereignty is probably the next essential element of the state which distinguishes it from other organisations. By virtue of its sovereign authority the state claims supremacy in internal matters and freedom from external control. This authority may be exercised by the government of the day but it essentially belongs to the state from which it is derived by the government. By virtue of its sovereignty, the state, through the government declares its law, decisions and issues commands which are binding on the citizens, the non-compliance of which leads to punishment. It is on account of this sovereign status that the state deals independently with other states.

The existence of sovereignty is so essential that only so long as it is armed with sovereignty does a state remain in existence. The moment a state loses its sovereign authority, either by internal revolt or external aggression, the result is anarchy and complete annihilation of the state.

A state continues to exist so long as it is armed with sovereignty. If a state loses its sovereignty because of internal revolt or external aggression, the result is anarchy and disappearance of the state as such. Some writers regard 'international recognition' as an essential element of the state. This denotes formal recognition of the sovereignty of the state over a given territory and population by other states. International recognition, however, is the outcome of the sovereignty of the state, not a condition of its existence. When a new state, like Bangladesh, comes into existence, it may be recognized by some states immediately while other states that withhold their recognition for quite a long time. Much depends on the foreign policy of a state whether to recognize the new state immediately or to delay it. USA had withheld recognition of the new states of USSR and People's Republic of China for decades after they

came into existence, but they did exist as states. Hence, international recognition is only incidental to the sovereignty of the state, not a fundamental element of the state itself.

V RECOGNITION

In addition to the four basic element of state, some scholars regard international recognition as another essential element of statehood. They argue that any inhabited portion of territory assumes the character of a state only when it is accorded recognition by other members of the international community. Recognition of one state by another, however, is a political act which depends upon considerations of national interest. For instance, the United States of America did not accord recognition to the USSR until the beginning of the fourth decade of the twentieth century. Similarly, the recognition of the Peoples Republic of China was withheld by the USA for almost two decades after it came into existence. Thus, the act of international recognition cannot be considered an indispensable factor for the existence of a state, even though it is an important act in international politics. International recognition, which denotes formal recognition of the sovereignty of a state over a given territory and population by other states, is not a fundamental element of the state itself.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Mention the elements of statehood. Briefly discuss the problem involved in regarding international recognition as an essential element of statehood.

2. Write a short note on population as an element of statehood.

-
3. Write a short note on territory as an element of statehood.

-
-
4. Highlight the significance of government as the concrete expression of state.

-
-
5. How important is the existence of sovereign authority for the existence of a state?

2.1.5 STATE AND OTHER ASSOCIATIONS

The term State is often confused with terms such as nation and society. Then, it becomes extremely important to highlight the basic distinction between these terms and the state.

2.1.6 STATE AND SOCIETY

Society is defined as the sum of human conditions and activity regarded as a whole functioning interdependently. For a long time the state and society were treated as identical. The ancient Greek thinkers provide a classic example of such treatment. Even in modern times, the term 'state' is sometimes used synonymously with 'society'. However, the two have now come to be considered as distinct entities and any attempt at treating them as identical is decried. R M MacIver as appropriately pointed out that, "to identify the social with the political is to be guilty of the process of all confusions which completely bare any understanding of either society or the state".

The human person, it is said, is by nature a social animal. He/she may be able to live without state but cannot do so without the society. Society, therefore, is the primary association. State, on the other hand, may be created, altered or dissolved in keeping with the nature of the society. Thus, the state depends upon the society for its existence and not vice-versa.

The society is a much wider concept than the state. It is an association of human beings which fulfils all the requirements of their existence from cradle to grave – economic, religious, cultural and so on. The state, on the other hand, is usually described as "society politically organized." It is concerned only with the political aspect of a person's life only when a society possesses a common decision-making authority and is governed by a common set of rules and regulations does it acquire the character of the state. Society, moreover, binds people into a variety of relationships, all of which do not fall in the domain of the state. MacIver has expressed this fact, thus:

There are social forms like the family or the Church or the club which owe neither their origin nor their inspiration to the state; and social forces, like custom or competition, which the state may protect or modify but certainly does not create; and social motive like friendship or jealousy, which establish relationship too intimate and personal to be controlled by the great engine of the state ... the state in a word regulates the outstanding external relationship of men in society."

State, however, is a territorial concept. It must possess a definite territory within which it exercises unchallenged sovereign authority. The society, however, is not a territorial concept. It may be either confined to a small group such as the family or may extend to acquire international boundaries to the whole world. Organisation is an essential attribute of state. Societies can be both organised as well as unorganised. The unorganised nomads travelling from place to place, for instance, also constitute a society. The state, on the other hand, cannot be imagined without organisation. Every state possesses a government which makes laws and is responsible for regulating the lines of its citizens.

Sovereign authority is a characteristic feature of a state. A society does not possess any sovereign power and thus cannot compel obedience from its members. The norms of the society are based on customs and morality and are not backed by any coercive power. The chief sanctions behind these norms or rules are moral persuasion and public opinion. State, however, possesses sovereign authority as well as coercive power to enforce its will.

Society may coincide with the state, particularly when the society takes the form of a nation. This, however, need not always be true. There can be societies within the state as well as those which extend beyond the national boundaries. The former may take the form of a village community and the latter of friends, relations, colleges, customers etc. across national boundaries. One can have a society that is not necessarily a state. The primitive tribes who constitute society need not necessarily constitute a state.

The State is formed out of society. So society is a primary association. It is society which chooses the pattern of its political grouping. States may be created, altered or dissolved, but society goes on forever. Men can live without a state, but not without society. That is why man is described as a social animal by nature. Growth of the state is an attribute of civilization, whose form is subject to change with the advance of civilization. The state depends on society for its existence, not vice versa. Thus, R.M MacIver (*The modern State*; 1926) observed: There are social forms like the family or the church or the club, which owe neither their origin nor their inspiration to the state and social forces like custom or competition, which the state may protect or modify, but certainly does not create; and social motives like friendship or jealousy, which establish relationships too intimate and

personal to be controlled by the great engine of the state. The state in a word regulates the outstanding external relationships of men in society. Thus, man owes much more to society than what he owes to the state. But when state and society are identified and men's obligations towards society are attributed to the state, it leads to socially disastrous consequences complete subordination of man to the authority of government, unrestrained by any control mechanism.

2.1.7 STATE AND NATION

Some writers define nation on the same basis as nationality and then advocate a separate state for each nationality. This view is no longer held valid. A nation grows on a much wider base. It refers to people living in a defined territory, inspired by a sense of unity, common political inspiration, common interests, common history and common destiny through they may belong to different nationalities. In other words, groups of people of different races with different religions, languages and cultures etc. may live together and feel united citizens of the same state owing their undivided allegiance to that state. Thus, nationhood transcends the conditions of birth and extends to the permanent residents of a state. Members of a nation of course distinguish themselves from other nations.

They may sometimes be prejudiced against other peoples. Yet logical outcome of the idea of a nation postulates equality among nations, their coexistence and cooperation. Since 1920 the principle of national self-determination has been almost universally accepted which has led to the establishment of nation-state, and rapid development of international law to regulate relations between nations states

The term 'state' is often confused with nation, although, quite clearly, the two are quite distinct entities. Let us first, therefore, clearly understand the meaning of the term nation.

a) Nation

The term 'nation' is derived from the Latin word "*nasci*" which 'to be born' which literally implies a group of people born in the same place. A nation, however, is a much more complex entity that is shaped by a number of obedience and subjective influences. The former constitute cultural and the latter psycho-political constructs. In fine, therefore, a 'nation' is a product of cultural, psychological and political factors.

The Cultural Factor : Culturally, a nation is a group of people together by virtue of common history, traditions, language and religion. Nations, however, need not be culturally homogenous entities. On the contrary, they may and do exhibit varying levels of cultural heterogeneity.

The Psychological Factor: Psychologically, a nation is a group of people that shares a loyalty or affection in the form of patriotism. National pride, however, does not constitute an essential condition for membership of a nation; a simple feeling of ‘belonging’ is also a sufficient condition.

The Political Factor: Politically, a nation is a group of people who regard themselves as a natural political community. This perception of being a natural political community may be expressed in the form of a desire to establish or maintain statehood or in the form of civic consciousness alone.

Society may coincide with the state, especially when society takes the form of a nation. Thus, Indian society and the Indian state denote associations of the same set of persons. But that is not always the case. There can be a society within the state, such as a village community. Social relationships can extend beyond the state also. Thus, you can have friends, relatives, acquaintances, sympathizers, admirers, clients, customers or even colleagues beyond the national frontiers of your state. They belong to your society, but not to your state. Then, there can be a society without a state. Primitive tribes who constitute society need not constitute a state. Even the groups of hunters, root-diggers and food gatherers of a primitive type form a society though they are not aware of the idea of the state.

The state is formed out of society. So society is a primary association. It is society which chooses the pattern of its political grouping. States may be created, altered or dissolved, but society goes on forever. Men can live without a state, but not without society. That is why man is described as a social animal by nature. Growth of the state is an attribute of civilization, whose form is subject to change with the advance of civilization. The state depends on society for its existence, not vice versa. Thus, R.M. MacIver (The Modern State; 1926) observed: There are social forms like the family or the church or the club, which owe neither their origin nor their inspiration to the state; and social forces like custom

or competition, which the state may protect or modify, but certainly does not create; and social motives like friendship or jealousy, which establish relationships too intimate and personal to be controlled by the great engine of the state. The state in a word regulates the outstanding external relationships of men in society. Thus, man owes much more to society than what he owes to the state. But when state and society are identified and man's obligations towards society are attributed to the state, it leads to socially disastrous consequences complete subordination of man to the authority of government, unrestrained by any control mechanism.

b) State vs Nation

Some writers define nation on the same basis as nationality and then advocate a separate state for each nationality. This view is no longer held valid. A nation grows on a much wider base. It refers to people living in a defined territory, inspired by a sense of unity, common political aspirations, common interests, common history and common destiny though they may belong to different nationalities. In other words, groups of people of different races, with different religions, languages and cultures, etc. may live together and feel united as citizens of the same state, owing their undivided allegiance to that state. Thus, nationhood transcends the conditions of birth and extends to the permanent residents of a state. Members of a nation of course distinguish themselves from other nations.

They may sometimes be prejudiced against other peoples. Yet a logical outcome of the idea of a nation postulates equality among nations, their co-existence and cooperation. Since 1920, the principle of national self-determination has been almost universally accepted which has led to the establishment of nation-states, and rapid development of international law to regulate relations between nation states.

The terms “state” and “nation” are quite distinct entities. There exist fundamental differences between the two.

Firstly, while a state stands for a politically organised society within a given territory, a nation has a wider connotation in that it implies a feeling of consciousness and oneness. An independent government is an essential attribute for a state but not for a nation.

Secondly, a nation is a psychological condition, whereas a state constitutes a legal condition.

Thirdly, a state can exist in the absence of national feelings but a nation cannot. Before 1918, for instance, Austria-Hungary was a state but could not be regarded a nation because it did not possess the necessary feeling of unity and oneness which constitute the essential prerequisites for qualifying as a nation.

Fourthly, a nation need not necessarily be limited to a state but may extend beyond its boundaries. The German nation, for instance, is spread across not only Germany but Australia and Switzerland as well. On the other hand, a state may contain of more than one nations within its territorial boundaries. For instance, different national entities like the Bangla, Kashmiri, Punjabi or Tamil are coexisting with the territory of the Indian State.

The distinction between state and nation has been best highlighted by Prof. Zimmern. According to him “nationality like religion is subjective, statehood is objective, nationality is psychological, statehood is political, nationality is a condition of mind, statehood is a condition of law, nationality is a possession, statehood is an enforceable obligation, nationality is a may of feeling, thinking and living, statehood is a condition inseparable from all civilized ways of living.”

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What you understand by the term ‘society’?

2. What are MacIver’s views on the implication of confusing state with society?

3. Distinguish between 'state' and 'society'.

4. What do you understand by the terms 'nation'? Discuss the various factors that shape and mould nation ?

5. Distinguish between state and nation.

2.1.8 LET US SUM UP

In traditional political theory, state continues to remain a significant area of political enquiry. The term “state” came into popular usage in the 16th century onwards and was coined by Niccolò Machiavelli in his book *The Prince* in early 16th century. Various scholars have ascribed various connotations, meaning and definitions to the term. However, four elements of state can easily be discerned in all of them, namely, population, territory, government and sovereignty. Some scholars regard international recognition as an element of statehood as well but there is no consensus on this point since recognition is viewed as merely incidental to the sovereignty of a state and not a fundamental element.

The term “state” is often confused with terms such as society and nation making. It is essential to differentiate between these notions.

2.1.9 EXERCISES

1. What are the four essential elements of a state ?
2. How does the concept of sovereignty differentiate a state from other organizations?
3. In what ways is society broader than the state, and how are they interrelated?
4. Why is international recognition considered important but not essential to statehood?
5. How does the modern concept of a nation differ from the idea of a single nationality-based state?

2.1.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

Eddy, Asirvatham, and Misra, C. K., *Political Theory*, New Delhi: S. Chand and Co. Ltd., 2000.

Dahl, Robert A, *Modern Political Analysis*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., 1995.

Freed Morton, H. and Friedreich, Walter M., *International Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, vol 15, USA, Macmillan and Free Press, 1968.

Garner, J W , *Political Science and Government*.....

Gauba, O. P, *An introduction to Political Theory*, New Delhi: Macmillan Ltd., 1995.

Jain, M P, *Political Theory*, Delhi: Authors Guild Publications, 1995.

Kapoor, A C , *Principles of Political Science*, New Delhi: S Chand and Co. Ltd. 1999.

Miller, David (ed.), *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Political Thought*, Britain, Butler and Tanner Ltd.

Sabine, G. H., *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, vol. XIV, New York: Macmillan Co., 1937.

**2.2 THEORIES OF ORIGIN OF STATE: DIVINE, HISTORICAL/
EVOLUTIONARY AND SOCIAL CONTRACT**

Diwakar Singh Jamwal

STRUCTURE

2.2.0 OBJECTIVES

2.2.1 INTRODUCTION

2.2.2 THEORIES OF ORIGIN OF STATE

2.2.3 Theory of Divine origin

2.2.4 Historical or Evolutionary Theory of state

2.2.5 Social Contract Theory

2.2.6 Criticism of Social Contract Theory

2.2.7 LET US SUM UP

2.2.8 EXERCISES

2.2.9 SUGGESTED READINGS

2.2.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this lesson, one should be able to:

- The contribution of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau to social contract theory.
- The different perspectives of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau on state of nature and social contract made for formation of state.
- The limitations of social contract theory propounded by different social contractualists.

2.2.1 INTRODUCTION

Political thinkers and philosophers have tried and attempted to trace out and explain the origin of the state in various methods, according to the nature and the social condition prevailed at the time of their thinking. However, there is no valid answer to “what is the origin of the state”? There were many contradictions in the thesis on what the origin of States. Nowhere in the history has it been recorded when the state came into existence. There were various beliefs regarding the origin of the state, some believe that the origin of the state lie in the hands of God whereas others believe that they are based on social contract and some trust on single force, the family or the process of evolution. The research anthropology ethnology and comparative philosophy had tried to focus on the origin of the state but it was not adequate.

2.2.2 Theories of origin of state

Concept of the State comprises the core of political thought. Political thought has been defined as 'thought about the State', its structure, its nature, its origin and its purpose. Several political thinkers and School of thought have developed ideas about the origin of State. When new ideas appeared, old ideas were criticised or modified.

Prof. R.N.Gilchrist aptly mentioned that "of the circumstances surrounding the dawn of the political consciousness, we know little or nothing from history, where history fails, we must resort to speculation". Historical method and evolutionary course of action failed to prove when mankind originally came under the control of state. It is only the imagination of the political scientist and historical researchers that various elements which might have made contribution for the origin of the state. As such, there was no agreeable and acceptable conclusion among the political thinkers regarding the fundamental question of origin and establishment of state. As a result, there were various theories concerning the primary or pre historical origin of the state propounded by the political scientists and historical researchers. These theories are:

1. The theory of Divine Origin
3. Social Contract Theory
2. Historical or Evolutionary Theory.

2.2.3 Theory of Divine origin.

This theory is the oldest theory regarding the origin of State. According to this theory The state is a divine institution of God. The State is created by God and God had sent one regent or messenger who will act as the representative of the God. The King or representative of the God is not answerable to anyone except the religious priests. The religious priests create a sort of fear among the masses to obey the orders of the King. The obedience to King by the public is obedience to God.

The King who is the creature of the God enjoys absolute power and above the law. Therefore such a state is a theocratic state. In this way, this theory justifies the origin and legitimacy of political power in terms of divine will with the help of religious priests.

According to MacIver, the magic man was priest and king. All are combined as one. In the epic Mahabharata, it is recorded God appointed Manu to rule the people as per their request to protect them. James in his work "The Law of Free Monarchies", kings are justly called God, for they exercise a manner of resemblance of divine power on earth, King are accountable for God only. The people cannot question him for the right or wrong done by him. James has stated the following rights of the king in Law of free Monarchies:

- i. Monarchy is divinely oriented.
- ii. Hereditary right is indispensable
- iii. Kings are accountable for God alone.
- iv. Resistance to lawful king is sin.

Justification of Divine origin of state with reference to different religions.

The Divine origin of the State was universally accepted during the ancient period. The Mahabharata has proved clearly the idea of Divine origin of the state. The people were fed up with Anarchy and they prayed to God and God appointed Manu as the ruler or King of the State.

Lord Krishna declared himself as the king of people which is clearly mentioned in

Shrimad Bhagwat Gita. The Jews too supports his idea of Divine origin. There are many references in the old testament where it is stated that God selects, appoints and dismisses the rulers. The Greek and the Romans regard the State as indirect divine origin.

The Bible says, "Let every soul be subject into the higher powers. There in power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Thus God is the source of royal powers. The ruler is the agent of God on earth".

A religious conflict took place, the supporters of Pope in Rome argued that Jesus was the son of God and he transferred all the powers to the king and kept spiritual powers with himself. on the other hand the supporters of the Roman empire rejected it and argued that the king was the representative of God and he is not under the Pope. This conflict ended in the Augsburg confession which declared God himself created the whole world.

The Divine rights of the Kings was supported by Sir Robert Filmer Bossnet, Saint Augustine, Prof Goop Gooch, J.N. Figgs.

Divine Rights of King's are :

- a) God gives political power to Kings.
- b) Political power is hereditary.
- c) The King is responsible and Answerable to God only and not to the people.
- d) The people should obey the orders of the King.
- e) Disobedience to King is a sin.

CRITICISM OF DIVINE ORIGIN THEORY OF STATE

The divine origin theory of state remain popular only up till the French Revolution 1789 which gave new slogan of Liberty, equality and Fraternity to the world The

revolution separated the state from the clutches of church Machiavelli, too separated religion from politics and became the champion of secularism but he supported that the Prince can be moral and immoral for the security of state. So, the divine origin theory has been criticized on the following grounds :

1. It leads towards dictatorship.
2. The appointing authority is God, who is invisible.
3. It is meant only for the rulers and for the general masses.
4. It is not applicable to modern state which consists of large population with multiple religions.
5. It is not based on religious faith and the religious faith is purely individual feeling.
6. It justifies unlimited powers of the King which is not possible in reality.
7. State is not the creation of God but of man.

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Explain Divine theory of state?

2. Critically examine Divine Right theory of State ?

2.2.4 THE HISTORICAL/EVOLUTIONARY THEORY OF STATE.

All the theories regarding 'The Origin of the State' were found inadequate, incomplete, defective and speculative. These were not able to give the true and correct explanation of the origin of the state. These were lacking on the ground of logic, legal, philosophical and historical defect. In real sense these are assumptions and the emphasis is on the one or two facts which is insufficient to come to a definite conclusion. In this regard, Dr. Garner has aptly stated, "the state is neither the hand work of God; nor the result of superior physical force; nor the creation of resolution of convention, nor a mere expansion of family. The state is not a mere artificial creation but an institution

or natural growth of historical evolution". J W Burgers reported that "state has a continuous development of human society out of a grossly imperfect beginning through crude but improving forms of manifestation towards a perfect and universal organization of mankind". According to Leacock "the state is a growth, an evolution, the result of a gradual process running through out all the known history of men and receiving into remote and unknown past". A detailed examination of the rise of the state resulted in that there were many factors which have contributed for the evolution of the state.

Thus, the important factors contributed to the growth of the state are

1. Natural Instinct
2. Kinship
3. Religion
4. Property and Defense
5. Force
6. Political Consciousness

Further, investigation reveals that the facts contributed played different role in attaining the constituent portion of the statehood. The method adopted by each community varies from each other and is different according to environment. In this regard, Sumner

and Keller rightly pointed out that "As there are no charms or even sharply marked lines of demarcation between periods of evolution but zones of transition only, it is impossible to say at what point the state first appears as it is to determine when moral becomes law or at what hour the child becomes youth or youth a man".

The state is neither the creation of God, nor the creation of social contract but it is the result of slow evolution with multiple factors which collectively have played a vital role for the creation of state. So the political philosophers like Garner and Leacock are of the opinion that historical developments are responsible for the Growth of the state. Sumner and Keller are the strong supporters of historical or evolutionary theory of State

Factors responsible for the growth and development of state.

a) Natural and Social instinct - The first and important factor for the growth of state is the nature. As we observe that all living creatures live a social life which is a natural instinct. Man by nature is a social animal and thus instinct has compelled human being to live together. The Human being live in society and thus instinct has always compelled for the societies and associations to form a state.

The statement of Aristotle that man is by nature a social and political animal and he who by nature and not by mere accident is without a state is either above humanity or below it further he stated that the state came into existence for the sake of more life but it continues for the sake of good life. Nature implies man to live in society in order to regulate society based on customary rules and regulations. In course of time, rules and regulations took the form of laws; society gradually became a political organization which paved way for the evolution of the state to which nature and social environment assisted in the development. Thus, the natural and social instinct of man had conclusive role in the growth and development of state.

b) Kinship - The kinship mean blood relationship. The kinship ties finds only in the family and the family consists of father, mother, and children as a nuclear unit or joint family system. All Activities of the family are controlled and supervised by the eldest male and eldest female member which in technical language are called Patriarchy and Matriarchy respectively. The expansion of families resulted into tribes and clans. These tribes and clans played an important role for the formation of state. Gettle rightly pointed

out that kinship strengthens the bond of unity and contributes to form the political organization. Many features of early state are prescribed to modern state. MacIver stated that in kinship creates society and society at length creates the states. Sir Henry Maine pointed out, "the most recent researches into the primitive history of society point to the conclusion that the earliest tie which knitted men together in communities was consanguinity or kinship"

c) Religion- The Religions have played a vital role for the formation of state. Religion is a powerful instrument of social control. The people initially started worshipping the sea, the sun, the moon, the cloud, the Rain, the Mountain etc. as Gods and Goddesses. This is how the people developed a faith in the God. The religions have compelled the people for community or common feelings and such common feelings resulted into tribes and clans, who had a head priest e.g. Priest in Mattan (Kashmir) and Priest in Haridwar (Pandey). These priest has full record of clans. So, Religion is the symbol of unity.

According to Gettle, "kinship and religion were, therefore, two aspects of the same thing and the unity and obligation of the groups were given religious sanctions. It is important part in this regard is that in the primitive era religion made man civilized, cultured and culture to discipline". Gettle has aptly stated, "thousands of years were needed to create that discipline and submission to authority on which all successful governments must rest and their chief means in early part of the process where theories and despotism are based mainly on the super natural sanction of religion"

Prophet Mohammed united the scattered and un scattered races and tribes of south Arabia and preached them about Islam. Here Islam emerged.

Guru Govind Singh united the people in the name of Religion against his Aurangzeb who was hell bent to conversion of Hindus to Musalmans. Even Mohd. All Jinah united all the Muslims in the name of religion and succeeded in the formation of Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Religion in all ages of history and even now plays an important role in formation of state.

d) Property and Defence - On the basis of Historical facts, that Ancient people have passed through three Economic stages for their livelihood and survival which are :-

S.No.	Stage	Occupation
1.	Huntsman stage	Hunting
2.	Herdsman stage	To keep domestic animals like sheep goat etc.
3.	Husbandman stage	Agriculture

The Huntsman lead a wandering life for the search of food. The second stage was Herdsman stage and here the human beings kept domestic animals for fulfilling his needs e.g. horse was used as a means of transport.

The third stage was Agriculture stage and here he learnt the art of Agriculture and settled at one place. All these factors of property — moveable and immovable as well as trade and commerce led towards conflict.

In order to maintain Law and order and resolve peace, the need of state was felt and here the state came into existence. The organized military or defence was established to check the external aggression. So here the full fledged state with all the parameters established.

e) Political consciousness -The concept property and defence led towards political consciousness among the people. They thought of establishment of such an institution which may protect them from external control and internal rivalries, business conflict, property disputes etc. The necessity of a common authority became the source of existence of state where rules, regulations and laws existed to protect people from internal conflict and disputes.

Prof. Gilchrist has stated "underlying all other elements in state formation including kinship and religion is political consciousness, the supreme element". According to Bluntschli, "desire for social life leads to the organization of state".

f) Force — Force has always played a major role in the formation of state. They

say that God is always on the sides of big battalions so that the people with strongest military force established their hold on the weaker military force.

It was the use of physical force and military strategies that the Kings have remained in power and formed state. Thus war, foreign attacks and invasion, conquest etc. are responsible for the growth and evolution of state.

According to German thinker Nietzsche "the strong people are the rare great minds who alone are fit to direct, the destiny of the people". Bluntschli stated that force is an essential organization of state. In this regard, the view of Prof. MacIver is that the emergence of the state "is not due to force, although in process of expansion of force undoubtedly played a part".

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Explain Historical Theory of State?

2. Critically Examine Historical theory of State ?

2.2.5 SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

The Divine theory established the 'Divine Rights' of kings. In contradiction, the social contract theory emphasized that the state was not the creation of God but it was the result of an agreement entered into by men who originally had no government organisation. The history of world is divided into two periods; the period before the state was initiated and the period after.

In the first period there was no government. There was no law that could be enforced as there was no human authority to formulate and to enforce them. Man lived in a state of nature, in which they were subject to follow only such regulation that nature was supposed to prescribe. How men lived in the state of nature without coercive agency of a government, what made them establish a government, the term of contract and the party to contract were discussed in the theory. One thing accepted by all the exponents of the theory was that the state was a human creation as a result of contract.

The concept of social contract was found in the political treatises of both east and west. Kautilya in his Arthasasthra mentioned that "the king Manu supported the payment of one-sixth of the grains grown and one-tenth of their sovereign dues, the king took the responsibility of maintaining the safety and security of their citizen. Plato in his Crito stated that Socrates was represented as awaiting calmly the execution though it was unjust, because he would not breakup his contract with the state by escaping from prison into exit. Milton in his "Tenure of Kings and Magistrates" argued that men were born free, and that wrong sprang up through Adam's sin, wherefore to avert their own complete destruction men agreed by common league to bind each other from mutual injury, jointly to defend themselves against anything that gave disturbance or opposition of such agreement. The power of kings and magistrates is nothing else "but what is only derivative transferred and committed to them in trust from the people, to the common good of them all in whom the power yet reminds fundamentally, and cannot be taken them, without the violation of their natural birth right".

In the 16th and the 17th century, the 'Social Contract Theory' gained popularity. It advanced during the period of religious wars in the course of popular and famous

revolution in England, America and France. Richard Hooker (1554 - 1600), Hugo Grotious, Milton are also supporters of this theory. However, the Social Contract Theory raised to the peak in the hands of Thomas Hobbes (1588 - 1679), John Locke (1632- 1704) and Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712-1978). All the three exponents established their thesis from the beginning of human habitation.

1. Hobbes views on State of Nature.

The Hobbes State of Nature means absence of state. The people were living when Might was right. The State of Nature was a "War of all against all." The State of Nature was selfish, brutish quarrelsome, solitary, Nasty and short libed. The life was short. The people were shedding the blood of the physically weaker people. Injustice was prevailing in societies. There was anarchy and chaos. The people used to sleep inside their houses while locking the doors.

Hobbes views on social contract

Thomas Hobbes was a great English philosopher. He gave the idea of social contract in which the Monarch enjoys absolute powers. The Leviathan was his important work in which he justifies the rule of the Stuart Kings and defended their absolute power. Hobbes plea was that the people were fed up with the state of nature and life was a jungle's law. So the people entered into a contract where each surrendered his or her powers to the King subject to condition that thou shall protect their rights i.e. right to life, liberty and property. Therefore, the absolute King who took the responsibility to rule the state fixes some important conditions where were :-

- I The people select the sovereign to govern themselves and so the sovereign is not a party to the social contract.
- II. Once contract is signed, the people cannot break the ties of contract.
- III. The people don't have the right to revolt against the authority of sovereign.
- IV. The sovereign enjoys absolute power.
- V. He is the main source of laws.
- VI. The sovereign is indivisible, non-transferable and unchallengeable.
- VII. He has the authority to declare war or renounce a treaty.

VIII. If he fails to provide protection, the ties of the contract would automatically be snapped.

Criticism of Hobbes theory of social contract.

The Hobbes's social contract can be criticized on the following grounds :-

- I. It does not deal with rights of the people.
- II. The church fathers criticized this theory that state is a divine origin and divine institution.
- III. The State of Nature mentioned by Hobbes was wrong and the Nature of Man as described by Hobbes as quarrelsome and selfish was wrong.
- IV. Hobbes social contract encourages despotism, authoritarianism and lastly dictatorship.
- V. The state has always a Govt. and King himself cannot be Government in all.
- VI. This contract is not in favour of democracy.
- VII. The King is not a party to contract and so the contract is incomplete. It is one sided.

2. John Locke's view on State of Nature.

John Locke is an English political philosopher of 17th. century. He is a strong supporter of constitutional Monarchy. In his famous book "Two Treaties on Civil Government" he justified the glorious revolution of 1688 and deposition of James.

The State of Nature was peaceful and unlike that of Hobbes state of Nature. The people enjoyed rights and liberty. There was equality and freedom, but there was 'No Law' to solve the disputes. The people faced difficulties in absence of any authority. So it led to trouble, anarchy and disorder. Hence a need for the contract was felt.

3. John Locke's concept of Social contract.

John Locke has given two contracts :-

(a) **Social contract** — This contract formed a civil society. With the form of social contract, the primitive State of Nature ends. The Social contract protects human life

and safeguard the property and freedom.

(b) Governmental contract — After entering into first contract, the people entered into 2nd contract i.e. Governmental contract. It is purely a political contract. The people have given up their rights to a person or an assembly of persons due to danger of their insecurity. The people shift their responsibility to the Government for their protection and Governance. In case the Govt. fails to provide protection and security, then people have right to revolt against the Government. So Locke is in favour of Limited Monarchy and the State is formed on the consent of people.

4. Criticism of John Locke's concept of Social contract.

- I. He has not differentiated between the community and political body.
- II. It is a negative state which does not interfere in human life.
- III. He is favour of Limited Morarchy.
- IV. He does not favour legal sovereignty.
- V. His sovereignty is subject to division between people and the King.
- VI. He did not bother about the protection of the State.
- VII. His social contract is one sided, confused and unclear.

I. Rousseau on State of Nature

Rousseau is the strong supporter of "Nature" He has given the call " back to the State of Nature". For him, "Man is born free but everywhere, we find him in chains."

The man in the State of Nature was happy, ideal and full of pleasures. He enjoys hunting, plucking of fruit to fill his stomach, covers his body with animal skin and leaves. The State of nature was the 'Noble Savage' of man. But with the passage of time, its life in the State of nature changed. it is because of increase in population, introduction in agriculture, Mutual disputes, ill will, jealousy. All these factors brought a change in the State of Nature. The happiness is replaced by mutual disputes, murders, tension and disturbances in the State of Nature

2. Rousseau's social contract in context to General will and Main Features of General will.

In order to get rid of all tension and worries in the State of Nature, everyone surrenders all his rights to the community and as a result the community became sovereign. There is only one contract in the State which formed the Government. Rousseau called his contract as "General Will" and this will was nothing but "Each while giving himself to all, gives himself to no one, but still each is a master of his own."

Main features of General will :-

- I. It represented collective god.
- II. It does not give importance to private interest.
- III. The General will is inalienable and indivisible.
- IV. It cannot be represented by any one.
- V. The people consider the best interests as their own interest and will. So the General will is individual will & well of all.
- VI. He differentiates between the Govt. and the Sovereign people.
- VII. Law making is the function of the General will and not the Government because the people are supreme. So He supported popular sovereignty and opposes indirect democracy.
- VIII. Law is the symbol of General will.

3. Critical assessment of Rousseau's social contract

- I. He has not cleared the difference between the General will and the will of all.
- II. His explanation about General will is unhistorical and based on imaginations.
- III. His State of Nature as divine Savage is not based on reality.
- IV. His General Will encourages absolutism and justifies authoritarianism.
- V. It has no logic.
- VI. The will of the individual is indivisible and it cannot be divided into actual will and the real will.

2.2.6 CRITICISM OF SOCIAL CONTRACT THEORY

English philosophers contended that the contract between the government and governed could not be accepted with the basic differences of the fact of the history. It is unhistorical, merely a fiction. It is illegal, as there was neither the authority nor sanction before the contract was completed. It is the bad philosophy, because the growth of the nation state is a natural process but not an artificial manufacture.

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Explain Social Contract theory of state?

2. What contributions made by Hobbes, to Social Contract theory of State?

3. Give a brief explanation of the nature of state in Social Contractualists views ?

-
4. Critically examine Hobbes Theory of Social; Contract ?
-
-
-

5. What is the significance of social; Contract theory in the present world. ?
-
-
-

2.2.7 LETS US SUM UP

With all its defects the theory has certain merits. It emphasized the state to ensure safety and protection of its subjects. The civil society rests on the consent of the ruled and not on the ruler which paved way for modern democracy. Man born free and after the contract also remained free. The political sovereignty laid the foundation of adult suffrage and importance of electorate.

2.2.8 EXERCISES

1. Why is there no universally accepted explanation for the origin of the state?
2. What are the core criticisms of the Divine Origin Theory in the context of modern governance?
3. How does the Social Contract Theory reconcile individual freedom with state authority?
4. In what ways did property, defense, and religion shape the rise of organized political structures?
5. Can the concept of state formation be universally applied across different cultures and

historical contexts?

2.2.9 SUGGESTED READINGS

Dyke, V.V., *Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis*, London: Stevens and Sons, 1960.

Lasswell, Harold, *The Future of Political Science*, New York;1963.

Germond, D., *Modern Western Political Thought: Machiavelli to Marx*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press: 1994.

Macpherson, C.B., *The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism*, London: Oxford University Press, 1994.

Sabine, G.H, *Encyclopaedia of Social Sciences*, vol.XIV, New York: Macmillian, 1937.

Garner, O.P., *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New Delhi: Macmillian, 1995.

Jain, M.P., *Political Theory*, Delhi: Authors Guild Publications, 1995.

**2.3 THEORIES OF NATURE OF STATE :
ORGANIC, LIBERAL AND MARXIST**

Diwakar Singh Jamwal

STRUCTURE

2.3.0 OBJECTIVES

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

2.3.2 ORGANIC THEORY OF STATE

2.3.3 The state as a Natural Institution:

2.3.4 State As an Ethical Institution

2.3.5 Herbert Spencer's organic theory

2.3.6 LIBERALISM AND THE CONCEPTION OF STATE

2.3.7 Functions of the State According to Negative Liberalism

2.3.8 Functions of the State According to Positive Liberalism

2.3.9 Nature of Marxian Theory of State

2.3.10 LET US SUM UP

2.3.11 EXERCISES

2.3. 12 SUGGESTED READINGS

2.3.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you may be able:

- to know the organic conception of state
- to know the function of the state in negative and positive liberalism
- to know Marxist theory of the state
- to understand the nature and function of the state

2.3.1 INTRODUCTION

The nature and functions of the state are considerably differ from one time to the other. However, according to many, certain functions of the state are constant over the period, and the functions and the nature of state changes with the changes in overall economic and social changes. According to these scholars there is a direct relationship between economic system and its political management. Since political management is carried out by the state according to the existing socio-economic system, the nature of the state is obviously tied with the nature of socio-economic system. There are many theories to explain the nature of the state from the days of the Aristotle to now. In this lesson, we are going to focus on thee important theories that explain the nature of the state and its functions in contemporary society: a) Organic theory, b) Liberal theory and c) Marxian theory.

2.3.2 ORGANIC THEORY OF ORIGIN OF STATE

The analogy between state and organism is very old and most common comparison in political science. Plato and Aristotle composed the symmetry of the state to that of the body. In Medieval times it got a peace of prominence in political writings.

It will be helpful here to discuss “Bluntschli” views regarding organic origin of the

state before elaborating the concept further. According to Bluntschli, state organism is copy of a natural organism, particularly in the following respects:

- (a) Every organism is a union of soul and body i.e. of material elements and vital forces.
- (b) Although an organism is and remains a whole, yet in the parts it has members which are animated to satisfy in various ways the varying needs of the whole.
- (c) The organism develops itself from within outwards and has an extend growth. Bluntschli also ascribes to the state a moral and spiritual personality which is masculine in nature.

This theory compares the state with an organism or a living body and the individuals with its organs. This thinking has two obvious impacts for individuals:-

- (1) The whole existence and worth of individuals depend on the existence of the state as the existence of organs depends on the existence of organism.
- (2) Secondly hierarchy of position and status is legitimised by this theory which justifies unequal treatment by basing its argument on that different organs are placed in organism to perform different functions within the organism – hence justifying superior position of some in relation to others.

2.3.3 THE STATE AS A NATURAL INSTITUTION

This theory accepts that the state as a natural institution up to such an extent that it ascribes the existence of individual as a civilised individual to the existence of the state. Thus Aristotle held that state comes into existence for the sake of life and continues for the sake of good life. Aristotle held that man by nature is a ‘political animal’ and held that one who lives outside of state is either beast or god. Aristotle declared that state is prior to man.

The interest on organic nature of the state was renewed in the writings of Edmund Burke (1729-97) in the eighteenth century. G.W.F Hegel (1770-1831) was the most

eloquent exponent of the organic nature of state and declared: 'State is the march of God on Earth'. In the nineteenth century, organic theory of state got new support from the writings of biological school of political theorists. These theorists equated the development of political institutions with the growth of living beings towards higher forms of life as characterised by the increasing differentiation of parts.

2.3.4 STATE AS AN ETHICAL INSTITUTION

According to this theory when an individual performs his duties in state and enjoys his rights as a citizen of the state, it has a moralising impact on his personality because through it man achieves moral excellence. Differentiation of functions in the state gives ethical foundation to the state. Like the manner in which Aristotle justified the institution of slavery on the basis of capabilities of different individuals and also regarded that it secures a good life both for the masters and the slaves. Modern biological school of political theory also supported the notion of state as an ethical institution. According to them organism is the real source of life and energy for its parts, so the state is the spring of good life for its citizens. Some writers even claimed that the states makes an appeal to the rational nature of man and therefore eulogised the state as a 'Moral organism'. The champions of the organic theory claimed that individuals could have any rights within the state but they cannot have any rights against the state.

2.3.5 HERBERT SPENCER'S ORGANIC THEORY

Spencer holds that the society is an organism since it possesses all the attributes of a living body. The first attribute of society that makes it an organism is growth. Just like any living body, the society grows and develops and in the process becomes increasingly complex. There occurs a progressive differentiation both of structure and function yet the interrelated nature of its functions persists. Just as the hand depends on the arm and the arm on the body and head, so do the parts of the social organism depend on each other. Just as the co-ordination and interrelation of the constituent units it's essential for the very life of an organism, so it is for the society. The parts of the animal body form a concrete whole, unlike the society. In case of the society, the parts are separate and distinct. Yet the social organism is made a living whole by means of language, which establishes unity, making social organism possible. The basic difference between a living body and the society, however, is that while in the former consciousness

is concentrated in one definite part of the whole; in the latter, it is spread over the whole. Hence, Spencer argues, one must seek the good of the units rather than the good of the whole.

Spencer gives a number of structural analogies between society and the living organism. Just like the animal possesses its organs of alimentation, the society possesses its industrial structure. Just as in lower and simple life forms there is no organ, only a number of parts acting as an organ, so in the social development there is a primitive state where each individual carries on his work alone and sells his produce to others. Subsequently on account of evolution, comes the cluster of cells in the animal; the social parallel is of the group of families clustered together in a fixed locality where each does its own work. Then as the developing animal requires a more-active glandular organ, so society passes from the household to the factory stage. The analogy again is evident in the functions that the living organism and society perform. A simple animal, if cut into two, will live on as before; so a simple form of society such as a nomadic tribe, can easily be divided. But to cut highly organised animal, such as a mammal, in two means certain death. Moreover an increase in the development of animal means increase in the adaptation of particular organs for particular functions. Similarly specialization also takes place in a developed society. Specialisation in each case, while it implies adaptation for one duty, means unfitness for other duties.

The social organism, like any other living organism, is made up of various systems. These are:

- (a) the sustaining systems :
- (b) the distributory system : and
- (c) the regulating system.

The first, that is the sustaining system, constitutes the means of alimentation in the living body and production in the body politic. Just as the foreign substances which sustain the animal determine the alimentary canal, so the different minerals, animals, and vegetation determine the form of individualisation that takes place in a particular community. The second, that is, the distributory system comprises the circulatory system in the organic body; in the body politic its parallel is transportation. The vascular system in the body has its social equivalent in roads and railways. The third, that is,

the regulating system, is the nervous system in the animal; in the body politic it is the government, military.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Explain State as a natural Institution ?

2. Is State an Ethical Institution? Support your answer?

- 3 Elaborate Herbert Simon's Theory of nature of State ?

2.3.6 LIBERALISM AND THE CONCEPTION OF THE STATE

Liberal views on the functions of the state have been changing from time to time. The reason for this is quite simple. With the change in circumstances and relative position of the classes, theories also change accordingly. The notions of the state, sovereignty, etc. changes with the change in conditions and the requirement of the classes which support these. During the 17th century, the requirements of the capitalist class which supported liberalism were quite different and during the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries the requirements of this class changed, thereby necessitating a different role of the state in society. Negative liberalism of the 18th and early 19th century, which supported the state with minimal functions, changed to positive liberalism in the later half of the 19th and the early half of the 20th century which supported the positive state with welfare functions. Negative liberalism assigned only negative or police functions – resolving conflict, maintenance of law and order and regulation of free competition – to the state and adopted the principle of *laissez faire*. The state was regarded as the police state. Positive liberalism assigned positive or welfare functions – economic, social, cultural and political to the state. Thus liberal views underwent a change and because of this we find two liberalisms – negative and positive. With this in mind, the functions of the state, according to negative and positive liberalism will be discussed below.

2.3.7 FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE ACCORDING TO NEGATIVE LIBERALISM

Negative liberalism is also known as the theory of *laissez faire* or the police state, or the theory of individualism. According to this, the state is a necessary evil, a necessity because of selfish and egoistic nature of man; the state maintains law and order in society, it removes the uncertainties and ambiguities in society. It is an evil because it is an enemy of individual liberty. The state and individual freedom are seen as opposite, and negative liberalism wants to give more and more freedom to the individual by increasing the sphere of his activities and decreasing the sphere of the state. The function of the state is to provide physical security to the individual who can develop his personality without any interference of the state. Thus this theory supports the view that the individual should be left alone by the state to develop his own personality

in his own way. The main functions of the state are negative to check violence, disruption, disorder and fraud. In brief, it means that the functions of the state should be the bare minimum so that the liberty of the individual may be maximised. The main supporters of negative liberalism were Adam Smith, Bentham, Nock, Aokeshott, Nozick and Friedman Conclusion.

The arguments of negative liberalism in support of the minimum functions of the state are economic, political, moral and scientific. On the economic basis, it is suggested that a free and uncontrolled economy is necessary for the economic development of free society because every individual knows his self-interest better. On the political basis, it is suggested that increase in the functions of the state will lead to increase in the power of the state and will endanger the individual's freedom. On the moral basis, it is said that by increase in the functions of the state self-dependence and initiative of the individual will suffer and he will become a parasite on the state which will hinder the development of his personality. On the scientific basis, social Darwinism is supported according to which only those who have the capacity to survive must survive – “survival of the fittest” is the laws of nature which should be applicable to society. The state should not give support to those who otherwise are unable to survive on their own.

In brief, as Gilchrist has summarised the following are the main functions of the state according to negative liberalism.

1. Protection of the state and individuals from foreign aggression.
2. Protection of individuals against each other that is from physical injury, slander, personal restraint.
3. Protection of property from robbery or damage.
4. Protection of individuals against false contracts or breach of contract.
5. Protection of the handicapped (Spencer opposes this).
6. Protection of individuals against preventable evils such as plague or malaria.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What do you understand by Liberal Theory of State?

2. Briefly write down the functions of the State according to negative Liberalism?

3. On what grounds the negative liberalists argued for the minimum role of state

4. “State is an instrument for the service of social man.” Comment.

2.3.8 FUNCTIONS OF THE STATE ACCORDING TO POSITIVE LIBERALISM

During the 18th and 19th centuries, the rising capitalist class supported the ideas of negative liberalism. During this period, the capitalist class opposed the interference of the state in the economic affairs of society in order to have free development of capitalist economy. Free trade, free contract and free enterprise were the economic requirements for the free development of capitalism. Since state power was not there in the hands of the capitalist class, they always doubted the authority of the state and its interference in trade, industries and economy was regarded as a hindrance in economic development. But after the Industrial Revolution (1760-1830), the liberal thinking with regard to the state and its functions underwent a change. Negative liberalism was replaced by positive liberalism.

The 19th century in Europe has been a century of great thinking and great philosophers emerged during this period. Political power slipped from the hand of the feudal class and it came dimly in the hands of the capitalist class. This class now was not afraid of the state and any increase in the functions and powers of the state meant increase in the strength of this class. With the development of capitalism, a new class – working class – also became strong and this was the exploited class on whose labour and toil capitalists made huge profits. The condition of this class was really terrible. The working conditions, hours of work, wages and the standard of living of this class were very bad. Extreme exploitation of this class brought many reactions – idealistic, humanist, utopian socialist, Marxian and positive liberal. The working class was getting organised

and was challenging the privileges of the exploiting capitalist class and their socio-economic, political, social and moral system.

Positive liberalism emerged as a reaction to these views. The liberal views of the state and its functions changed and now liberals were not afraid of the state because state power was in the hands of the capitalist class. Positive liberalism demanded more and more welfare function from the state and increase in the powers of the state was the net result of this. Instead of being a necessary evil, the state was now regarded as an institution for the general welfare and guardian of the common interest of society. The state was treated as a captain instead of being an umpire in the affairs of society and the state became a welfare state instead of a police state. Why this change in the liberal view did take place? An answer to this has been provided by Titmuss. He says, “The force behind the process of historical development of ‘the welfare state’ have been varied and complex. Fear of a social revolution, the need for a law-abiding labour force, the struggle for power between political parties and pressure groups, a demand to remove some of the social costs of change – for example industrial accidents – from the backs of the worker, and the social conscience of the rich all played a part”. Various thinkers like – Mill, Green, Hobhouse, Lindsay, Tawney, Cole, Barker, Laski and MacIver – gave the philosophy of the positive state by clarifying the positive functions of the state.

The theory of positive liberalism is also called the ‘theory of welfare state’, ‘theory of industrial state, revisionist or reformist liberalism. The main feature of this theory of the state functions is that it entrusts various social, economic, moral and cultural functions to the state. The state is not regarded merely as a ‘necessary evil’ but it is assumed that the state can perform various functions of social welfare, can bring equilibrium, can satisfy socio-economic demands of the general masses. To provide an understanding about the liberal views on state, some of the key thinkers’ opinions were given below.

Views of J.S. Mill (1806-1873)

The main views concerning the functions and nature of state according to J.S. Mill are as follows:

1. The state has not originated because of selfish interest of individuals; it is the

product of human will.

2. The state is not a necessary evil. It is an agency of social welfare and creates an atmosphere in which individuals can develop their personality.
3. Society cannot be governed peacefully by the laws of free competition, free contract and free exchange.
4. The state can perform economic functions like control of monopolies, working hours and working conditions of workers.
5. Public health, public security and public education are important functions of the state.
6. The state must encourage scientific research.
7. Apart from these functions, Mill supports the functions assigned by negative liberals to the state.

Views of T.H. Green (1836-82)

T.H. Green mentioned the following functions of the state :

1. The function of the state is to remove the hindrances to the development of human personality and maintained the external conditions required for the inner development of human personality.
2. Poor education, poverty, ignorance and bad working conditions are hindrances to the moral and intellectual development of human personality. The state must remove these hindrances by positive welfare functions.
3. The function of the state is to look after the common interests of society.
4. The basis of the state is neither force nor contract but the human will.
5. The state is not the highest morality in itself but it is a necessary condition for the moral development of man.

Views of Laski (1894-1950)

Laski mentioned the following functions of the state:

1. The state must perform only general functions.
2. The state co-ordinates the interest of various associations and institutions of society.
3. The state must bridge the gap between the rich and the poor through its economic functions.
4. Industries and distribution of commodities should be controlled by the state.
5. The state must perform the functions of social welfare – education, health and housing.
6. The state must safeguard the interest of the working class and save them from exploitation.
7. Rights and liberties are to be safeguarded by the state.

Views of MacIver (b. 1882)

The following are the main views of the MacIver with regards to functions of the state.

1. The state is an instrument for the service of social man; an association of society.
2. As the state performs limited functions, its power should also be limited.
3. The state cannot perform all the functions efficiently and only general functions should be performed by it and the rest of the functions should be left to various other associations.
4. The state should not perform certain functions such as control of opinions, morality, religion, customs and fashion.

5. The functions of the state are establishment of unity and order. Order is mainly for protection, conservation and development.
6. The function of the state change with changes in the needs of society.

Views after 1926: Keynes, Roosevelt, Galbraith, Macpherson.

In 1929, the liberal economies of the world found themselves amidst an unprecedented crisis – the catastrophic Great Depression. Western liberal democracies were facing crises due to the increasing of unemployment, loss of production, starvation of general masses and the octopus of fascism was emerging to maintain the system – of course, the capitalist system. The crippled capitalism, unable to stand on its own, demanded assistance and with it a new socio-economic and political outlook emerged and an era of state regulated capitalism associated with state-monopoly capitalism emerged in the European world. To save the capitalist economy from this crisis, the theory of Keynes (1883-1946) emerged.

The capitalist class welcomed the interference of the state in economic affairs because otherwise, its own survival would have been endangered. A positive state was the requirement of the capitalist class as it would safeguard the aggregate interest of this class, appease the working class by welfare services, avoid a revolutionary situation by bringing reforms, and regulate the economy in a balanced way.

John Galbraith (b. 1909) has analysed the outlook of the state on issues like production, demand, distribution, price control unemployment, poverty, scientific research, inflation, security of workers, banking, economic security, economic inequality, taxation, technological and industrial development, economic stability, education, social equilibrium, wage control, planning and public services. He has justified the concept of planned economy in liberal state.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient

1. Define J S Mill's views regarding functions and nature of State ?

2. What is positive liberalism? How do you define it ?

3. Write main views of MacIver with regards to functions of the state?

2.3.9 NATURE AND FUNCTION OF THE MARXIAN THEORY OF THE STATE

The Marxian theory of the state is very different from the liberal theory. The Marxian theory of the state is based on man, society and politics. How state has been defined and how its functions are analysed in Marxian theory are elaborated below.

Marx himself has not formulated the theory of the state separately. Miliband says, “Marx himself never attempted to set out a comprehensive and systematic theory of the state”. Chang writes, “Before Lenin published his *State and Revolution* in 1917, the Marxian theory of the state had been almost entirely neglected not only in economics but also in Sociology and Political Science. In short, there is no doubt that the Marxian theory of the state has been gradually neglected in the social sciences. But discussion on the state is scattered in almost all the writings of Marx. Marx, being busy in the historical analysis of the capitalist mode of production, could not concentrate on the specific issues like that of the state. But Engels and other Marxist scholars and revolutionaries have written on the aspect. The main points of the Marxian theory of state may be enumerated as follows :

1. Marx made it clear in his early writing that the state is an organ of the economically dominant class and through the power of the state this class in spite of being a minority class, is able to have political dominance over the majority class, i.e the working class.
2. Marx never maintained that the state is a higher morality and can end all the conflicts in society and bring unity and harmony. He criticised the Hegelian idea that “the state is the march of God on earth’ and maintained that the state is merely the servant of property owners. He maintained that political emancipation is not human emancipation and said: “The limit of political emancipation is immediately apparent in the fact that the state may well free itself from some constraint, without man himself being really freed from it, and that the state may be a free state, without man being free.

3. Explaining the relationship of society and the state, Marx maintained that the state is neither above the society, nor can it organise the whole society and harmonise various interests. He writes, “It is, therefore, not the state that holds the atoms of civil society together. Only political superstition today imagines that social life must be held together by the state, whereas in reality, the state is held together by civil life.
4. Though the general Marxian view of the state is that it serves the interest of the dominant economic class, in some circumstances, especially when the classes are getting established it can act as an absolute power over all the classes. The position of the state is termed by Marx as Bonapartism, the rule of Bonaparte in France during 1848-1852. Marx writes, “France, therefore, seems to have escaped the despotism of an individual and, what is more, beneath the authority of an individual without authority.” For Marx, the Bonapartist State, however independent it may have been politically from any given class, remains, and cannot in a class society but remain, the protector of an economically and socially dominant class”.

It may sometimes happen that in order to save the whole system or under the pressure of exploiting classes, the state may take some steps against the ruling class. It may so happen that some policies of the state, even in normal times, may be against the interests of ruling classes, but in the final analysis, the state serves the interest of the dominant economic class. For example, the state may curb hoarding, smuggling, profiteering and adulteration and deal severely with traders indulging in such activities. But all these are done by the state to save the capitalist system as a whole. It does not mean that the nature of the state has changed. The functions of the state must be seen with reference to the total socio-economic and political order. In a similar way, the state may nationalise some industries or make some laws for the welfare of workers. But it does not mean that the state has become socialist and is trying to end capitalism. These may be the requirements for saving the whole system and, to save the whole, a part is generally checked and curbed.

5. For the abolition of classes, Marx gives the theory of revolution which is closely associated with the Marxian theory of the state, and it is the most important aspect of the theory. According to Marxian philosophy, the task of philosophy is twofold: a) to understand the world and b) to change it. Thus Marxism not only draws our attention to the exploitative nature of the state and society, but also tells us the way to change the exploitative system and establish an exploitation-free society. Marxism is not for reforms of the capitalist systems but suggests that these should be overthrown by a socialist revolution and replaced by a socialist state and economy.
6. About the nature of the socialist state, Marx writes that it will be a transitional state, the purpose of which will be the abolition of the classes and in a classless communist society the state will wither away. Thus the Marxian theory of the state does not glorify the state rather it is a theory of its overthrow, its withering away. Marxism presents a theory of the overthrow of the capitalist state, and withering away of the socialist state in a classless society.

The above mentioned issues can be summarised in the following manner to illustrate the state in Marxist understanding.

1. The state is not an above-society or moral institution. It is not an association to bring unity in society and contribute to the welfare of the whole of society. The state cannot resolve the class struggle and it serves the interest of property owners.
2. The state is a historical entity. It is a product of specific social and economic conditions. It is a part of the superstructure which stands on the economic sub-structure.
3. In a class divided society, the state is an instrument of a class. The interest of the dominant economic class is served by the institution of the state.
4. The state tries to maintain socio-economic and political order of the ruling class, in the final analysis.
5. In order to abolish classes and establish a classless society, a socialist revolution under the leadership of the working class is necessary. After the revolution this class

will establish its revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, the purpose of which will be the establishment of a classless society.

6. In a classless society, the state will wither away.

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Define Marxian theory of state.

2. According to Marxism the task of Philosophy is “two fold”. Describe

3. What is the nature of Socialist State?

4. Write three important feature of the Marxian theory of State.

2.3.10 LET US SUM UP

The chief contribution of this theory of the state lies in discovering and demonstrating the role of economic forces in shaping history. The earlier historians had hardly paid attention to this role. By focusing on this role, Marx opened up new possibilities of historical writing. In fact this theory of the state was a very powerful attack on the complacency of social thinkers who held that the state existed for the benefit of all social groups, and that the different conditions of the rich and the poor were of their own making. This theory sought to trace the roots of social injustice in the conditions created by the social system itself which was claimed to be an instrument of the 'common good' and justice.

2.3.11 EXERCISES

1. How does the organic theory justify the hierarchical structure and inequality within the state?
2. What are the core differences between negative and positive liberalism regarding state functions?
3. In what ways did historical and economic changes, such as the Industrial Revolution, influence liberal theories of the state?
4. How did thinkers like J.S. Mill, T.H. Green, and Laski redefine the role of the state in liberal thought?
5. What role did economic crises, like the Great Depression, play in shaping state intervention models such as Keynesian economics?

2.3.12 SUGGESTED READINGS

Carnoy, Martin, *The State and Political Theory*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Chang, S.H.M., *The Marxian Theory of the State*, New York: Russel & Russel, 1965.

Ebenstein, William, *Modern Political Thought-The Great Issues*, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH, 1970.

Engels, Friedrich, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1972.

Friedrich, Carl J., *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Joad, C.E.M`., *Introduction to Modern Political Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1974.

Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003.

Heywood, A., *Political Theory - An Introduction*, Third Edition, Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2004

**2.4 SOVEREIGNTY AND ITS THEORIES:
AUSTIN’S THEORY AND PLURALISTIC THEORY**

Diwakar Singh Jamwal

STRUCTURE

2.4.0 OBJECTIVES

2.4.1 INTRODUCTION

2.4.2 SOVEREIGNTY

2.4.3 Meaning

2.4.4 Development of the concept of Sovereignty

2.4.5 Aspects of Sovereignty

2.4.6 LEGAL SOVEREIGNTY OR AUSTIN’S CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY

2.4.7 PLURALIST THEORY OF SOVEREIGNTY

2.4.8 LETS US SUM UP

2.4.9 EXERCISES

2.4.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

2.4.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you may be able:

- To understand the concept of Sovereignty
- To know meaning, features and various aspects of sovereignty.
- To understand Austinian Theory of Sovereignty and its criticism.
- To understand Pluralist theory of sovereignty and its criticism.

2.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Generally, we say that the state is our state and it is for our benefit. All of us have rights given by the constitution and the state has to respect them. We also know that the government is responsible for the maintenance of peace and security. For this purpose, the government makes laws and it has a right to punish those who disobey them. But the question is why do we obey the law and what is state authority? We experience state authority everywhere in our routine life. If all this is well known, then why, you might say, we have to study what we already know. But are we sure that we know it properly or our knowledge is just scanty? The fact is that we only have a dim view of the state power or sovereignty. It seems to be very simple, but the fact remains that it is one of the most complicated notions in Political Science and a rudimentary understanding has no meaning because state power is not something which is theoretical and confined to books.

2.4.2 SOVEREIGNTY

Sovereignty is a key concept in traditional political theory. It constitutes one of the four elements of the state without which statehood remains incomplete. Derived from the Latin term *Superanus*, which means supreme, sovereignty denotes the supreme power of the state to extract obedience from the people who inhabit it. It means that the power of the state is unquestionable and the state has a right to demand allegiance

from its citizens. It also means that the violation of the command of the state would invite penalties or other punishment. This is also called 'internal sovereignty'. Internally, the state is supreme to any individual or organisation, living or functioning, within its boundaries, and they have to function under the laws and command of the state. None can claim superiority over or immunity to the state. The power of the state over them is original, total, unlimited and all comprehensive. Sovereignty also has an external connotation, which means that in the comity of states, every state is supreme and is free to cast its destiny.

2.4.3 MEANING

Sovereignty, one of the constituent elements of the state, is a basic legal and political concept. Like politics and the state, sovereignty has also been dominated by the legalistic view. Among the four elements of the state – population, territory, government and sovereignty, sovereignty is regarded as the most important distinguishing feature of the state. Laski observes, "It is by possession of sovereignty that the state is distinguished from all other forms of human associations". In the 16th and 17th centuries modern states emerged, and were established as sovereign national states, having sovereign power in their internal and external affairs. Thus, legally speaking, one of the essential features of the modern states is sovereignty which makes it superior to other associations of society. It is a commonly accepted traditional view of the state and sovereignty.

The term sovereignty has been derived from the Latin word *superanus* meaning supreme. It means that in every state there is a supreme authority, unrestrained by law. Sovereignty is accepted as the supreme power in a society, it is power unrestrained and highest which can control everybody, without being controlled itself by any other power. In every society there are many classes, class-interests, associations, groups and institutions, which represent the collective interests of their respective members. Among all these, one which has supreme power is known as sovereign. In modern societies, it is generally assumed that this power belongs to the state and the state alone. Because of this power the state is regarded as the supreme institution in society having supreme legal power to enforce its own will over all the associations with its coercive instruments. The will of the state is expressed through laws. The state can

compel Socrates to drink the hemlock, can compel the common citizen to obey laws, just or unjust. The state can express its sovereignty by imprisoning the common citizens who disobey, or threaten to disobey the laws of the state. The traditional concept of sovereignty of the state is that it is the power of the state which is supreme and unrestrained, which is expressed through laws, which is commanding coercive power can compel a common citizen to obey the laws even against his own wishes. In order to maintain this sovereignty, the state maintains army, police, bureaucracy, courts, prisons, instruments of torture, secret agents, firing squads, hanging ropes, etc. All these are known as the material bases of state sovereignty because these are directly associated with its coercive power.

The traditional meaning of sovereignty is purely a legal one. "From the legal standpoint the state is a total order, and the only total order precisely because the state and law are identified". Thus sovereignty of the state becomes nothing but the sole law making and commanding power of the state. The state is supreme both internally and externally. Thus sovereignty has two aspects-internal and external. This has been defined by various writers in different ways. Some definitions of the term are as follows:

Bodin: "Sovereignty is the supreme power over citizens and subjects unrestrained by law."

Grotious: "Sovereignty is the supreme political power vested in him whose acts are not subject to any other and whose will not be overridden".

Blackstone: "It is the supreme, irresistible, absolute, uncontrolled authority in which the *jura summi imprii* reside".

Jellinek: It is that characteristic of the state by virtue of which it cannot be legally bound except by its own will or limited by any other power than itself".

Pollock: "Sovereignty is that power which is neither temporary nor delegated, nor subject to particular rules, which it cannot alter nor answerable to any other power on earth".

Duguit: "Sovereignty is the commanding power of the state, it is the will of the nation organised in state, it is the right to give unconditional order to all individuals in the

territory of the state”.

Laski: Sovereignty of the state “issues order to all men and all associations within its area; it receives order from none of them. It will be subject to no legal limitations of any kind. What it proposes is right by mere announcement of intention.”

On the basis of above definitions, some basic elements of sovereignty can be derived. These are:

- | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Permanence | 4. Exclusiveness |
| 2. Absoluteness | 5. Inalienability |
| 3. All-comprehensiveness | 6. Indivisibility |

The above mentioned definitions of sovereignty project the traditional view of sovereignty, which emphasised the following points:

1. Sovereignty is an attribute of the state.
2. It is the supreme will of the state.
3. It is a legal coercive power of the state.
4. The sovereign makes the laws and extracts obedience from the people.
5. Sovereignty lies in a person or a body of persons.
6. The power of the sovereign is absolute and unlimited.

Check Your Progress 1

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Write the meaning of Sovereignty.

-
-
2. Give three definitions of Sovereignty you feel more appropriate.
-
-
-

2.4.4 DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY

Sovereignty as the supreme power of the state is a modern concept. It came into existence with the rise of the nation-state in Europe when the powerful monarchs asserted their authority. But as such, the idea of sovereignty is very old and can be traced to the ancient Greek city-states. Aristotle, the father of Political Science, defined it as the supreme power of the state. Aristotle had two views. According to him, the deliberative organ of the state should be sovereign and secondly, he held that the law should be sovereign. He preferred sovereignty to be vested in law. The Romans considered sovereignty as the fullness of the power of the state. It was generally accepted that the state should be the final authority in solving the disputes among its citizens and the law of the state was binding upon them. But in the medieval ages, feudalism prevailed. The king's authority was highly restricted. It was limited by the church which claimed immunity in both civil and criminal cases. Thus, the king was not sovereign. His competitors came to be known as 'Estates' and feudalism was a state of these estates. Barker calls it as "a paradise of estates" rather than a pattern of a state where the authority of the state was sidelined. Thus, there could not be the modern concept of sovereignty.

Jean Bodin is the first political philosopher who propounded the modern concept of sovereignty. He defined sovereignty as the supreme power over citizens unrestrained by law. He also defined citizenship as subjection to a sovereign. To Bodin, the power of sovereignty cannot be delegated; sovereignty is also perpetual and unlimited. Sovereign is the source of law and has the unconditional right to make, interpret and execute law. Bodin also discussed the location of sovereignty which, he argued, depended upon the form of government. Thus, it is located in the king in a monarchy, while in a democracy it resides in popular bodies.

To Hobbes, sovereignty is the creation of a social contract and the sovereign is that individual or assembly who is authorised to will for the general purpose of a peaceful life. Hobbes gave vast powers to his sovereign. His command is law and all laws are subject to his interpretation. His authority is absolute and unlimited and the individual cannot disobey him. Sovereignty is inalienable and indivisible. Hobbes pointed out that limited sovereignty is a contradiction in terms. But Hobbes very clearly put one limitation on sovereignty. The sovereign cannot command any individual to kill, wound or maim himself.

Another social contractarian, Rousseau located sovereignty in the people expressed as 'General Will'. To Rousseau, general will and sovereignty are inter-changeable concepts. Sovereignty is unlimited, supreme and absolute. It is also inalienable and indivisible. But unlike Hobbes, Rousseau's sovereignty is based upon the consent of the people. It is a free acceptance by every individual of the exercise of force by the whole group of which every individual is a part.

The French Revolution is another milestone in the development of the modern concept of sovereignty. The French Revolution stood for absolute and unlimited sovereignty on the ground that people being sovereign, there is no need to restrict the supreme as well as externally.

2.4.5 VARIOUS ASPECTS OF SOVEREIGNTY

In many books “various kinds of sovereignty” has been discussed. But this does not seem proper because there may be various aspects or forms of sovereignty but not

kinds. The question of various kinds does not arise with supreme power, which ought to be by one. Various aspects of sovereignty, mainly based on the location of sovereignty, are as follows:

- | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Legal sovereignty | 3. Popular sovereignty |
| 2. Political sovereignty | 4. De jure and de facto sovereignty. |

2.4.6 LEGAL SOVEREIGNTY OR AUSTIN'S CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY

As stated before, sovereignty means supreme law-making power in a society, which is unrestrained by any law, and can make any kind of laws. It means the authority of the state to issue the highest orders. It is neither bound by moral nor by natural laws. Laws made by the sovereign are to be obeyed by all compulsorily. In every society this type of authority is required and people will obey the laws of this authority either habitually or because of the fear of punishment. According to Garner, "The legal sovereign, therefore, is that determinate authority which is able to express in a legal form the highest commands of the state that power which can override the prescriptions of the divine law, the principles of morality, the mandates of public opinion, etc." Thus, legal sovereignty is the one in whose name all the laws of the state are made and obeyed. A legal sovereign is above the laws because he has the supreme law-making power. Courts recognise only the laws made by a legal sovereign and this is the legal view of sovereignty. Thus laws is nothing but command of the legal sovereign.

The question arises: where does this legal sovereignty lie in the modern state. It is well known that laws are made by legislatures in our times. But legislatures, Parliament in India, Congress in America, Duma in Russia cannot make any law as they like because they have to follow their constitutions and if the laws made by them override the constitution these can be declared null and void by the Supreme courts, under their power of judicial review. In a federal state the legislature cannot make laws on matters assigned to the states, because legislative powers are divided between the centre and the state by the constitution. Thus legal sovereignty does not rest with legislatures in

constitutional governments. The British parliament is bound by public opinion, as well as by moral and other laws. Nowhere in history, an unlimited power of law-making has been seen. This is purely a legal view of sovereignty and according to this view the main characteristics of sovereignty are as follows:

1. Legal Sovereignty is determinate, definite, organised, precise and well known.
2. It is supreme and unlimited power to make laws. It is not subjected to any control from within and without.
3. Laws made by it should be obeyed by all and disobedience to it will involve punishment.
4. It is the fountain-head of all legal rights.
5. It alone has the power to make laws and a law is nothing but its command.

The concept of legal sovereignty found the most explicit statement in the Austinian theory of sovereignty. This theory is also known as legal, or traditional, or totalitarian, or monistic theory of sovereignty Austin in his lectures on Jurisprudence (1832) explained this theory. His views are inspired by the views of Hobbes and Bentham. He says, “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, the determinate superior is sovereign in that society and the society, including the superior, is a society political and permanent”.

The following are the main points of the Austinian theory :

1. In every independent political community there exists of sovereign power, or sovereignty as an essential attribute of an independent political community.
2. The sovereign is not an indefinite body or a vague concept, but it is a determinate person or body of persons.
3. The sovereign is legally unlimited. There are no legal limits to his authority.

4. The obedience rendered to the sovereign is not casual but habitual. The obedience to the sovereign is continuous, regular, undisturbed and uninterrupted. The majority of the members of society should render obedience to it.
5. The power of the sovereign can neither be delegated nor be divided.
6. Law is the command of the sovereign and it is not based on custom or traditions.

Criticism of Austinian theory:

Prominent supporters of the monistic theory of state sovereignty are Bodin, Hobbes, Rousseau and Austin. According to the Austinian theory, there is a single source of power in all the societies which enjoys all-comprehensive and unlimited power. This is known as sovereignty of the state. This view of the state sovereignty has been attacked by the pluralists on legal, social, philosophical, historical administrative and political bases. Laski has criticised the Austinian theory merely on three counts: historical, legal and political.

On the **historical** basis, Laski maintained that sovereignty of the state emerged because of special circumstances in a particular time. Laski says, “The sovereign state, historically, is merely one of those ways, an incident in its evolution, the utility of which has now reached its apogee... The territorial and omnipotent state is the offspring of the religious struggles of the 16th century.” He further states. “The sovereign states thus emerges to vindicate the supremacy of the secular order against religious claims”. According to Laski, in our times this dangerous historical requirement of the 16th century – state sovereignty – is no more needed.

On the **legal basis** Laski attacks the main features of legal sovereignty – determinate sovereign absoluteness, indivisibility, inalienability, all comprehensiveness – with three arguments. Firstly, he says that the state is not merely a legal order; secondly, the power of the state is limited, and thirdly, law is not the command of the sovereign. To think the law as simply a command is, even for the jurist, to strain 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.” Laski attacks the Austinian

view that law is the command of the sovereign and says, "Law, for the student of politics, is built upon the general social environment. It expressed what are held to be the necessary social relations of a state at some given period." Laski rejects the legal principle of the Austinian theory of sovereignty that sovereignty has got unlimited power of making laws and law is merely the command of the sovereign. The most perfect example of sovereign power in the Austinian sense can be King in Parliament in Britain, because it is said that it can make any law it desire, because of its supremacy. Laski writes, "Everyone knows that to regard the King in Parliament as a sovereign body in the Austinian sense is absurd". In a federal state or in a state in which citizens have certain fundamental rights, the character of sovereignty cannot be seen the way it termed by Austin.. In such states sovereignty is always limited.

As a theory of **political organisation** the Austinian theory has been strongly criticised by Laski. He writes, "Unlimited power is nowhere existent, in reality, has not existed anywhere. Laski writes, "The will of the state, in fact, is the will of the government as that will is accepted by the citizens over whom it rules. A further argument to attack the Austinian theory on a political basis put forward by Laski is that "men are members of the state; but they are members also of innumerable other associations which not only exercise power over their adherents, but also seek influence the conduct of government itself.

Laski as an internationalist and pacifist strongly attacked the notion of unlimited external sovereignty of the state. He writes, "In a creative civilisation what is important is not the historical accident of separate states, but the scientific fact of world inter-dependence". It means that states are mutually inter-dependent and external sovereignty is fatal to their own interest. States must live in an atmosphere of mutual inter-dependence with goodwill rather than in a strained atmosphere of externally sovereign national states. External sovereignty will cause war and will be injurious to the interests of humanity. "If men are to live in the great society, they must learn the baits of cooperative intercourse:" Laski's criticism of the Austinian view may be concluded by quoting him again, "It would be lasting benefit to political science if the whole concept of sovereignty were surrendered".

2. Political Sovereignty

It is pointed out that behind the legal sovereign lies the political sovereign to which the legal sovereign has to bow. Political sovereignty is not recognised by the law. It is not determinate also in the sense that its identification is a very difficult task. Yet its existence cannot be ignored. It influences and controls the legal sovereign.

3. Popular Sovereignty

Modern democracy is based on the concept of popular sovereignty which means that the source of all authority is the people. J.J. Rousseau is credited with espousing it in modern times. Cicero pointed out that the state was 'people's affairs'. He held that the state was a moral community, a group of persons and the authority arose from the collective power of the people.

4. Dejure And Defacto Sovereignty

Often the de jure sovereign and the de facto sovereign are the same because the person or persons holding power are also recognised by the law. The distinction between the two becomes real in some situations of crisis which may be the result of a coup or any other kind of violent overthrow of the government. For example in Russia, the communists overthrew the Tsarist Government. While the law recognised the latter as the holder of power, in reality the former was in command and using the authority. In such a situation, the rule of a de facto ruler is based upon force or on the fact that the situation is under his control. In contrast, the de jure sovereign has the legal sanctity to rule.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What is legal sovereignty and how do you define it?

2. Give three main characteristics of legal sovereignty.

3. What are the main points of Austinian theory of Sovereignty?

4. On what grounds Laski criticised the Austinian theory of Sovereignty?

2.4.7 PLURALIST THEORY OF SOVEREIGNTY

What is Pluralism?

Before understanding pluralism, one has to understand monism, because pluralism is just contrary to it. In his well-known book Hsiao writes: “A monistic state is one which possesses, or which should possess, a single source of authority that is theoretically comprehensive and unlimited in its exercise. This unitary and absolute power is sovereignty, and the theory which affirms the existence of such sovereignty in the state is designated by the pluralist as monism. In brief, monism regards sovereignty to be the absolute, indivisible, supreme power of the state and it has been beautifully defined by Austin. Bodin, Hobbes, Rousseau and Hegel are the philosophers who have supported the monistic view of sovereignty”.

It is against such a state that pluralism has raised its voice of protest to such and absolutist idea of sovereignty, states Hsiao. The pluralistic State or sovereignty is intended to be its direct antithesis. Hsiao further writes, “The pluralistic State is simply a State in which there exists no single source of authority that is all competent and comprehensive, namely, sovereignty, no unified system of law, no centralised organ of administration, no generalisation of political will. On the contrary, it is a multiplicity in its essence and manifestation, it is divisible into parts and should be divided. Thus in brief, pluralist sovereignty is limited and divided sovereignty. Pluralism does not regard sovereignty as all-comprehensive, absolute and indivisible. It is assumed that the state is only an association. The following are the main points of pluralism:

- 1.** Society is not unitary but unitary in diversity. There are many interests in society.
- 2.** The state is an association like any other association of society. Sovereignty and state are not all comprehensive.
- 3.** The state cannot have unlimited and absolute sovereignty.

4. Sovereignty of the state is not indivisible. It should be divided between the state and other associations.
5. As man has to owe allegiance to other organisations and associations of society, his total allegiance is not and cannot be towards the state.
6. Law is not the command of sovereign as it is based on moral and natural rules, customs, traditions, etc.
7. The external sovereignty of the state is restricted by international laws.

Supporters of Pluralism and their Ideas

Pluralism got wide support in England, America and some countries of Europe. Among the main supporters of pluralism in England were Maitland, Figgis, Sidney Webb and Beatrice Webb, Cole Lindsay, Barker and Laski.

Prominent supporters of pluralism in America are William James, Miss M.P. Follett and R.M. MacIver. William James who is said to have provided pluralism with philosophical basis of pragmatism suggested a middle way between unlimited monism and unlimited pluralism. James wanted to have a pluralistic universe with monistic establishment. Miss Follett gave a beautiful description of moderate pluralism. Though she supported pluralistic sovereignty, Follett accepted that the state is superior to other associations and communities as it alone can bring unity in diversity. MacIver regarded the state as merely an association like other associations of society.

Laski's Views on Pluralism

The pluralists believe that Austin's concept of sovereignty cannot be verified from history. According to Laski, historically, sovereignty has always been subjected to limitations except for a very small period when we really had a sovereign in Austin's sense. This was the period when the nation-state arose and the kings asserted their authority. This nation-state was the result of the religious struggle of the 16th century and the emergence of the sovereign state was a vindication of the primacy of the secular order over religion. Thus, there were certain historical factors which were

responsible for the creation of absolute sovereignty of the state.

Laski says, "No sovereign has anywhere possessed unlimited power; and the attempt to exert it has always resulted in the safeguards." Infact, every sovereign has to work within the society and the society works through customs and traditions, which are the result of a long historical process and no ruler, no matter how ruthless he is, can violate them. It has been pointed out that internally the rights of the individual limit the sovereignty and externally, the international law restricts the operation of sovereign power. Besides the concept of popular sovereignty gives ultimate powers to the people and accordingly, the legal sovereign has to bow before them.

It will not be wrong to suggest that the pluralists have a great distrust of power and those who exercise it. That is the reason why Laski objected to the absolute powers of the sovereign. To him it is ethnically indefensible. It is ethically wrong as it retards the development of the individual and his moral stature. Laski stood for decentralisation and argued that the state should be responsible for its actions.

The Pluralists also reject the notion of law as advocated by Austin. According to Austin, law is the command of the superior and this command is from higher to inferior. Laski termed this as ridiculous. He pointed out that Laws are universal in character and are applied on both the lawmaker as well as the subjects. But in the case of a command, the commanding authority is over and above its command and is not bound by it.

The Pluralists view the state as an association. Laski asserts that we are not a universe, but multiverse and the associations are as real as the state. The associations have their interests to promote and functions to serve and they are not dependent on the state; rather, they grow in the whole environment as a natural response to factors in that environment. They have an inner life that is as autonomous as the state itself.

Maxey sums up the major postulates of pluralism as follows:

1. "That the state is but one of the numerous social, economic, political and other grouping through which men in society must seek to satisfy their interests and promote their welfare;

2. That these different groupings are not creatures of the state but arise independently and acquire power and authority not given by the state;
3. That the functions of such voluntary associations as churches, labour unions, trade organisations, professional societies and the like are as necessary as those of the state;
4. That the monistic state is not only incapable of wielding absolute authority over such bodies, but is incapable of regulating their affairs intelligently or administering them efficiently;
5. That the monistic concept of sovereignty is a mere legal fiction which not only misses the truth but does incalculable harm in obstructing the evolution of society along more natural beneficial lines".

Laski (1894-1950) was an eminent teacher, political theorist, fighter for human liberty against absolutism, great pacifist and an important, well-recognised leader of the Labour Party of Britain. He was a man with multi-dimensional intellect and renowned teacher of politics in the London School of Economics and Political Science. Laski was a great supporter of the liberal tradition and also its rational critic. He was against capitalism and because of this he is regarded by many as a socialist. He tried to record and analyse the events and developments during the first half of the 20th century, a period of rapid and surprising developments in the socio-economic and political life of the world as a whole. Laski tried to keep pace with the changing times and gave a rational, liberal democratic and socialist democratic analysis of political and socio-economic changes. As a fearless, outspoken journalist and writer, as a great supporter of human freedom and pluralism, Laski tried to give a new direction to political thinking in keeping with the requirement of the 20th century.

Laski has written on major socio-economic, political and moral problems of the 20th century. He has discussed Pluralism and state sovereignty in many important books. But here, because of limitation of space and scope only his views, as expressed in his most famous book *A Grammar of Politics* (1952) will be briefly discussed. These

can be divided into the following main parts:

1. Criticism of the monistic theory or the Austinian theory.
2. Social organisation and the state
3. The state and other associations.
4. Authority in a democratic state.
5. Authority and obedience.

CRITICISM OF PLURALISTIC CONCEPT OF SOVEREIGNTY

The pluralist assumptions and their critique of the legal view of sovereignty have been criticised on many grounds.

1. The pluralists suffer from an inner contradiction. On the one hand, they stand for decentralisation of power and autonomy of groups or associations; on the other hand, they also want the state to play a regulating role by coordinating the activities of the various associations. But the question is as to how the state will perform this function without overriding powers. Infact, by assigning the job of coordination, the pluralists give back the power of sovereignty with all its characteristics in Austin's sense to the state.
2. It is pointed out that modern society is highly complicated and the state must have power as the final judge in reconciliation of the interests of divergent groups. The concept of welfare state and planning has increased the activities of the state and it is dominating the entire life of an individual. No doubt, the individual is organised in groups and the groups play a commendable role in the enrichment of human personality but, that in any case, does not affect the primacy of state.
3. Austin himself will not object to what the pluralists stand for. He has only given a legal interpretation of sovereignty, which is the true statement of facts. International law is still in the developing stage and cannot be regarded as a limitation on sovereignty and legally speaking, customs and traditions are also no restraint on sovereignty. The inadequacy of the pluralist argument can be well understood when we find that even a strong advocate like Laski, later on, criticised the pluralist view of sovereignty. He pointed out that the pluralists failed in understanding the state as an expression of class relations.

Check Your Progress Exercise 3

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Define pluralist concept of sovereignty.

2. Write five characteristics of pluralism.

3. Who are the main supporters of pluralism?

4. What is the main criticism on plural theory of sovereignty?

2.4.8 LET US SUM UP

Sovereignty is the supreme power of the state by which the state exerts its authority. Legally speaking, there cannot be any restriction to its power of exerting obedience. It also monopolises the power of using legitimate physical force. This view is best represented in Austin's concept of sovereignty in which sovereignty has been depicted as permanent, absolute, universal, inalienable, exclusive and indivisible. The state essentially functions on the basis of this doctrine only. But it is also a fact that state sovereignty has always been subjected to limitations and in practical terms, the power of sovereignty has never been supreme. The pluralists have remarkably projected this view where they conceived state as an association. They argued for a limited state and division of sovereign powers between the state and other associations.

2.4.9 EXERCISES

1. Why is sovereignty considered the most essential and distinguishing feature of a state?
2. How does internal sovereignty ensure the maintenance of law and order within a state?
3. How does legal sovereignty function differently in constitutional democracies compared to absolute monarchies?
4. What role does popular sovereignty play in legitimizing the authority of a government?
5. What are the implications of a conflict between de jure and de facto sovereignty for the stability of a state?

2.4.10 SUGGESTED READINGS

Gettell, Raymond G, *Political Science*, Calcutta: The World Press, 1961.

Dyke, Vernon Van, *Political Science-A Philosophical Analysis*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1960.

MacIver, Robert M., *The Modern State*, London: Oxford University Press, 1926.

----- , *The Web of Government*, New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Friedrich, Carl J., *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Ebenstein, William, *Modern Political Thought-The Great Issues*, New Delhi: Oxford and IBH, 1970.

Gaubha, O. P., *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New Delhi: Macmillian, 2009.

3.1 RIGHT AND JUSTICE; LIBERAL AND MARXIST PERSPECTIVES

Shashi Kumar, Seema Rohmetra & Diwakar Singh Jamwal

STRUCTURE

3.1.0 OBJECTIVES

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.2 RIGHTS

3.1.3 Origin of the concept of Rights

3.1.4 Definitions of Rights

3.1.5 Characteristics of Rights

3.1.6 Classification of Rights

3.1.7 Bases of Rights

3.1.8 Liberal -individualist theory of Rights

3.1.9 Idealist theory of Rights

3.1.10 Historical Theory of Rights

3.1.11 Social welfare theory of Rights

3.1.12 Laski's Theory of Rights

3.1.13 Recent Development in Liberal individualistic Theory of Rights

3.1.14 The Marxist Theory of Rights

3.1.15 JUSTICE

3.1.16 Idea of Justice

3.1.17 Procedural Justice and Substantive Justice

3.1.18 Dimensions of Justice

3.1.19 LET US SUM UP

3.1.20 EXERCISES

3.1.21 SUGGESTED READINGS

3.1.0 OBJECTIVES

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

- To know how the concept of Rights originated in the history of political theory
- To know how different thinkers defined the rights
- To understand the Liberal Marxist Perspective
- To know different kinds of Rights
- To understand the different aspects of Justice

3.1.1 INTRODUCTION

Rights occupy a very significant place in political theory. Initially, the concept of right is broadly developed in liberal philosophy. In fact the consciousness of rights was developed along with the progress of liberalism. Later on, the Marxists extended the scope of rights to new broader form.

Necessity of rights arises when individual seeks to develop his socio-economic political and moral potentialities. Rights are not only necessary for the development of society but social values as well. Justice is also an important part of society, without it human beings cannot get what is due for him in Society.

3.1.2 RIGHTS

Rights are claims, social claims necessary for the development of human personality. They are not entitlements a person is possessed with. In ancient and medieval times, some people were entitled to enjoy privileges. But to these privileges nobody could

give the name of rights. Rights are not privileges because they are not entitlements. There is a difference between rights and privileges; rights are our claims on others as are others' claims on us; entitlements on the other hand are privileges granted to some and denied to others. Rights are universal in the sense that they are assured to all; privileges are not universal because they are possessed by few. Rights are given to all without any discrimination; privileges are given to some, the selected few. Rights are obtained as a matter of right; privileges as a matter of patronage. Rights emanate in democratic societies; privileges are features of undemocratic systems

3.1.3 ORIGIN OF THE CONCEPT OF RIGHTS

The concept of rights basically finds its origin in the voice of protest against the domination and exploitation by the dominant groups in a particular society. So rights are meant to safeguard the individual from the unreasonable and arbitrary use of power by the ruling classes. As R. M. MacIver, in his *Great Expressions of Human Rights* (ed.) has significantly observed:

Over most parts of the earth and throughout the major range of recorded history the masses of men have lived in a condition of misery and oppression. Nearly everywhere shall dominating groups acquired the techniques of power and used them to keep in subjection their fellowmen.... In every age the voice of protest has been heard. In every age the vision of human liberation has been glimpsed.

In modern times this perception of human liberation has been developed into the concept of rights. Whereas in the earlier line, Rights were considered to be the sum total of those opportunities which ensured enrichment of human personality. The idea of human liberation has been developed into the concept of human rights. So in its modern usage, the rights not only refer to certain demands, on the other hand, they have been referred to in the structure of the government, so as to prevent it from using its power in an arbitrary manner.

3.1.4 DEFINITIONS OF RIGHTS

Different theorists have given their own definition as far as concept of rights is concerned.

LASKI: "Rights in fact, are those conditions of social life without which no man can

seek, in general to be at his best.”

GREEN: “A right is a power of acting for its own ends.... Secured to an individual by the community on the supposition that it contributes to the good of the community.”

BARKER: “Rights are the external conditions necessary for the greatest possible development of the personality.”

SALMOND: “A legal right...is an interest recognised and protected by a rule of law—an interest the violation of which would be a legal wrong.... And respect for which is a legal duty.”

BENI PRASAD: “Rights are those social conditions which are necessary or favourable to the development of personality.”

After going through above definitions, it is important to note that the concept of Rights has been reviewed a number of times. After the reviews and the consequent re-definitions, the concept of rights has been altered. It has now come to stress upon two important aspects. Firstly the benefits associated with rights should not be continued to only the dominant sections of the society. Secondly, besides delimiting the activities and authority for the state, rights must also define the functions of the state so as to assure relevance in the contact of society. So the altered view of rights has stressed upon the negative and positive aspects of rights. Negative Rights stand for the area where the state is not allowed to interfere. Positive rights stand for the sphere in which state can intervene, for instance role played by the state in securing the rights of the people i.e. weaker sections of the society.

3.1.5 CHARACTERISTICS OF RIGHTS

The concept of rights has a number of features like:

- Rights emerge from the society. They are the result of human relationships in the society. There can be no rights in the absence of society.
- Rights are the claims which need recognition and acceptance of the society.
- Rights must be given to all the sections of the society without any discrimination

i.e. they should not be a prerogative of the privileged sections only.

- Rights are not static. They keep on changing with the changes in new demands of individual.
- State has an important role to play as far as rights are concerned. Though state do not create the rights but it does maintain, protect and co-ordinate the rights.
- Rights are always asked to duties, the right of a person becomes the duty of all the persons in a society. The relation between the two can be expressed in the following sentence- “Rights without duties are like men without shadows: they only exist in fairy tales.”
-

Check your Progress I

NOTE: Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) What are rights? What is the basis of its origin ?

2. What are the different characteristics of Rights, with which they are associated ?

3. What are the negative and positive aspects of rights ?

3.1.6 CLASSIFICATION OF RIGHTS

Broadly speaking Rights are differentiated under following heads :-

I Moral Rights

II Legal Rights

III Civil Rights

IV Political Rights

I Moral Rights : Moral rights are the rights which are recognised by the society but which cannot be enforced through the courts. These are based upon the moral code of the community. For instance it is required that a child must be fed properly, a teacher must be respected by his pupils. But, if these requirements are not met properly,

they cannot be legally enforced through courts.

II Legal Rights : Legal rights are the rights which are recognised by the state these right carry legal backing along with. These rights are the privileges granted to the individuals. If they are not given these rights, then they can go to the courts for the enforcement of these rights. According to Lealock, “A legal right is a privilege enjoyed by a citizen as against his fellow citizens granted and upheld by the sovereign power of the state.”

III Civil Rights : These are the rights which are essential to civilised existence. These are called civil because they are important conditions of a civilised society. The following are generally included in the category of civil rights :

i) ***The Right to Life :*** The right to life is the most basic of all the rights. It implies the duty to live. As Gilchrist says: “from the point of view of the general welfare, every life is valuable and to murder another or murder oneself means the elimination of an individuality which has duties as well as rights.”

ii) ***Right to Personal Liberty:*** The right to life also entails life to personal liberty. To quote Gettell, “Mere life without the right to exercise one’s faculties and to determine the general conditions of life would be valueless.” The right to personal liberty also means that every one has a right to move freely in any part of the country. It is important to note that right to personal liberty is not absolute and can be united especially during emergencies.

iii) ***Right to Freedom of Thought and Expression:*** This right to freedom of thought and impression is of great significance especially in democratic countries. This right is extrinsically linked to the freedom of speech and press. According to this right, everyone has a right to freely express himself. According to Bury, it is “one supreme condition of mental and moral progress.” Similarly, Laski says that “to allow a man to say what he thinks is to give his personality the only ultimate channel of free impression, and his citizenship the only means of moral accuracy”. This right is also not an absolute one in the sense that this right does not mean that anybody has the right to abuse or to spread communal feelings; etc..

iv) ***The Right to Property***: The right to property is an important civil right which is based upon an assumption that 'owning property is the natural instinct of man'. It means that individual has a right to 'acquire, hold and dispose of property, without any hindrances. It also implies that an individual can alienate property by way of gift, exchange or will.

v) ***The Right to Freedom of Religion and Conscience***: This right means that everybody has a right to follow any religion. The Constitution of India also guarantees this right under Article 25. It says: "subject to public order, morality and health...all persons are equally entitled to freedom of conscience and the right freely to profess, practice and propagate religion.

vi) ***The right to Equality***: Right to equality means that every one is equal before law *irrespective of caste, race, sex, place of berth or any of them*. The right to equality forms the basis of modern democratic states.

vii) ***The Right to Association and Assembly***: Under this right every one has an equal right to form associations. Association, according to Gierke and Matland, are instinctive to man. It is important to note that right to association and assembly is also united by the state.

viii) ***The Right to Family***: The right to family implies that everyone has a right to marriage. This right to marriage finds its base in the maintenance of purity of marriage relatives.

The other two rights which fall under the domain of civil rights are the right to work and right to education. But these rights have acquired great importance in modern times.

VI Political Rights

These rights form the basic of democratic societies. These rights provide an opportunity to all the people to participate in the affairs (political) of the government, thus influencing the policy of the government. The political rights include :

1) ***The Right to Vote:*** The right to vote implies the right to participate in the elections. The elections which form an important part of democracy may be direct or indirect. Modern democracies, because of their large populations, are representative democracies. And effective participation in the government is possible for the people only through their representation. Consequently, the right to choose the representatives or the right to vote at elections is of fundamental importance. The right to vote implies that every citizen who has reached the age of adulthood is eligible to cast a vote. To cast a vote is a procedure where by citizens express their opinion about as to which persons they design to be chosen as their representatives.

2) ***The Right to Be Elected:*** The right to be elected is another important political right. According to this every individual is eligible after a certain age to contest elections for the offices of union parliament, state legislative or any other local body.

3) ***The Right to Hold Public Offices:*** It means every one has an equal right to hold public offices. Article 16(1) of the Constitution guarantees to all its citizens in India “equality of opportunity in matters relating to employment or appointment to any office under the state.

4) ***The Right To Criticise The Government:*** The right to criticise the government is one of the most important political rights. It is guaranteed to the citizens only in a free and democratic state. This right enables the government to move on the right track. “Democracy is really a government by criticism, for truth only comes by the clash of opinions and every citizen has something of value to contribute and he must not be hindered in bringing it forward.”

Check Your Progress II

NOTE : Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) Broadly classify the rights and discuss each of them.
-

2) What are civil rights? Which are the other rights included in the civil rights?

3) Which are the rights, as a result of which people can participate in the affairs of the government ?

3.1.7 BASES OF RIGHTS

Various explanations have been put forward so far as the bases of rights are concerned. Consequently the concept of rights has been explained from two different perspectives:

1. Liberal Individualist Theory of Rights
2. Marxist Theory of Rights

3.1.8 LIBERAL-INDIVIDUALIST THEORY OF RIGHTS

The liberal individualist theory of rights can be traced back to seventeenth century. No doubt these rights claimed to be universal in nature that is they were intended to serve the interest of all the sections of the society. But in actual practice, these rights were stressed upon to secure the interests of the middle class. According to Harold J. Laski, in his *State in Theory and Practice*, has observed :

The birth of the liberal tradition can only be explained by the shift in the residence of economic power which accompanied it. At bottom it was a way of justifying the transfer of political authority from a land owning aristocracy to commercial middle class, and like all philosophies which seek to justify such a transfer, it started its principles in terms of a logic wider in theory than it was prepared to admit in practice.

The exponents of liberalism are projected themselves as the champions of the “rights of man”. But the interpretation and formulation of these rights was done in accordance with the model of a “free market society”. Consequently these rights formed the basis of capitalist system.

In the later stages of its development, liberal individualist intended to reconcile the interests of different sections. These sections included those of rising working class, consumers and ordinary people etc. This is the way liberal individualist rights got reflected in the form of various theories. Some of the important among these theories are presented here.

a) Theory of Natural Rights

During early phase of liberalism, in the 17th and 18th centuries, the concept of individualism was evolved. Individualism became the ontological base of liberalism. It emphasised on autonomy and absolute moral worth of each individual. Hence individualism is only bases of natural rights theories. According to liberal concept of man, individual is autonomous, self-centred and atomised.

The theory of Natural law and its impact on political history of man : The two great revolution of the eighteenth century, the American and the French, were influenced

by the theory of natural rights. The American declaration of Independence (1776) declared natural rights to be self-evident truth and asserted that “all are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights.” Similarly the declaration of the rights of man and the citizen (1789) issued by the French National Assembly said, “the final end of every political institution is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible right of man. These rights are those of liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression”.

The notion of Natural rights finds its origin in the liberal theory of the origin of the state from the “social contract”. According to this theory certain rights were enjoyed by man in the “State of nature”, that is, before the formation of civil society itself; these comprise the natural rights of man, which must be respected and protected by the state.

Among the exponents of the social contract theory, John Locke is the greatest champion of natural rights. According to him the important rights which are natural to the instinct of man include the rights to life, liberty and property. All these rights are to be respected and protected by the state. And if the state failed to maintain these rights, man had the right to act without any external restraints. Basically, the theory of natural rights has been deduced from natural law. It posed a challenge to the established authority of Church, the state and social set-up. Its emergence was to counter the political absolutism of papacy, domination of feudalism and monarchy, where individual could not enjoy its freedom and autonomy at all.

The theory of natural rights had its impact in political history of man. The two great revolutions of eighteenth century, the American and the French, were influenced by the theory of natural rights. The American declaration of Independence (1776) declared natural rights to be self-evident truth and asserted that “all are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights”. Similarly, the declaration of the rights of man and the citizen (1789) is issued by the French National Assembly said, “The final end of every political institution is the preservation of the natural and imprescriptible rights of man. These rights are those of liberty, property, security and resistance to oppression.”

The notion of natural rights can be traced in Hobbes writing of Social Contract theory of state. Hobbes maintains that in the state of nature everyone has a right to everything. Being an absolutist social thinker, Hobbes recommends that “Men must give up the right to everything in order to get effective rights against each other guaranteed by a sovereign power”. Hence, Hobbes became an absolutist by denying the natural right of an individual. Later on, John Locke propounded the theory of natural rights. According to him, natural rights are the rights which man enjoys in the state of nature. According to him, the three important rights enjoyed by man in a state of nature are right to life, liberty and property. In the content of these rights, state’s sole function is to protect these rights and interpret them correctly. The individuals have the right to overthrow the government, if it is not able to uphold the sanctity of natural rights.

Criticism of liberal individual theory of Natural Rights :

- 1) There is no universally accepted concept of natural rights.
- 2) Among those who support this theory, there is no agreed list of natural rights.
- 3) Rights cannot exist in the state of nature what man receives from nature is powers and not rights. For instance nature gives man not the right, but the power to defend himself from his enemies.

b) Theory of Legal Rights

After the phase of natural rights, the legal theory of rights developed in the last decades of 18th century. During this century the capitalist class captured the state power and since this class is not threatened with the laws, the liberal thinkers propounded legal theory of rights. Where as the theory of natural rights depend upon nature and are therefore inalienable, the theory of legal rights makes rights dependent upon the will of the state. As per this theory, rights will neither absolute nor ordained by nature but the law of the state gives them. This theory was established earlier by English thinkers like Bentham and Austin and later on supported by Riche and Salmon. Bentham rejected the theory of natural rights as “rhetorical nonsense upon stilts,” and believes that, “Rights are the fruits of law and of the law alone. There are no rights anterior to the law.” Also Ritche states that “legal right is the claim of an individual upon others

recognised by the state”.

The legal theory of rights has been criticised on many grounds.

- Firstly, pluralists like Laski opined that the state does not create the rights. It merely recognises maintains and co-ordinates them, so that all may enjoy the benefits of rights.
- Secondly, to say that the state is the sole creator of rights is to make it absolute. Legally as pointed out earlier, there are many limitations imposed upon the state by customs, traditions, morality, habits and the will of the people. Therefore to argue that all rights are in reality derived from the law is not correct.
- Thirdly, legal theory of rights has a very limited scope. It does not cover the whole range of rights. As Hocking points out: “The weakness of the legal theory of rights is that it does not cover the whole field of rights. It explains the nature of only those rights which have been given a legal recognition by the state. It is silent in respect of moral rights.”
- Lastly, according to theory of legal rights, the state is the only source of rights, it would mean that there can be no rights against the state. It is a wrong view. Under certain circumstances, the individuals can have rights against the state. While Laski calls it the right of resistance, T.H. Green regards it as the ‘duty of resistance’.

3.1.9 IDEALIST THEORY OF RIGHTS

The idealist theory of rights is also called the “personality theory of rights.” The chief exponents of this theory were philosophers like Kant, T. H. Green, the idealist thinkers of England, and some other writers also supported this theory.

The idealist theory or personality theory of rights differs from the theory of natural rights and that of legal rights. While the theory of natural rights takes rights as the creation of nature and the legal theory of rights treats rights as the creation of the state, whereas idealist theory of rights describes right as external conditions that are necessary for the existence and perfection of human personality. Hence rights are

claimed by the idealist thinkers from the ethical and moral point of view.

T.H. Green in his “Lectures in the Principles of political obligation” maintains that right is a claim based on the rational will of man and for this reason it is recognised by the society which gives moral sanction to it and this translated into law by the state which gives political sanction to it.

German philosopher Kant advocates theory of moral rights for the achievement of moral freedom. As this moral rights does not depend upon the state for its recognition, the state can only contribute to create the condition in which the individual can enjoy his moral rights. State would remove the obstacles which come in the way of the fulfilment of moral rights. As such Kant feels that rights are the external requirements for the internal development of man. He also associates rights with duties and maintains that rights are not mere privilege but these are obligations also. Bosanquet, another idealist views rights as both a legal and a moral reference. He maintained that “rights are the conditions for the realisation of the end of the state, claims recognised by the state i.e., by the society as ultimate authority to the maintenance of conditions favourable to the best life.”

Criticism:

FIRST, the theory is not clear in so far as there is a difficulty in fixing the conditions essential for each individual for his fullest self-development.

SECOND, the problem of thinking together of ‘individual good’ with ‘social good’ always remains there, which is insoluble.

THIRD, Just as the ‘greatest happiness of greatest members’ cannot be evaluated similarly, the conditions for the moral perfection of the man can not be assessed.

3.1.10 HISTORICAL THEORY OF RIGHTS

In the 19th century a new school of thought i.e. a “historical school of philosophy, law and politics” came into existence. They interpreted the notion of rights in reference to its origin with past, the tradition and customs of a given society. They criticised the natural rights theory or legal or moral rights theories on not having an historical basis of their origin. According to the historical School, laws are a product of long historical

evolution, of a society and based on tradition, customs and demands. They also maintain that with the change in line and circumstance the nature of rights also changes. The prominent thinkers of the historical theory of rights are Savigny, Ranke, Maine and Burgess. According to other proponents of this theory like Edmund Burk, rights are the crystallisation of customs and traditions.

Criticism:

- 1) No doubt political theories are determined by the customs and evaluations to some extent but it does not mean only. These customs and traditions form the basis of the origin of rights.
- 2) One can not accept the notion that only customs or traditions form the basis of rights. This can be attributed to the fact that if rights are always talked of with reference to customs, the reference would become impossible.
- 3) It is also held by the critics of historical theory that all rights can not be based on customs for instance the right of social security or right to education or right to work – all these rights do not have their basis in customs or traditions.

3.1.11 SOCIAL WELFARE THEORY OF RIGHTS

This theory of rights became popular during later half of Nineteenth Century. It was upheld by the utilitarian namely Bentham and Mill. This theory became popular because of the fact that individualistic philosophy could not lead to harmony in the society. It failed to reconcile the conflicting interests of individual and society. Consequently theory of social welfare to became relevant. It is based on the assumption that rights are created by the society. Since they find their origin in the society, so they are aimed at the realisation of common good and social welfare. And scarce, rights are conditions of social welfare, laws, customs usages, traditions and natural rights “should all yield to what is socially useful or socially derivable.” What is considered to be useful in the society is determined by the utilitarians by the principle of “greatest happiness of greatest member’.

CRITICISM:

1. It is a vague theory and this vagueness finds its basis in the fact that it is very difficult to define social welfare - whether it comprise the greatest happiness of

greatest number or the interest of the majority or the public opinion.

2. In contemporary times, governments are trying to legitimise their action in the garb of social good. Consequently the erosion of rights of the people are taking place.
3. The system which does not give any importance to the individual personality cannot last long, this can be attributed to the fact that it would give rise to opposition from that section of society whose personality is crushed and whose rights are affected.

3.1.12 LASKI'S THEORY OF RIGHTS

The discussion of the different theories of rights would remain incomplete if the mention is not made to the Laski's theory of rights. Laski has talked about rights both as a liberal as well as a socialist. Being a liberal, he is a staunch supporter of individual liberty. Also he stresses upon the creation of a just society which reflects his socialist orientation. Laski maintains that rights, in fact, are "those conditions of social life without which no man can seek, in general, to be himself at his best".

Rights are Corrective with Duties and Functions: For Laski, Rights and Duties are linked to each other. No right can exist alone. It has to be accompanied by a corresponding duty. Rights are genuine only to the extent that others accept them as their obligations.

Particular Rights: In order to have a clear understanding of Laski's theory of rights it is important to make a mention of certain particular rights of which he makes mention these are.

Right Pertaining to the Individual: These are the rights which are of utmost importance to the development of the personality of individuals. These include :

The right to work, which is based upon the concept of the performance of social function. According to Laski, "the citizen has a right to work. He is born into a world where, if nationally organised, he can live only by the sweat of his brow. Society owes him the occasion to perform his functions to leave him without access to the means of existence is to deprive him of that which makes possible the realisation of personality."

The right to adequate wages is another important right. It is important because it alone enables an individual to secure a minimum “standard of living without which creative citizenship is impossible.” This right does not imply that all citizens should be given an equal income, on the other hand it means that all should be given the minimum wages which are required by the individual for his own maintenance.

Right to reasonable hours of work is also a particular right stressed by Laski.

According to this right, every person has to work for a reasonable period of time.

Right to education is a right stressed upon by Laski. According to this right all persons should be so educated so that they must feel “fit for the tasks of citizenship.” It means that an individual must be given that basic education because of which he should be able to perform his duties properly.

THE RIGHT TO POLITICAL POWER: The right to political power has also been given importance by Laski. It gives all the rights to the individual to participate in the affairs of the government like right to contest elections, right to criticise and so on and so forth.

The right to freedom of speech and expression has also been emphasised by Laski. The right to freedom of association and public meetings is an important right supported by Laski. It is one of the important rights which give individual freedom to form associations and hold public meetings. The right to property is a right which has been upheld by Laski. He gives importance to this right so long as it leads to the growth of the personality of an individual.

Check Your Progress III

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What are the two important bases of rights?

2. What are the different themes which form the subject matter of liberal individualist theory of rights?

3. What forms the basis of legal theory of rights?

4. Who are the main advocates of historical theory of rights?

-
-
5. Critically examine social welfare theory of rights.

-
-
6. Laski has given a liberal and a socialist orientation to theory of rights. Discuss.
-
-
-

3.1.13 RECENT DEVELOPMENTS IN LIBERAL INDIVIDUALISTIC THEORY OF RIGHTS

In the last three decades, the liberal individualistic theory has come to be influenced by the views of Robert Nozic and John Rawls.

Nozic

According to Nozic, the theory of rights is based upon the natural right of ‘self-ownership’. It means that individuals are an end in themselves rather than means. The opening sentence of his book reads: “The individuals have rights and there are no things. Person or groups may do to them. (Without violating their rights). Therefore

society must respect the rights of individuals. The rights of the individuals mean the freedom to choose our life and to realize our ends, aided by the voluntary cooperation of other individuals possessing the same dignity”.

As far as the substance of the rights is concerned, Nozic supports the doctrine of individualistic rights. The doctrine of individualistic rights stresses upon mainly the right to hold and acquire property and the freedom of contract. As far as the right to property is concerned, these rights include welfare rights of the individual and their protection by the state. The freedom of contract on the other hand implies that every person has an inclusive sphere around himself. This domain according to Nozic must not be violated without his consent.

John Rawls

John Rawls has provided us with a “theory of justice”. It is important to note that the words rights and justice have been used interchangeably by Rawls. For him, any account of right, its importance should be based on the notion of justice. In his book *A theory of Justice* Rawls has talked about two important principles which form the basis of rights of men.

Principle I: According to first principle, “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 for all”. By basic liberties Rawls Means :

- i) Freedom of speech
- ii) Freedom of conscience
- iii) Freedom of the person (as defined by the concept of the rule of law)
- iv) Freedom from arbitrary arrest.
- v) Right to hold personal property.

Rawls calls the first principle as the principle of greatest equal liberty.

Principle II: According to second principle, social and economic inequalities are to

be arranged so that they both are :

A) To the greatest benefit of least advantaged.

B) Attached to offices and positions open to all under conditions of fair equality of opportunity.

Part I of the first and second principle is known as the difference principle where as the part II of second principle is known as the principle of fair equality of opportunity. After giving these principles for the distribution of rights among the people, Rawls offers two priority rules for ordering the above principles. First priority rule states that the 1st principle of the greatest equal liberty is lexically superior to the second principle. Second priority rule states that out of the two parts of second principles, the principle of fair equality of opportunity is superior to the difference principle.

Check Your Progress IV

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) Who are the theorists who have dominated liberal individualistic theory of rights in the recent years?

- 2) What do you mean by the right of Self ownership?

3) In which Book Rawls has given his theory of justice?

4) Which are the two principles which form the bases of rights according to Rawls?

5) Give the order of priority of principles which Rawls has given while putting forward his theory of justice.

3.1.14 THE MARXIST THEORY OF RIGHTS

Marxists have not given any specific theory of Rights. They have just given certain views regarding “Rights”. Along with the Marxian philosophy, the criticism of the

liberal concepts of rights has further led to the creation of Marxist theory of rights.

According to Marxist theory of rights, emphasis is more on the economic and social rights rather than civil or political ones. According to Marxists, rights are important means to serve the interests of the proletariat.

Marxists opine that liberal view of rights do not carry any importance unless they are supplemented by economic and social rights. According to them, “true liberty is possible only where there are no problems of exploitation, unemployment, beggary or anxiety for the coming day. Privacy of social and economic rights therefore forms an important feature of Marxian theory of rights. Explaining the view, Stalin said: “What can be the personal freedom of an unemployed person who goes hungry and finds no use for his foil.” Only where exploitation is annihilated, where there is no oppression of some by the others, no unemployment, no beggary, and no trembling for fear that a man may tomorrow lose his work, his habitation, his bread – only there is true freedom found”. So true freedom according to Marxists can only be found if economic right precede civil rights.

CIVIL RIGHTS

To conform to the interests of the working people and to strengthen the socialist system, according to Marxists, only those civil rights should be given to the people which can serve the interests of the working people. It means all the rights including the right to freedom of speech, the freedom of assembly, freedom of press must be consistent with the interests of working class. It also means that all the civil right must be exercised in a manner so that the socialistic system of the society is strengthened.

The Right to Association: This right is another important right emphasised by Marxists. But this right is not absolute and so it subjected to certain restrictions. According to this right, everybody is free to become a member of public organisations like trade union, cooperative associations, sports organisations and so on and so forth. But, as far as the political organisation is concerned, the Communist Party enjoys special status. Marxists regard Communist Party as the “Vanguard of the working people”. Faith in actual fulfilment of rights of the individual, the Marxists believe in actual operation of the rights of individuals and not merely in herbal statement of

rights.

For the actual fulfilment of the right of the individual, Marxists believe that means and measures should be adopted. Rights and duties are correlative. Every right has a corresponding duty according to Marxists. Like rights, duties also find their base in Marxian Philosophy that the individual is the benefactor as well as the beneficiary of the state. In capitalist system the interests of the Individual and society are not compatible. According to Marxists, in the socialist system the conflicting interests of the individual and society can be reconciled.

Guardianship of Rights: The guardianship of rights is given to the Communist Party by the Marxists. This Communist Party is based upon the principle of democratic centralism. The first term implies that all the decisions in an organisation from lowest to the highest level are made through debates and discussions. And centralism implies that once a decision is taken, then iron discipline has to be followed.

Check your Progress V

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) Which rights form the bases of Marxian theory of rights?

- 2) Of which class, should the rights intend to serve the interest?

3) Which party is to act as the 'vanguard of the proletariat'?

4) On which principle is the party to be based ?

3.1.15 JUSTICE

Justice is of central importance in political practice and theory. While a decent or good society or polity must have several virtues, justice is, according to a widespread view, the first of them. In the words of the leading contemporary moral and political philosopher, John Rawls of Harvard University, "justice is the first virtue of social institutions." He made that statement in his book, *A Theory of Justice*, which was published in 1971. Rawls's book inaugurated what has been rightly called "a golden age in theorising about justice." Consequently, justice, as noted by Tom Campbell, is today "the central and commanding concept of current mainstream normative political philosophy."

3.1.16 IDEA OF JUSTICE

The word "justice" is derived from the Latin words *jungere* (to bind, to tie together) and *jus* (a bond or tie). As a bonding or joining idea, justice serves to organise people together into a right or fair order of relationships by distributing to each person his or her due share of rights and duties, rewards and punishments. The Roman Emperor, Justinian, stated some of the precepts of justice (in Latin) as *alterum non laedere* (not to harm or injure others); and *sum cuique tribuere* (to allocate to each what is due to him or her). Justinian's precepts of justice were derived from the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, who had defined justice as the treating of equals equally and of unequals unequally in proportion to their inequalities. He had also distinguished three types of justice, namely, distributive justice, corrective justice and commutative justice (i.e. the justice of equivalence in the exchange of different kinds of goods).

As a moral-political value, justice is inter-linked with such other moral-political values as liberty, equality and fraternity. What makes a society or state just in a basic sense is its right or fair ordering of human relations by giving to each person her or his due rights and duties as well as due rewards and punishments. Justice does this by bringing about adjustments between the principles of liberty, equality, co-operation, etc.

The problem of justice in the contemporary world is concerned with determining logical criteria for allocation of goods, services, opportunities, benefits, powers and honour as well as obligations in society. In short, justice is concerned with the allocation of benefits as well as burdens.

Justice is primarily a problem of moral philosophy. In a communist state, If everybody's needs are met and the problems of injustice disappear. Justice is primarily a problem of discovering the right course of action. Here the distinction between rights and wrong becomes important.

The term justice implies the quality of being Just, right or reasonable. It is opposed to what is unjust, wrong or unreasonable.

The justice is an ethical concept which demands that truth be honoured and wrong and untruth be dishonoured. This is the version of all religions.

3.1.17 PROCEDURAL JUSTICE AND SUBSTANTIVE JUSTICE

In discussions of justice, a distinction is drawn between procedural justice and substantive justice. The former refers to justice or fairness or impartiality of the processes and procedures through which a law or policy or decision is arrived at and applied. Substantive justice refers to justice or fairness of the content or outcome of laws, policies, decisions, etc. Principles of procedural justice have traditionally been based on the idea of formal equality of persons, i.e., their equality as human beings or as subjects of the rule of law, irrespective of their differences in gender, religion, race, caste, wealth, etc. Often, rights-based justice is seen as procedural justice, whereas needs-based justice is seen as substantive justice.

3.1.18 DIMENSIONS OF JUSTICE

a) Social Justice :- The social Justice demands the followings :-

- i) The people should not be discriminated on the grounds of class, caste, race or gender
- ii) The people should be judged on their work achievements and actions.
- iii) The people belongs to different caste, race or gender should receive the same kind of rewards for the same kind of work.
- iv) The people who have been ignored for century together be given reservation.
e.g. the SC/ST and OBC/ Disabled are given reservations. The special quotas to the SC/ST and OBC/ Disabled be given un educational institutions. Further the women should be given special reservations in Panchayati Raj and Municipalities.
- v) No person should be deprived of those social conditions which are essential for his or her development. For example there is a provision of scholarship for students belongs to SC/ST/OBC's for continuation of their education.

The term social justice in the wider sense, implies rendering of social life in such a

manner that the material and moral benefits of social efforts are not concerned by a small privileged class but accrue to the masses to ensure the uplift of lower, weaker and unprivileged sections of the society.

This involves a logical synthesis of liberty, equality and fraternity in their substantive aspects so that:

1. liberty of thought and expression, etc. is supplemented by a democratic electoral system free from the decisive influence of money and manipulative power;
2. formal equality is not rendered ineffective due to vast economic disparities, especially in the field of seeking justice in the law-courts and availing of educational and career development opportunities;
3. special safeguards for minorities and weaker sections help to raise their dignity and promote the spirit of fraternity;
4. the right to property is subordinated to the common good and the pattern of production of goods and services tends to subserve social needs.

b) Economic Justice

The term Economic Justice may be used in the restricted sense of rendering human relations in economic sphere e.g. relation between employer and worker, between traders and consumer, between Landlord and the tenant between the money lender and the borrower etc., so as to eliminate exploitation of the vulnerable section of society. The economic Justice restore that dignity of human beings who have lost it due to lower economic, educational and cultural status.

Economic justice is directly related to economy and money matters, its equal distribution, its proper safety. Both liberals and Marxists have different opinion about economic justice. The Liberals believe that welfare services and progressive system of Taxation can provide economic justice to the people. Economic justice is one of the important function of state, which demands the followings:-

- i) There should be no economic disparity in the state
- ii) There should be no economic exploitation in both private and public sector.
- iii) There should be proper utilization of the collected money in the form of Taxes.
- iv) The State encourages different institutions for the proper safety of the economy of people such as LIC, Banks and other different finance companies and Banks etc.

It also provide GPF, PPF and facilities for their old age safely.

c) Political Justice

The term political justice refers to the transformation of political institutions, political processes and political rights. This implies establishment of democratic instructions in the political life of the community, so that these instructions represent and take care of the interests of the people, not of the privileged class. Thus representative institutions the legislature and the executive should be constituted on the principle of the universal adult franchise, while the independence of judiciary should be protected and maintained. This implies rule of Law i.e the principle that Government should not be arbitrary. Further political justice implies a full guarantee of the liberty of thought and expression especially the right to criticise the government and its politics.

In the second place, political justice implies a full guarantee of the liberty of thought and expression, especially the right to criticize the government and its policies. Finally, there should be complete freedom for forming associations and interest groups to enable the citizens to articulate their interests through the normal channels of communication and through political parties as well as to express their approval or disapproval of particular measures, to organize peaceful protests against harmful measures, and to pressurize the working of the government through democratic channels and procedures. In a nutshell, political justice postulates the universal availability of the mechanism for resolving the conflicting claims of different interests in society. (Add points)

Political justice implies the following conditions :-

- i. Political justice prevails only in the democratic form of government.
- ii. Political justice means where people enjoy their political rights. The right to vote, right to contest election and existence of political parties etc.
- iii. Political justice implies a full guarantee of the personal liberty, the liberty of thought, expression belief, faith, right to criticise the Government and its policies, right to petition, right to information, freedom of press etc.

- iv. The sovereignty lies with the people. The people makes and unmakes the Government.
- v. Political power should be based on the will of the people.
- vi. Public opinion should be given the regard by the leaders, politicians and government.
- vii. There should be independent and impartial judiciary or judicial system in the state, so that political power may be controlled and checked through judicial review and judicial activism.

d) Legal Justice

The term 'legal justice' is broadly applied in two contexts: (a) 'justice according to law' here we do not question the validity of law but focus on the principles of administration of justice according to the prevalent law; and (b) 'law according to justice'-here we examine the substance of the law itself to ensure that it conforms to the requirements of justice. Alf Ross in his *On Law and Justice* (1958) argued that justice consists in an efficient administration of law and that it should not be tested on some imaginary moral values. The notion of a legal order implies that decisions shall be made not arbitrarily but in accordance with general rules, and that these general rules (whatever they are) shall be correctly (that is what moralists call impartially) applied; that is by criteria defining the class of cases coming under the rule, and not affected by the subjective reactions of the judge. Justice then is conformity with existing law. This view represents an outstanding example of the concept of legal justice as 'justice according to law'. It does not question whether a particular law itself is right or wrong, on the plea that there is no scientific way of such verification

On the other hand, Ernest Barker, in his *Principles of Social and Political Theory* (1951), has dwelled on the concept of legal justice as 'law according to justice'. Barker draws a distinction between 'positive law' and 'natural law' to show that law derives its validity and value from two different sources. Positive law denotes a particular law-the law defined and declared by each community for its own members.

On the other hand, natural law is a universal law-a law founded on what is right-in-itself. (Add points from book)

Main Points of Legal Justice are :

- I. There is a close relationship between justice and Law. The legal justice cannot be provided in absence of Law.
- II. It is based on rational discrimination
- III. The Law should be equal for equals and unequal for unequals.
- IV. There should be equal protection of Laws. Even a criminal has also to defend himself.
- V. The law or legal justice should be within the reach of the poorest of the poor. If a poor cannot afford to have a private practitioner, the court should provide him a law practitioner.
- VI. Judiciary should be independent and impartial so that the judicial review and judicial activism should be conducted easily.
- VII. The legal justice should be simple and cheap
- VIII . Law is blindfold because justice is based on hearings, witnesses and proofs.
- IX. The Legal justice safeguards rights Liberty and equality.

Check Your Progress VI

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers .Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) Explain the ideas of Justice?

2) What is Procedural and Substantial Justice?

3) What are the different kinds of Justice?

4) On which principle is the party to be based ?

3.1.19 LET US SUM UP

In this unit, you have read about the idea and concept of justice. It is one of the important concepts in Political Science as well as other social sciences. There are different types of justice viz., procedural and substantive. One of the most pathbreaking works in the domain of justice has been done by John Rawls. His liberal egalitarian conception of justice is basically a critique of the utilitarian conception of justice. Of course

3.1.20 EXERCISES

1. How do rights differ from privileges in terms of their universal application and societal recognition?
2. How did liberalism shape the evolution of the concept of rights, particularly during the 17th and 18th centuries?
3. Why did the theory of natural rights pose a challenge to established authorities like the Church and monarchy during the 18th century?
4. What are the limitations of the legal theory of rights, particularly in addressing moral rights or rights against the state?
5. How does the social welfare theory of rights balance the interests of the individual with the needs of society, and what challenges arise in defining "social welfare"?

3.1.21 SUGGESTED READINGS

Barry, Norman P., *An Introduction to Modern Political Theory*, London: Macmillan.

Carnoy, Martin, *The State and Political Theory*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

Charlesworth, James C., (ed.), *Contemporary Political Analysis*, New York: The Free Press.

Dahl, Robert A., *Democracy and its Critics*, New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1991. _____, *Modern Political Analysis*, New Delhi: Prentice Hall, 1991. Lucas, J.R., *The Principles of Politics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Macpherson, C.B., *Democratic Theory-Essays in Retrieval*, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Rawls, John, *A Theory of Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971.

3.2 LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

Diwakar Singh Jamwal

STRUCTURE

3.2.0. OBJECTIVES

3.2.1. INTRODUCTION

3.2.2. LIBERTY

3.2.3 Meaning

3.2.4 Dimension of Liberty

3.2.5 Kinds of Liberty

3.2.6 EQUALITY

3.2.7 Meaning

3.2.8 Dimension of Equality

3.2.9 Relation Between Liberty and Equality

3.2.10 LET US SUM UP

3.2.11 EXERCISES

3.2.12 SUGGESTED READINGS

3.2.0 OBJECTIVES

- To understand the concept of liberty and equality.
- To identify the different types of liberty and equality.
- To know the relationship between equality and liberty.
- To find out whether these two concepts are opposite to each other or complementary to each other.
- To understand the concept of liberty and its dimensions.
- To analyse the relationship between liberty and equality.

3.2.1 INTRODUCTION

The relation between equality and liberty has been one of the interesting controversies of liberalism. The root of the controversy is: Are liberty and equality opposed to each other or are they complimentary to each other? In the modern constitutions, we find a frequent association of both liberty and equality in the list of fundamental rights. But they have not always been the same. The English liberal tradition seemed to place more emphasis on liberty while the French tradition had always sought to secure recognition of the principle of equality. Historically speaking, early negative liberalism preferred liberty to equality. It held preservation of liberty in the sense of 'absence of restraints' as the principle function of the state and any concession to equality beyond 'equality before law' was deemed as exceeding the proper scope of the functions of state. In order to understand the relation between equality and liberty, we have to understand first the concept of liberty and equality.

3.2.2 LIBERTY

The concept of 'liberty' or 'freedom' denotes a very important principle of political

philosophy. Liberty is sometimes regarded as the distinctive principle of liberalism, but freedom is acclaimed as a universal principle. Freedom is eulogized by liberal, idealist as well as Marxist theory. Nobody quarrels with freedom as an end, but different schools of thought differ on the means and mode of realizing freedom. Even the champions of absolutism, authoritarianism and slavery pay lip service to freedom, claiming that for ordinary men, submission to authority regarded as the symbol of some sort of excellence is the best way to realize freedom.

3.2.3 MEANING

The theme of liberty is integrally connected with the theme of rights. It is the provision of rights with their due enforcement by the state that ensures freedom to a citizen and thereby enables him to seek the best possible development of his personality. The term 'liberty' comes from the Latin word 'liber' that means 'free'. The meaning of liberty generally taken a wrong way as it is identified with the absence of restraints and limitations. No man can be absolutely free. In the sense of unrestrained freedom liberty is not possible in society. Thus viewed, liberty means man's right to do what he wants for the sake of making the best possible development of his personality. Social life is regulated by a set of principles or norms that make man's life civilized. These restraints lay down the line of distinction between good and bad, right or wrong, moral and immoral, legal and illegal. In fine, the real meaning of liberty should be understood with this point in view that the liberty of an individual is relative to that of others. Liberty is defined by Mahatma Gandhi as follows, "liberty does not mean the absence of restraint but it lies in development of liberty." According to John Seeley, "liberty is the opposite of over-government".

3.2.4 DIMENSIONS OF LIBERTY

The meaning of liberty has two dimensions negative and positive.

Negative Liberty

In a negative sense, it implies the absence of restraints as far as possible. Negative liberty meant that there should not be any hindrance in the path of one's actions. Here the point of stress is that restraint is bad, because it effects curtailment of individual

freedom. J. S. Mill and F. A. Hayek, John Locke, Thomas Hobbes, Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham are exponents of negative liberty. Mill maintained that there should not be any hindrance in the path of man. Hayek says that every individual has some assured area of personal freedom with which others cannot interfere. The negative view of liberty is not appreciated in the present times. Now individual liberty is sought to be reconciled with state authority. Restraints are essential if the state desires to achieve the goal of public welfare.

Positive Liberty

The positive concept of liberty admits that there must be compulsion if liberty is to have a practical meaning. It is a contribution of T. H. Green. He defines it as a positive power of doing something that is worth enjoying in common with others. Since man is social creature, his life should be regulated by certain social bonds. Hegel, Rousseau, Herder, Marx, H. J. Laski, Barker are other advocates of positive liberty.

Liberal Versus Marxist View Of Liberty

The Marxist interpretations regarding real meaning and nature of liberty hinge mainly on the nature and scope of economic liberty available in the pattern of social life. The liberals define liberty as a bundle of rights that enable a man to seek the best possible development of his personality. They do not bother for the kind of social life of man. On the other hand, the Marxist view of liberty covers the case of man's life in the society he lives and the conditions he is subjected to. It follows that in the Marxist view; there can be no real freedom unless the capitalist system is replaced with the socialist system. The Marxist concept of liberty rejects the case of 'free will' as the ingredient of liberty. Man is not only a social creature who can understand the pattern of his social existence and then change it by means of his conscious revolutionary social activity. It is quite obvious that Marxist view of liberty cannot be appreciated by the liberal thinkers who identify liberty with constitutional government, political democracy and orderly administration based on common law system. They are, Milton Freidman, Louis Fischer and Arthur Koestler.

3.2.5 KINDS OF LIBERTY

Simply stated, liberty implies a condition of freedom especially opposed to political subjection, imprisonment or slavery. In a wider sense, it is a multiple concept having these important varieties.

1. **Natural Liberty:** It implies complete freedom for a man to do what he wills. It means no restraint to any kind whatsoever on the doing of a man. Just as all creatures live according to their will in the world of nature, so should be the pattern of man's life. Let a man do what he wills. But liberty in modern society is within restraints. So the idea of natural liberty is therefore an errant nonsense. As a social creature man should lead a life regulated by social restraints.
2. **Social Liberty:** Social liberty relates to man's freedom in his life as a member of social organization. As such it refers to a man's right to do what he wills in compliance with the restraints imposed on him in the general interest. This kind of liberty consists in the rights and privileges in the society, which is protected by the state. Thus social liberty liberates a man from the fear of arbitrary aggression.
3. **Personal Liberty:** Personal liberty means the availability of those conditions in which the individual can act without being under any type of arbitrary restraint. Every individual has the right not to permit any other individual to interfere in his personal affairs. Every individual should have the liberty to dress, food, standard of living, marriages, education of children, etc. Personal liberty stands for the personal security, personal freedom in movement, and enjoyment of personal property. The state should not interfere in the personal matters of the individual. Such liberty is essential for the free development of human society.
4. **Political Liberty:** Political liberty refers to the power of the people to be active in political affairs of the state. Thus it is integrally connected with the life of man as a citizen. It requires two things, political education and free supply of news. By political liberty Laski means the freedom of the individual to participate in the affairs of the state. Political liberty includes liberty to vote, to contest in elections, to hold public office, to express political views and criticize government, to have free and fair election, freedom for public opinion, etc.

5. **Economic Liberty:** Economic liberty allows individuals to be engaged in some gainful occupation. It means liberty to earn one's own daily bread. In simple words, every individual regardless of caste, colour, creed, place of birth, sex And religion should have liberty to earn money through some occupation. The individual should be free from the constant fear of unemployment and insufficiency that perhaps more than any other inadequacies affect the whole strength of the personality.

6. **Domestic Liberty:** It is by and large a sociological concept that takes the discussion of liberty to the spheres of man's family life. It implies that of all associations within the state, the miniature community of family is the most universal and of the strongest independent vitality. There was a time when the authoritarian state was reflected in the authoritarian family. Thus with the advent of democracy, liberty pervaded the sphere of family life as well. It intends the freedom enjoys in a family to have respectable relations with others.

7. **National Liberty:** It is synonymous with national independence. As such it implies that no nation should be under the subjection of another. It stands for national independence, freedom from imperialism, etc. Like individuals nations also think in terms of liberty. As a matter of fact national liberty is another name for national sovereignty. Every nation wishes to remain free. And without independence the progress of the nation or the state is not possible. In a slave country people cannot enjoy the comforts of life. For this love for national liberty is identified with patriotism.

8. **International Liberty:** The ideal of liberty covers the world as a whole. Thus in the international sphere, it means that renunciation of war, reduction in arms production and abandonment of use of force and pacific settlement of international disputes. It also desires adequate curbs on the strength of military force so that it may not crush the liberties of the local people or people of a different country.

9. **Moral Liberty:** It stands for the freedom of the individual to act as per his rational self. Every individual should have the liberty to develop his personality according to his will. This type of freedom is contained in the idealistic interpretations of thinkers from Plato and Aristotle in the ancient to Rousseau,

Kant, Hegel and Green in modern times.

Check Your Progress I

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) What do you mean by the concept of liberty?

- 2) Discuss negative and positive concepts of liberty?

- 3) What are the different kinds of liberty?

3.2.6 EQUALITY

Equality is a value and a principle essentially modern and progressive. Though the debate about equality has been going on for centuries, the special feature of modern societies is that we no longer take inequality for granted or something natural. Equality is also used as a measure of what is modern and the whole process of modernisation in the form of political egalitarianism. Modern politics and modern political institutions are constantly subjected to social pressures to expand opportunities equally irrespective of ethnicity, sexual identity or age. Equality is a modern value in the sense that universalistic citizenship has become a central feature of all political ideologies in modern industrial democracies. Again, equality can also be taken as criteria for radical social change. It is related to the development of democratic politics. Modern societies are committed to the principle of equality and they no longer require inequality as automatically justifiable. The principle of equality enunciated by the American and French revolutions has become the central plank of all modern forms of social change and the social movements for the reorganisation of societies.

3.2.7 MEANING

Equality, like liberty, is an important pillar of democracy. In common parlance the term equality is used for identity of treatment and identity of rewards. However, this is not a correct use of the term because absolute equality is not possible. Like liberty, equality has also been assigned both negative and positive meaning. In the negative sense, equality means the absence of special privileges. It implies the absence of special privileges. It implies the absence of barriers like birth, wealth, caste, colour, creed, etc. In the positive sense, equality means provision of adequate opportunities for all the members of the society. It may be observed that adequate opportunities do not mean equal opportunities. Therefore, equality really means the provision of adequate opportunities to all citizens without any discrimination. Nobody should be debarred from certain facilities simply because of his status, caste, creed, etc.

Explaining the meaning of equality in positive context, Laski writes that equality means:

1. Absence of special privileges. It means that the will of one is equal to the will of any other. It means equality of rights.
2. That adequate opportunities are laid open to all. It depends upon the training that is offered to the citizens. For the power that ultimately counts in society is the power to utilise knowledge; that disparities of education result above all in disparities in the ability to use that power. Opportunity should be given to everyone to realise the implications of his personality.
3. All must have access to social benefits and no one should be restricted on any ground. The inequalities by birth or because of parentage and hereditary causes are unreasonable.
4. Absence of economic and social exploitation.

In short, equality implies the following things.

1. All persons should be provided with adequate opportunities for the development of the personality.
2. No class or caste or group enjoys special privileges that are not available to other members of the society.
3. There should not be any discrimination among members of society and if there is any discrimination it should be based on reasonable grounds.
4. Rights are equally distributed among all and all have equal access to opportunities leading to authority.

3.2.8 DIMENSIONS OF EQUALITY

The concept of equality is dynamic one and has kept on changing according to times. Accordingly different scholars have suggested different dimensions or kinds of equality.

Laski mentions only two kinds of equality, political and economic. Lord Bryce refers to four kinds of equality - civil, political, social and natural.

1. Civil Equality

Civil equality implies equality of all before law. All citizens irrespective of their status and position should be treated at par and no distinction should be made on the basis of caste, creed, sex, political opinion, social status, place of birth, etc. The laws of the state should be passed for the benefit of all and should not be used as instrument for the promotion of interest of a particular section of population. Equal rights should be available to all the persons and nobody should be denied enjoyment of any right.

2. Political Equality

Political equality means that all the citizens have the right to participate in the affairs of the state without any discrimination on grounds of caste, colour, creed, sex, etc. All the avenues of authority should be open equally to all the citizens and they should enjoy right to vote, right to contest election, right to criticize the government, right to hold public office, etc. The doctrine of political equality is based on twin principles of universal adult franchise and human dignity.

3. Social Equality

It assumes that there should not be any discrimination among various citizens on the basis of social status, colour, caste, creed, rank, etc. It is opposed to the grant of special privileges to any person on the basis of his social status or caste, religion, etc. It may be observed that social equality cannot be established through law alone. It can be achieved only through regulation of social habits and institutions. Education can also play a significant role in bringing social equality.

4. Economic Equality

In modern times scholars have attached great importance to economic equality and consider it as vital to the existence of other types of equality. Economic equality does not imply that there should be equal distribution of wealth. On the other hand it means that there should not be concentration of wealth in few hands only and certain minimum standards of income should be assured to all.

5. Natural Equality

The concept of natural equality rests on the principle that nature has created every one as equal. Nature has not bestowed all human beings with the same qualities. Interpreted in this sense the idea of natural equality is a myth.

6. Legal Equality

Here equality means that all people are alike in the eye of the law and that they are entitled for its equal protection. Thus the principle of equality implies equal protection of life and liberty for everyone under the law, and equal penalties on everyone violating them. In a strictly technical sense, the principle of equality implies equal protection of law to all denying discrimination on any artificial ground whatsoever. Viewed in a wider perspective it also means justice at a low cost at the earliest practicable time so that everyone irrespective of his social or economic status may get it according to the established procedure of the land.

7. International Equality

It means the extension of the principle of equality to the international sphere. All nations of the world should be treated equally irrespective of their demographic, geographical, economic or military compositions. That is the principle of internationalism requires that all nations of the world should be treated on identical terms whether they are big or small in terms of their size, location, natural resources, wealth, military potential and the like. It also implies that international disputes should be settled through pacific means in which every nation has right to discuss matters in a free and frank manner and that the use of force, or a threat of this type, is ruled out from consideration.

3.2.9 RELATION BETWEEN LIBERTY AND EQUALITY

The relation between equality and liberty has been one of the interesting controversies of liberalism. The root of the controversy is: Are liberty and equality opposed to each other or are they complimentary to each other? In the modern constitutions, we find a frequent association of both liberty and equality in the list of fundamental rights. But they have not always been the same.

Liberty and Equality As Opposed to Each Other

That liberty and equality are opposed to each other has been an important current of early liberalism. Classical liberalism gave so much importance to liberty that equality became a slave of it. It believed that liberty is natural and so is equality. So by nature liberty and equality are opposed to each other. Early liberal thinkers like Locke, Adam Smith, Bentham, James Mill, and Tocqueville felt that there should be minimum restrictions on the liberty of the individual. For example, Locke did not include equality in the list of three natural rights. Similarly, men like Lord Acton and Alexis de Tocqueville insisted that equality and liberty were anti-thetical. They argued that the desire for equality has destroyed the possibility of having liberty. Liberalism, during this era was based upon the concept of free market and open competition among the egoistic rational individuals and it believed that the outcome of economic competition, though unequal, is benevolent and progressive. This legitimisation of inequality had a strong emphasis on and commitment to the doctrine of individualism. At the political level, it asserted that there is a necessary contradiction between liberty and equality. Just as liberty is associated with the individual, equality is concerned with social intervention.

Thus, any attempt to remove inequality involves considerable social and political intervention to equalise conditions and to remove existing privileges. However, this intervention must interfere with the individual and his private exercise of freedom. Early liberals believed that no individual will voluntarily give up wealth and privileges in an unequal society and as a result, programmes of social equalisation must interfere with the democratic rights of the individual. Only the individual is fully able to know and express his peculiar needs and interests; it is inappropriate for the state or some other body to interfere in the life and liberty of private citizens. Liberty, choice and money were closely related in early liberalism. The wealth of the rich also constituted their liberty and being coerced to part away with their wealth meant a double encroachment on their freedom.

Equality and Liberty Are Complimentary To Each Other

The demand for economic and social equality raised in the 19th century by the socialists and positive liberals made equality the prime requirement of liberty. Positive liberals

maintained that liberty and equality are complementary to each other and the state was assigned the task of correcting the social and economic imbalances through legislation and regulation. The supporters of this viewpoint are Rousseau, Maitland, T.H. Green, Hobhouse, Lindsay, R.H. Tawney, Barker, Laski, Macpherson, etc. Positive liberalism saw the individual as a social being whose personal desires could be satisfied in the context of a cooperative social relationship within a social environment. It interpreted liberty as 'equality of opportunity' which means that opportunity should be given to everyone to realise the 'implication of his personality'. To provide such opportunity, deliberate social restraints need to be placed upon individual freedom.

Without the satisfaction of economic needs, liberty cannot be realised. In a society of economic unequals, gross inequalities make liberty the privilege of a few. As Laski wrote, an interest in liberty begins when men have ceased to be overwhelmed by the problem of sheer existence; it is when they have a chance of leisure, economic sufficiency and leisure for thought, these are primary conditions of free man. Equality, which aims to put an end to gross inequalities of wealth and power, is the true basis of liberty. Whenever there is inequality, liberty is thwarted. To quote Tawney again, 'A large measure of equality far from inimical to liberty, is essential to it. A society, which permits gross inequalities, cannot secure political or civil liberty. Where there are rich and poor, educated and uneducated, we find masters and servants'. Inequality of wealth results in the division of society between rich and poor where the rich use their wealth to capture power and use it for their selfish ends. Likewise, if there is a social inequality, people cannot enjoy liberty. For example, the untouchables, scheduled castes and tribes who are both socially and economically unequal cannot enjoy liberty. Similarly, equality in justice is a primary condition for the attainment of civil freedom, but the inability of the poor to employ skilful lawyers becomes a fatal bar to get justice. Thus, as Pollard writes, 'There is only one solution of liberty and it lies in equality. Liberty without equality can degenerate into a license of the few.'

Check Your Progress II

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers .Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1) Explain the meaning of equality??

- 2) . Discuss different dimensions of equality?

- 3) Explain the relation of equality with liberty?

3.2.10 LET US SUM UP

Equality is a value and a principle essentially modern and progressive. It is related to the whole process of modernisation in the form of political egalitarianism. It is also

taken as a criterion for radical social change. It is related to the development of democratic politics. Equality can be understood only in the context of prevailing inequalities. All human societies are characterised by some form of social inequalities of class, status, power and gender. Talking about equality, while Laski associated it with the absence of hereditary privileges, availability of opportunities and universal access to socio-economic benefits, Bryan S. Turner has gone a step forward and talks of equality in terms of availability of opportunities, equality of conditions and equality of outcome or results.

3.2.11 EXERCISES

1. How does the concept of liberty relate to the provision and enforcement of rights in a society?
2. In what ways does the principle of equality challenge the existence of special privileges in modern democratic societies?
3. How do the perspectives of negative liberty differ from those of positive liberty in terms of state intervention and individual freedom?
4. Why is political equality considered a cornerstone of democratic politics, and how does it manifest through specific rights like voting and holding public office?
5. How do early liberal thinkers' views on the opposition between liberty and equality contrast with the perspective that liberty and equality are complementary?
- 6.

3.2.12 SUGGESTED READINGS

Laski, Harold J., *Liberty in the Modern State*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.

Laski, Harold J. *The State in Theory and Practice*, London: George Allen & Unwin, 1961.

Lipset, Seymour Martin, (ed.), *Politics and the Social Sciences*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1969.

Lucas, J.R., *The Principles of Politics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967. Miller,

David, (ed.), *Liberty*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Plamenatz, John, *Democracy and Illusion*, London: Longman, 1978.

Gianfranco, Poggi, *The State-Its Nature, Development and Prospects*,
Cambridge.

3.3 POWER, AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

Prof. Vidya Bhushan

STRUCTURE

3.3.0 OBJECTIVES

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.3.2 POWER

3.3.3 Meaning

3.3.4 Characteristics of Power

3.3.5 Dimensions of Power

3.3.6 AUTHORITY

3.3.7 Meaning

3.3.8 Characteristics of Authority

3.3.9 Power V/s Authority

3.3.10 Max weber Classification

3.3.11 De-jure & De-facto Authority

3.3.12 Justification/Criticism-Debate

3.3.13 LEGITIMACY

3.3.14 Meaning

3.3.15 Controversy surrounds the concept of legitimacy

3.3.16 Means used for Legitimation Process

3.3.17 Relationship between Authority & Legitimacy

3.3.18 LET US SUM UP

3.3.19 EXERCISES

3.3.20 SUGGESTED READINGS

3.3.0 OBJECTIVES

This unit deals with one of the most important concepts used in Political Science namely “power”. It is a pivot of all political activities. After going through this unit you should be able to understand :

- The concept “power” and able to identify its use.
- The main characteristics of Power and its dimensions
- The main Characteristics of authority
- The De-jure and De-facto authority
- The relationship between Authority and Legitimacy.

3.3.1 INTRODUCTION

Power, authority, legitimacy are some of the key concepts in the study of politics. Each possesses a distinct meaning and implication for both the process as well as the study of politics. These terms, however, have been used interchangeably for so long that the differences between them tend to get blurred. It is only recently that political science has made a serious attempt to analyse these concepts in a proper perspective.

3.3.2 POWER

The concept “power” is as old as the discipline of Political Science. It was discussed by Plato and Aristotle – the fathers of Political Science – in general. Hobbes and Machiavelli, however, gave it a realistic touch. In fact there is no political thinker who has either directly or indirectly not discussed about “power”. MacIver has rightly said that “every thing that is happening around us in one way or the other is concerned with “power”. “Power” is, therefore, key concept in the study of politics. It is the pivot of all political activities. Recently, the idea of political “power” has assumed more significance in the context of rising conflicts in the community and the need for their resolution. Since every political institution brings some kind “power” within it, the people, therefore, wish to get as much involved in politics as possibly, they can. That is why political theorists – ancient and contemporary – are mainly concerned with “power” relations within a given community.

3.3.3 MEANING

The concept “power” cannot be easily defined in very precise terms. “Power” is a term with a very wide meaning. Different political thinkers have given different views about it. This term is, therefore, too diffuse and ambiguous and its meaning is elusive and complex. The word “power” is however, derived from certain Latin and French words which mean “to be able”. “Power” means one’s ability to control others’ actions. Power said to denote man’s control over the minds and actions of others. Some of the writers prefer to make power denote the existence of an ability or a capacity to control rather than the existence of actual control. They are of the view that “power” is the capacity to affect others without being as much affected.

According to Edward Shils “power is ability to influence the behaviour of others in accordance with its own ends.” In politics, power is exercised when one person is able to control or decisively influence another. Bertrand Russell takes power “as the capacity to influence the action of others”. According to MacIver “...power we mean the capacity to centralize, regulate or direct the behaviour of persons or things.” R H Tawney says that “power” is the capacity of an individual or group of individuals to modify the conduct of other individuals or groups in the manner which he desires.” According to Goldhiner and Shills “A person may be said to have power to the extent that he influences the behaviour of others, in accordance with his intention. Hans Morgenthau is of the view that the main aim of “power” is to establish control over the people and to continue that. Schwanzerberger

defines “power is the capacity to impose one’s will on others by reliance of effective sanctions for non-compliance.”

According to Lasswell “political power is the capacity to influence another’s behaviour by the threat of some form of sanctions.” According to Goldhiner and Shills “A person may be said to have power to the extent he influences the behaviour of other, in accordance with his intention.” Eric Rowe says, “power like authority is a means of favourably affecting the behaviour of another but by might or right. The possessors of power use force to improve their wills. Political power is, thus, the capacity to affect another’s behaviour by the threat of some form of sanction. The greater the sanctions or the numerous the sanctions, the greater will be political power.

Allan R. Ball is of the view that “power is a certain kind of human relationship. It is a relation which exists between individuals. It exists not only between individuals who have to deal with each other or some in contact directly, as between a worker in an office and his superior. It can also exist between people who do not know each other directly. For example bureaucrats whom I do not know or probably will never know in my life, have control over my life, and exercise power over me. What we call power is therefore, the effect of this relation”.

3.3.4 CHARACTERISTICS OF POWER

Following are the main characteristics of “power”:

1. ***Ability to influence the behaviour of others:*** “power” is the ability to influence the behaviour, functions and the policies of others. The very existence of “power” is impossible without the presence of such capacity and ability.
2. ***Power is certain kind of human relationship :*** Power does not exist in vacuum. When an individual influences other individuals, he in reality establishes a certain kind of relationship. Lasswell also believes that power is an interpersonal relationship.
3. ***Power depends on its use:*** Power depends on its use. The individual who uses his power practically is considered to be powerful.
4. ***Power supported by sanctions:*** Power must be supported by sanctions. It is

essential for power. An individual possessing power can get his work done forcibly. If need be he can impose sanctions or severely deprive those who do not obey.

5. ***Power is situational and status:*** Power depends upon situation and status. For example power of a Prime Minister and a President of a republic ends along with the termination of their tenures.

6. ***Power used for the attainment of goal:*** Power is used for the attainment of some goal. If the power is used without any purpose or goal, it would be ineffective and useless.

7. ***Power is relative:*** The power of the holder depends upon number of individual work in opposition. The power of an individual and communities is influenced by power of the other individual and communities.

8. ***Power has two aspects – Actual and Potential:*** Actual power means that power which an individual or a community uses actually. Whereas potential power stands for that power which an individual or a community can use, though it may not be used in that situation.

Check Your Progress I

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. How do you understand the meaning of power ?

2. What are the major characteristics of the Power ?

3.3.5 DIMENSIONS OF POWER

1 POLITICAL DIMENSIONS OF POWER

As the meaning of politics has changed recently from one of being a study of state and government to that of being a study of “power”, the idea of power has assumed an importance in the realm of contemporary political theory. Micheal Curtis has, therefore, rightly said “politics is organised dispute about ‘power’ and its use, involving choice among competing values, ideas, persons, interests and demands. The study of politics is, thus, concern with the description and analyses of the manner in which ‘power’ is obtained, exercised and controlled...”. Lasswell and Kaplan have, therefore rightly said, “power is fundamental to political science.” William A Robson has declared, “it is with ‘power’ in society that political science is primarily concerned its nature, basis, processes, scope and results.” Frederik Watkins said, “the proper scope of political science is not the study of the state or any other specific institutional complex, but the investigation and all associations complex, but the investigation and all associations in so far as they can be shown to exemplify the problem of ‘power’”. The focus of an interests of the political scientists is clear and unambiguous. It centres on the struggle to gain or retain “power”, to exercise power or influence on others or to resist that exercise.

In simples words “power” means the power of the government. The state through its agency – the government – exercises control over the individuals and associations within its territorial limits. According to E P Allens, “Political power is evidenced by the ability of those who control the instruments of governments to secure obedience to their decisions.”

History has, however, witnessed fierce struggle for the control over political power at different times. The long history, therefore, proves that obtaining political power has been

the key issue in politics.

2 ECONOMIC DIMENSION OF POWER

Economic power is the material power. It can also be called the power of wealth. According to Marxists writers, “the political power has always remained in the hands of possessing class and the possessing class has always exercised political power for its own benefits.

Good economic status or wealth is one of the important sources of power. An individual, with the help of money can manage to have essential conveniences and to attain power. A rich individual can pressurise high officials. In other words an individual, ambitious to attain power, always tries to amass wealth. Robert A Dahl has rightly said, “other thing being equal, it is right to expect that an individual with better resources will capture more power.”

Power is, therefore, treated as an instrument that connects economics with politics. Marx says, “property ownership involves control of production as well as political control. Political power generates economic power in the same way as economic power generates political. Hence economic status or wealth and political power are closely connected with each other. One cannot remain without other and vice versa. There is no denying of fact that economic power has affected and subjugated the political power”. Durverger, rightly pointed out, “today money is still the strongest political power.” This is also true in all democracies where political power is slave to the economic power. The economic power also governs the political power. The modern state has turned into welfare state in which the economic system is highly regulated and controlled by the political power. But with the rise and development of political consciousness, the political power has turned economics and the political power is not exclusively the domain of holders of economic power.

3 IDEOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS OF POWER

Ideology, which generally means the deep-rooted convictions and widely shared ideas of the people, has become the key feature of our political world. It is one of the important instruments to gain political power and to retain it. If politics is struggle for power,

ideology motivates the people to take part in this struggle. Ideology has, therefore, become an instrument whereby leaders motivate people to take part in political actions and to accord legitimacy to their political system. Thus ideological power becomes an instrument for the justification of political power.

It has also become an instrument to beat the opponents. As a matter of fact, it is the war of ideas that contributes to the struggle for power in contemporary politics. In short, ideology i.e. Liberalism, Conservatism, Democracy, Nationalism, Fascism, Socialism, Communism, Marxism, Neo-Marxism, Totalitarianism, Nazism and the like do play a major role in the struggle for power and to maintain and retain power.

Since, the objective of ideologies the overall progress of mankind, Ashim Gill says “different ideologies have devised different means to achieve this end and no one ideology is or can be absolutely applicable and relevant to all times, places and circumstances.” No one can stop the march of idea or ideology whose time has come. And ideas that are out of time with ground reality are bound to die.

Throughout history, ideologies have been divided between two opposite camps – the liberals and authoritarian, the radicals and conservatives, the capitalists and communists; the State and the Church; the socialists and fundamentalists; the upper classes and lower classes. They coexist and maintain equilibrium. The dominant ideologies of modern age have been democracy and communism. The Marxists believe “the origin of ideology lay in materialist base of the society”.

Ideological power is, therefore, closely related to political and economic power. Ideas have been crucial to politics and have been responsible for political changes. The political power for its own safety also propagates and protects the ideologies. A large part of ideology contains economics.

In short, political, economic, and ideological powers are inseparable parts of one whole with the objective of maintaining or changing a particular system.

Check Your Progress II

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answers . Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. How do understand political, economic and ideological dimensions of power?

2. Describe the Laswell views on Power?

3.3.6 AUTHORITY

Use the space given below for your answers Politics is basically concerned with power. But in political life, power is not exercised merely in the form of a control or domination that forces one person to obey another, rather it is exercised through the acceptance and willing obedience of the public. This clearly highlights the distinction between power (as a coercive concept) and authority (as a rightful exercise of power) which brings us to the question of the factor that transforms power into authority, and the basis of the rightful exercise of authority. This finally leads to the question of legitimacy – the perception that power is exercised in a manner that is rightful, justified or acceptable.

3.3.7 MEANING

The term authority is derived from the old Roman notion of “auctor” or “auctorites” which meant counsel or advice. The Roman Senate comprised of “men of reason” and “elders with experience” performed the function of approving or rejecting the decisions of the popular assembly in accordance with tradition and religious or moral values. Decisions or legislations thus confirmed by the Senate acquired “auctoritas” which meant augmentation. Authority is, thus, the embodiment of reason and depends (as defined by Carl Friedrich) on “the capacity of reasoned elaboration”. In other words, a person who

exercises authority has the capacity to give reasons for his decisions. Authority regulates behaviour, not by force, but mainly by speech and words.

Aristotle referred to human beings as “rule following animals” who regulate their own behaviour and that of others by means of framing rules. This in turn implies a general acceptance of rules that lay down as to who is to make rules/laws and give decisions regarding their application to real situations and cases. Authority, therefore, has two implications viz. someone with a capacity to reason elaboration conferred with the right to issue regulations and make binding pronouncements on the one hand, on the other it implies that someone also has the right to receive obedience. Thus, authority is based on a perceived “right to rule” and brings about compliance through moral obligation on part of the ruled to obey.

In other words, authority can be defined as a power that is properly or duly legitimised. It is a right of a person to influence the behaviour of another. It is a way of getting things done without any opposition. In fine, one can say that authority is power cloaked in legitimacy or rightfulness.

3.3.8 CHARACTERISTICS OF AUTHORITY

a) Moral Characters

Authority as pointed out earlier, is based upon a perceived ‘right to rule’ and brings about compliance through a moral obligation on the part of the ruled to obey. In other words, authority is obeyed because people feel morally obliged to do so on the basis of the belief that existing political institutions and authority are the most appropriate for the society at large. Authority, it has been agreed upon by philosophers despite serious differences, has a moral basis and character. This implies that it is not so important that authority is actually being obeyed than the perception that it ‘should be’ obeyed.

b) Emphasise Value Pattern of Society

Authority finds its support and base in the belief pattern of society. Usually people have a tendency to obey that authority willingly which is very much in tune with their own value pattern. For example, after independence, India adopted democratic structure in which people got the right to freedom of thought and expression. Authority in this structure linked

with democracy. So whenever there is some attempt to overthrow democracy as in the case of Indira Gandhi's authoritarian rule during emergency, people resent it. They always prefer democratic culture as it suits to their value pattern.

c) Obedience Based on Reason

There is a very close link between reason and authority. Authority is based on understanding that those who rule have a right to do so. Such a use of authority gets obedience very easily. Authority, therefore, is different from power. People obey those who are in power because power leads to persuasion, pressure, threats, coercion or violence. But authority, on the other hand does not involve such forceful use of power. People obey those who are in authority because they think it is a rightful exercise of power.

d) Not power per se but accompanies power

At times authority has been defined as a particular kind of power as 'formal power' or rightful power. But truly speaking, authority is not a kind of power. It is something that accompanies power. Carl J. Friedrich points out that it is quality in man and things, which enhance their power, something which creates power but is not itself a power. Power unaccompanied by authority is nothing but high-handedness.

e) Sociological concept

Some theorists treat authority as a mere sociological concept and emphasise that it differs from power only in degree. Thus whether someone is in authority or not can't be established by mere observation of his success in getting his way. On the whole, the authority is distinctive and forthright. It always expresses itself in categorical or imperative terms.

3.3.9 POWER VS AUTHORITY

There is a very thin line between power and authority. Although the concept can be distinguished analytically, yet the exercise of power and exercise of authority usually overlap. Generally Power involves the operation of at least a limited form of authority, on the other, authority is seldom exercised in the absence of power. That might be the reason that in totalitarians regimes, freedom of individuals and their movements is limited by the

commands of the authorities having a power content in it. Modern political theorists distinguish between power and authority by illustrating the way the obedience is secured. Exercise of authority is a product of rules whereas the power involves the ability to either reward or punish another. This can be seen in the activities of pressure groups. Although pressure groups may seek to influence the political process through persuasion and argument, they also exercise power by making financial contributions to political parties or candidates, threatening strike action, holding marches and demonstrations and so on. Coercion can be regarded as antithesis of authority when government exercises authority, it forces to comply it and then the concept of power takes over.

Power and authority are distinguishable from one another mainly on the basis of the means through which compliance or obedience is achieved. Power brings about compliance through persuasion, pressure, threats, violence or coercion. Compliance to authority is secured through moral obligation by those ruled. Thus, whereas power implies the ability to influence the behaviour of others, authority implies the right to do so. Similarly, power implies force or coercion, authority implies acceptance and willing obedience by the masses. In other words, authority may be expressed as the sum total of power plus legitimacy.

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. How do you view the relationship between power and authority ?

2. What are the different characteristics of authority ?

3.3.10 MAX WEBER'S CLASSIFICATION

A distinct notion of authority is derived from the writings of German sociologist Max Weber. He was concerned to explain why and under what circumstances people were prepared to accept the exercise of power as legitimate i.e., authority. In fact, he defined authority simply as a matter of people's belief about its rightfulness regardless of where that belief came from and whether or not it is morally justified. According to him, a government that is obeyed can be seen to exercise authority, it is of nobody's concern whether obedience may have been brought about by systematic indoctrination and propaganda. In order to understand the complex nature of political rule, he constructed three 'ideal-types' claiming to exercise powers on different basis. There are:

1. Traditional Authority
2. Charismatic Authority
3. Legal-Rational Authority

1. Traditional Authority

Traditional Authority is the right to rule resulting from the continuous exerciser of political power. Hereditary ruling families fit into this category. Though this category of authority has become redundant in modern industrial societies where people believe in democratic government and equal opportunities, yet the vestiges of traditional authority can be found in the survival of the institution of monarchy even in advanced industrial societies such as Britain, Belgium, Netherland and Spain and in institutions such as British House of Lords which still respects the hereditary principle. According to Weber, traditional authority is regarded as legitimate because it has always existed and accepted by the earlier generations. This form of authority is sanctified by history and is based upon immemorial customs. Such type of authority perpetuates hierarchical system which allocates a particular status to each person in the society. In civil society, the most obvious example of traditional authority is found in a family in the form of patriarchalism in which the domination of father persists.

2. Charismatic Authority

Charismatic authority results from the exceptional personal characteristics of the political leaders. It has nothing to do with a person's status, social position or office. Everything is determined by his or her personal qualities and in particular the ability to make a direct and personal appeal to others. This type of authority has always been there in political life because all forms of leadership require the ability to communicate and the capacity to inspire loyalty. In some cases, political leadership is constructed almost entirely on the basis of Charismatic authority. For example, during his hey days, N. T. Rama Rao, Ex- Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh declared himself as incarnation of God in public meetings and was successful to some extent in mobilising the masses in his favour through his charismatic personality. Often such type of authority is looked with suspicion. It is argued that it creates an image spectre of total powers as it is based upon the personality of individual and not confirmed by any rules or procedures. This form of authority may be less crucial in liberal democratic regions where the powers of the leaders are constitutionally defined but its significance can't be defined altogether in contemporary era.

3. Legal Rational Authority

According to Max Weber, this type of authority is more relevant in modern democratic societies. Here the authority emanates from the political office the individual holds, not from the individual who holds the office. The Indian Prime Minister is obeyed not because of the particular individual holding that office, but because he is the Prime Minister of India. The emphasis, here, is on the acceptance of constitutional rule. In legal rational authority, power is clearly and legally defined to ensure those who exercise power do so within particular framework of law. The darker side of such kind of authority is that it gives way to de- personalisation and inhuman social environment by the relentless spread of bureaucratic forms of organisations.

Weber is of the belief that none of these categories existed in pure form. While the British political system provides an example of a mixture of traditional and legal rational sources of authority on the other, American Presidential Form often combines a charismatic authority with the legal-rational one.

3.3.11 DE-JURE AND DE-FACTO AUTHORITY

An alternative means of identifying kinds of authority is the distinction between de-jure authority [Authority is Law] and de-facto authority [authority is practice]. De-jure authority operates according to a set of procedures or rules which designate who possesses authority and over what issues. For example, anyone described as being in authority can be said to possess de-jure authority. Both the traditional and legal rational authority defined by Weber come in the category of *de jure* authority. There are also occasions when the authority is exercised actually but can't be traced back to a set of procedural rules. This type of authority can be called de-facto authority. All forms of charismatic authority fall in such kind of authority. To illustrate this point, it can be said that President of India exercises de- jure authority as it is written in the constitution. But de-facto authority is exercised by Prime Minister who plays actual role in the political process.

3.3.12 JUSTIFICATION/CRITICISM-DEBATE

The issue of authority has been highly controversial in the late 20th century. One group of theorists regard that it has become redundant and they measure authority purely in negative terms. They are of the view that the concept became outdated due to the emergence of modern industrial societies. On the other hand, there is a group which strongly emphasise the importance of authority and defend it. They argue that it is the erosion of authority in public and private sphere that led to the disorder, instability and social breakdown.

There exists a ambivalent attitude towards the authority. During 17th and 18th Centuries social contract theorists provided a classic justification for authority. They argued that without an established system of authority, society would be called a 'state of nature', where barbarity and injustice rules. Here individuals fight against other to achieve their various ends as authority is missing in such regimes. This trend has been inherited by many liberal theorists. They also tried to defend authority as it establishes order and stability. It also protects individual's liberty from the encroachments of fellow citizens. Liberals emphasise the fact that 'authority arises from below'. It is based upon the consent of the people. At the same time authority necessarily constraints liberty and has the capacity to

become a tyranny against the individual. As a result liberals insist that authority be limited.

They prefer legal rational authority that operates within clearly defined legal constitutional boundaries.

A different attitude to authority has been adopted by conservative thinkers. In their view, authority is seldom based on consent. Rather it arises out of the 'natural necessity'. This way authority is regarded as essential feature of all social institutions.

It has also been argued by theorists that decline in authority paves the way for totalitarian rule in the society. Hanna Arendt in *The Origins of Totalitarianism* (1951) suggested that erosion of traditional values and hierarchical structure was one factor which gave rise to totalitarian regimes. She made a distinction between the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. In authoritarian societies, though the civil liberties are suppressed to a great extent but a considerable degree of individual freedom is permitted at least in the realm of economic, social and cultural life. But in totalitarian regimes individual freedom is completely suppressed because it controls every aspect of human existence and establishes 'total power' in the society.

Authority has also been organised as threat to reason and critical understanding. People surrender to the person in authority without questioning. This vitiates the environment of democratic culture which encourages respect to differences of opinions. Authority also asks for an uncritical trust in the judgement of others and an abdication of responsibility. Such tendencies have been highlighted by psychological studies which have linked the exercise of authority to the development of authoritarian character.

Check Your Progress IV

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Describe Weber's classificatory model regarding authority ?

-
2. What is the difference between de-jure authority and de-facto authority ?

3. Why the issue of authority has become controversial in late 20th century ?

3.3.13 LEGITIMACY

Legitimacy is an essential element that determines the stability of a democratic or popular political system. S M Lipset has defined it as “the capacity to produce and maintain a belief that the existing political institutions or force, are the most appropriate for society.” Legitimacy is the foundation of political power in as much as it “is exercised with a consciousness on the government part that it has a right to govern and with some recognition by the governed of that right.”

3.3.14 MEANING

The term legitimacy has been derived from the Latin word ‘Legitimare’ which means to

declare lawful. Broadly it means rightfulness. Legitimacy confers on an order or command an authoritative or binding character ensuring that it is obeyed out of duty rather than fear. It is a quality that transforms naked power into rightful authority. It addresses the question as to why people should obey the state. It addresses also the question as to why they do obey a particular state or system of rule. What are the conditions or processes that encourage them to see authority as rightful. All this process reflects a shift from philosophy to sociology. It also highlights controversial nature of the concept of legitimacy. The issue of legitimacy is of vital importance in the political sphere because it is necessary to know as to when and on what grounds government can command legitimacy. Because, in the absence of legitimacy, fear, intimidation and violence can only sustain government which is not a characteristic of contemporary democratic societies.

David E. Apter defines legitimacy as being “related to a set of conceptions held by significant members of the polity about the rightness of a political pattern.... Legitimacy is thus a behavioural term referring a set of limits on governmental action ... When legitimacy is withdrawn, government is weakened.” Then, legitimacy is the vital element that accords acceptance and hereby stability to a political system, regime or government. Rousseau quite eloquently brought out the essence and significance of legitimacy in ‘the social contract’ when he wrote that “the strongest is never strong enough to be always the master unless they transforms strength into right and obedience into duty”.

3.3.15 CONTROVERSY SURROUNDING THE CONCEPT OF LEGITIMACY

According to a standard classification made by Max Weber, there are essentially three ways through which an authority system may gain legitimacy. This is through tradition, through Rational-Legal definition and through charismatic appeal. He took legitimacy, as belief in the right to rule. He was of the view that a system of rule can only be described as legitimate if people are prepared to comply.

Most political philosophers gave moral or rational basis for authority and offer an objective difference between legitimate and illegitimate forms of rule. For Instance, Aristotle argued that rule was legitimate only when it operated to the benefit of the whole society rather than in the selfish interests of the rulers. While Rousseau argued that government was legitimate if it was based upon the ‘General Will’. Hobbes

emphasised the absolute powers of the monarch as legitimate. In the 20th century David Beetham in his work, *The Legitimation of Power* (1991) gave a social scientific concept of Legitimacy. He proposed that power can only be said to be legitimate if three conditions are fulfilled. First, power must be exercised according to the established rules. Second, these rules must be justified in terms of the shared beliefs of the government and the governed. Third, legitimacy must be demonstrated by the expression of consent on the part of the governed.

3.3.16 MEANS USED FOR LEGITIMISATION PROCESS

a) Consent

Although many different kinds of political systems can acquire legitimacy, democracies may be more in need of it than most other systems. Liberal democracy is often portrayed as the only stable and enduringly successful form of governments. It is argued that it contains the means of its own preservation. Democracy cannot be forced on a group of people against their will. Rather it is exercised in accordance with the values, wishes, preferences and intents of the general public. Government attains legitimacy if it responds to popular pressure. Many forms of political rule have sought legitimacy expression of popular consent. This applies even in the case of Fascist dictatorships like Mussolini's Italy and Nazi Germany where considerable effort was put into mobilising mass support for the regime by arranging plebiscites, rallies, marches, demonstrations and so on. In liberal democratic regimes of present, political participation in the form of voting for a particular party is the active expression of consent. Thus from this perspective, liberal democracies maintain legitimacy through willingness to share power with general public.

b) Constitutionalism

In simple words, a constitution can be understood as rules which govern the government. It is through the constitutional arrangement that powers, duties, and functions are allocated to the various institutions of the government. It also defines the relationship between individuals and the state. It introduces a system of checks and balances so that the government can't become arbitrary anytime. Constitutions confer legitimacy upon a regime by making a government. Therefore constitutional governments exercise legal rational

authority: their powers are authorised by constitutional law. Constitutions do not merely confer legitimacy, they are themselves bodies of rules which are subject to questions of legitimacy. Government power is legitimate if it is exercised in accordance with rules that are reasonable and acceptable in the eyes of the governed.

c) Ideological Manipulation

Radicals and Marxists adopted a more critical approach to the legitimisation process, one which emphasises the degree to which legitimacy is produced by ideological indoctrination. Usually, ideological control is used to maintain stability and build legitimacy. Ideological control reflects its capacity to manipulate human needs by using brains. The clearest examples of ideological manipulations are found in totalitarian regimes which propagate an official ideology and ruthlessly suppress all rival creeds, doctrines and beliefs. The means through which this is achieved are clear. As Althusser put it 'Ideological state Apparatuses' in the form of family, education, religion and mass media education is often reduced to the process of ideological indoctrination. The mass media is turned into a propaganda machine, and political opposition is clearly stamped out etc.

3.3.17 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN AUTHORITY AND LEGITIMACY

Authority and Legitimacy cannot be separated from each other completely. One resides in another though there is a thin line between Authority and legitimacy. Authority is mainly concerned with the rational use of power, whereas legitimacy is related to the acceptance of the rational by the people. Legitimate power or influence is generally called authority. In other words, authority can be treated as a legitimated influence. According to one usage of the term, a government or a political system is said to be legitimate if the people to whom its orders are directed believe that the structure, procedures, acts, decisions, policies, officials, or leaders of government possess authority or quality of righteousness. In fact, legitimacy is a control point for analysing the concepts of power, influence and authority which are inextricably and intimately related to each other. In the absence of legitimacy, exercise of power and authority can be considered as a forced compulsion or coercion.

Check Your Progress IV

Note : Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. How do you define the concept of legitimacy as a philosophical concept or a sociological concept?

2. What are means used for legitimisation process in the governance?

3.3.18 LET US SUM UP

The issue of authority and legitimacy has become contentious in the contemporary society. Weber distinguished between three kinds of authority based on different grounds upon which obedience can be sought: traditional authority which is rooted in history; charismatic authority that stems from personality; and legal rational authority grounded in a set of impersonal rules. These types of authority fit in either de-jure authority or in the sphere of de-facto authority. The relationship between authority and legitimacy can better be explained in the words of Andrew Heywood who defines the terms as ‘authority is power cloaked in legitimacy’.

3.3.19 EXERCISES

1. What is the key distinction between power and authority in the context of political science, and how do they interact in a political system?
2. How do the political, economic, and ideological dimensions of power contribute to the functioning of a modern state?
3. What are the main characteristics of authority, and how do they differ from the characteristics of power?

4. According to Max Weber, what are the three types of authority, and how do they differ in their basis for legitimacy?
5. Why is legitimacy considered essential for the stability of a democratic political system, and what are the primary means through which it is achieved?

3.3.20 SUGGESTED READINGS

Almond, G. and Verba, S., *The Civil Culture Revisited*, Princeton, : Princeton University Press, 1980.

Apter, David. E, *The Politics of Modernisation*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1965.

Ball, Alan R, *Modern Politics and Government*, Hong Kong: Macmillan Publishers Ltd., 1985.

Beetham, D, *The Legitimation of Power*, Cambridge Macmillan and Atlantic Highlands, N.J. Humanities Press, 1991.

Doctor, Adi. H, *Issues in Political Theory*, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1985.

Johri, J.C. *Contemporary Political Theory*, New Delhi: Sterling publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1999.

Lipset, S.M, *Political Man: The Social Bases of Politics*, New York, Doubleday, 1959.

Sternberger, Dolf, *Legitimacy in International Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, edited by David. I. Sills, New York: Macmillan and Free Press, 1969.

3.4 DEMOCRACY: MEANING, EVOLUTION AND TYPES

Diwakar Singh Jamwal

STRUCTURE

3.4.0. OBJECTIVES

3.4.1. INTRODUCTION

3.4.2. DEMOCRACY

3.4.3. Meaning

3.4.4. Evolution of Democracy

3.4.5. Procedural and Substantive Democracy

3.4.6. Types of Democracy

3.4.7 LET US SUM UP

3.4.8 EXERCISES

3.4.9 SUGGESTED READINGS

3.4.0 OBJECTIVES

- To understand the meaning and nature of democracy.
- To explain the evolution and growth of democracy.
- To know the different types of democracy.

- To discuss the various conceptions of democracy.

3.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Democracy is a form of government in which all people have an equal say in the decisions that affect their lives. Ideally, this includes equal (and more or less direct) participation in the proposal, development and passage of legislation into law. It can also encompass social, economic and cultural conditions that enable the free and equal practice of political self determination. Also, democracy in the modern world is quite different from democracy as it was practised in ancient Greece 2500 years ago. The democratic ideas and practice with which we are here concerned belong to the modern world.

3.4.2 DEMOCRACY

Democracy implies that form of government in which the sovereign power of the state is vested in the people as a whole and the government derives its ultimate authority from them. People are the ultimate source of the state power and they take part in the government directly or through their representatives so that public policy is made to conform to the will of the people in order to achieve the common welfare of the people.

3.4.3 MEANING

The word democracy itself is of Greek origin. The Greek word *demokratia* is a combination of two words *demos* (meaning the people) and *kratos* (meaning rule). This gives democracy its meaning as a form of government which the people rule, whether directly through personal participation or indirectly, through elected representatives. The main difference between ancient and modern democracies, of course, is in the way in which 'the people' were defined. In the ancient Greek polity, the 'demos' was rather restrictively defined, and notably excluded three main categories of persons: the slaves, women, and metics (the foreigners who lived and worked in the city-state). This meant that barely a quarter of the total population were members of the citizen body. Nevertheless, the direct participation of a 40,000 strong citizen body was no mean achievement.

Democracy is considered by the larger majority of the people around the world as a superior form of government compared to other forms in the modern times. It may be noted here that democracy is based on freedom, equality and social justice. The citizens in a democracy enjoy certain basic civil, political and legal rights and freedoms. At the same time, a democratic government must create equal opportunities for all in the socioeconomic spheres. In other words, there should prevail social justice in a democracy whereby the vast inequalities of wealth are eliminated and distribution of wealth takes place in an equitable manner. In this context, democracy has been defined as a society based on equal opportunity and individual merit, rather than hierarchy and privilege. It has also been described as a system of welfare and redistribution aimed at narrowing social inequalities.

Definitions

According to the Greeks, Democracy is the Government in which people rule over themselves. Aristotle considered it as a perverted form of government.

According to President Abraham Lincoln, it is a government of the people, by the people and for the people.

According to Bryce, Democracy is that form of government in which the ruling power of the state is legally vested, not in any particular class or classes but in the members of the community as a whole.

Prof. Seeley says, Democracy is a form of government in which everybody has a share.

According to Dicey, Democracy is a form of government in which the governing body is comparatively large fraction of the entire nation

3.4.4 EVOLUTION OF DEMOCRACY

Democracy has been described as one of the 'characteristic institutions of modernity', and as such it was the result of a complex and intertwined processes of ideological, social and economic change. In Britain, this change was signalled by the Industrial Revolution that began in the middle of the eighteenth century, while in France and

America it was launched by the political revolutions in the last quarter of the same century.

Britain is regarded as the first modern democracy because, in the aftermath of the Civil War in the seventeenth century, royal absolutism was brought to an end, and powers were transferred from the crown to the two houses of parliament. Though the franchise continued to be highly restricted, based on ownership of property, control of the executive had effectively passed to a loose coalition of the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, such that political conflict was, hence forth, peacefully conducted between the competing elites. It was only in the nineteenth century that the expansion of suffrage took place, beginning with the enfranchisement of the upper middle classes in the Reform Act of 1832. This was followed by the gradual extension of the franchise to the working classes, largely as a response to the pressure of political struggles by the working-class and radical movements like Chartism. By the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and three Reform Acts later, about two-thirds of the male population stood enfranchised. It was, however, not until 1929 that women secured the right to vote, and universal adult suffrage was fully achieved only in 1948, when plural voting was abolished in favour of the principle of one-person one-vote.

In France, the more radical tradition of democracy was inaugurated by the Revolution of 1789, with its stirring call of Liberty-Equality-Fraternity, and its emphasis on the principle of popular sovereignty. The Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen proclaimed the rights of personal liberty, freedom of thought and religion, security of property and political equality as the natural and imprescriptible entitlements not merely of French citizens, but of 'mankind' at large. Initially, the revolutionary constitution of 1791 established something akin to universal male suffrage, and even the property requirement for the right to vote was low enough to exclude only domestic servants, vagrants and beggars. Thus, four million male citizens won the right to vote in 1791, but four years later, more restrictive property requirements were introduced, bringing down the number of voters to just 1 00,000 prosperous taxpayers. Universal male suffrage was reintroduced only after the revolution of 1848, and universal adult franchise only a century later in 1946, when women won the right to vote.

In the United States of America too, the advance of democracy in the aftermath of the Civil War restricted to white men, and the enfranchisement of women, as also of indigenous and black people has not achieved until the twentieth century. Nevertheless, the Declaration of

Independence (1776) was the document that simultaneously effected the legal creation of the United States of America, and that of democracy in that country. Though slavery continued to be practised until the mid-nineteenth century, the American Revolution did give the modern world its first modern democratic government and society. Hereditary power of monarchy and aristocracy alike were overthrown as a republican government, in which all citizens were at last notionally equal, was put in place. An important institutional mechanism of the separation of powers between the three branches of government - the executive, the legislature and the judiciary was also affected, making it, difficult for any one branch to exercise arbitrary or untrammelled power.

The political ideas of the Levellers, John Locke and Tom Paine, and documents like the 'French Declaration of the Rights of Man (1789)', and the 'American Declaration of Independence (1776)', expressed the important ideas and principles that have underpinned democracy in the modern world. These writings and documents are also often seen as charters of liberalism, and liberalism was indeed an important handmaiden of democracy at this time.

John Locke's *Second Treaties on Government* (1681) is an important source book of classical liberal ideas. In this work, Locke presents an account of a hypothetical state of nature, governed by a Law of Nature, which mandates that no individual ought to harm another in life, health, liberty or possessions. This social contract, founded in the consent of every individual, is the basis of legitimate government. Civil law must now conform to the eternal rule that is natural law, and thus, the purpose of political society and of government is the preservation of the life, liberty and property of individuals (and Locke accordingly supplements this account with a defense of private property). If the government fails to discharge the purposes for which it was created, the people have the right to resist and replace it. It is this statement of the core principles of classical liberalism - individualism, popular sovereignty and limited government

that provided the foundation for liberal democracy.

The twentieth century saw an unparalleled extension of democracy in terms of both its inclusiveness as well as its spatial expansion. Beginning with the extension of the suffrage to women in the older western democracies, and ending with the dismantling of apartheid in South Africa, democracy in the twentieth century became more inclusive. This phenomenon has been described in terms of 'waves of democratisation'. The democratisation of many countries in Europe in the nineteenth century is viewed as the first wave of democratisation. The second wave is dated to the period following World War I, when many countries of Europe including those of Scandinavian became democratic. The third wave of democracy came after the Second World War, when new democracies were established in countries like Germany and Italy after the collapse of Nazism and Fascism; and following decolonisation in the 1950s and 1960, democracy was eagerly adopted by most of the new nations of Asia and Africa. The fourth wave of democratisation saw a return to democracy in post-Communist Eastern Europe, as well as in many countries of Latin America that had turned their backs on democracy.

3.4.5 PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE DEMOCRACY

In large and complex societies, it is not always possible for people to gather together to make decisions on each and every issue, as they did in the direct democracy of ancient Athens. This is why modern democracy works through representative institutions. People elect their representatives to a legislature or assembly, and these representatives are authorised to take decisions on behalf of those who elected them. Ultimate sovereignty, however, remains with the people, who can hold their representatives accountable, and refuse to re-elect them when the next election comes round. Representative government is almost synonymous with the idea of democracy today. Democracy should not be seen merely as a set of institutions e.g. free and fair elections, legislative assemblies, and constitutional governments arising out of these. This view of democracy is described as procedural democracy, because it emphasises only the procedures and institutions of democracy. It fails to see that notwithstanding formal political equality, some citizens may be more equal than others, and may enjoy

a greater voice than others in the determining of decisions. More often than not, it would be the poorer, less educated, and the socially disadvantaged citizens who would be unable to fully practice their democratic rights. Social and economic inequalities make it difficult for a formal participation to be effective. This is why theorists emphasise the importance of substantive democracy. This ideal suggests a society of truly equal citizens, who are politically engaged, tolerant of different opinions and ways of life, and have an equal voice in choosing their rulers and holding them accountable. The outcomes and decisions of the democratic process would then be mindful of the interests of all, rather than the interests of a few powerful groups and individuals in society. This also means that democracy is and should be the principle of organisation not only of government, but also the organising principle of all collective life in society.

3.4.6 TYPES OF DEMOCRACY

1. Representative Democracy

Since direct democracy is not possible in large and complex societies, the mechanism through which people take part indirectly in government is through electing representatives to carry out their will. For early social contract theorists, such as Hobbes and Locke, representative government was a form of government authorised by the people to act on its behalf. For Rousseau, however, sovereign power over the state should rest in the hands of the citizenry and its 'general will', because the opinions and interests of representatives could never be identical to those of the electorate. Today representative government based on the majority principle is considered the best way of giving effect to the democratic impulse.

2. Participatory Democracy

The classical theory of participatory democracy is found in the writings of Rousseau and John Stuart Mill. Rousseau's theory depends upon the participation of every individual citizen in political decision-making. The relationship between citizens is one of interdependence, such that each individual is equally dependent upon all the others viewed collectively as sovereign. Participation is important not only in decision-making, but also as a way of protecting private interests

and ensuring good government. For Mill, as for Rousseau, participation has an educative function for citizens. Popular democratic government is Mill's ideal polity, in which participatory institutions foster active citizenship and a public-spirited character. This is the mechanism through which the individual is made to take public interest into account and to make decisions guided by the idea of the common good, rather than by his own selfish interests. Thus, democratic institutions especially local ones are 'a school of political capacity'.

3. Deliberative Democracy

Deliberative democracy values open and public deliberation on issues of common concern. It starts from the assumption of individuals as autonomous persons, but does not view the social relationships between these autonomous persons as relationships of conflict or interest. Rather, it sees people as relating to each other and seeking to influence each other through reasoned argument and persuasion. For advocates of deliberative democracy, persuasion is the best basis for political power, because it alone respects the autonomy of individuals and values their capacity for self-government. It also gives individuals control over an important aspect of their lives, and makes for greater and continuous accountability of political power. Unlike participatory democracy, which requires individuals to be constantly engaged in making decisions, deliberative democracy allows for a political division of labour between citizens and professional politicians, though citizens are involved in deliberation about public issues.

4. Social democracy

Social democracy is a form of democracy that is based on a strong commitment to equality. Social democrats, therefore, support the idea of the welfare state based on redistribution. They believe in the liberal institutions of representative democracy, but wish to combine these with the ideal of social justice. To the extent that liberalism frequently takes the form of right-wing libertarianism - a belief in the unfettered freedom of the individual and the free market. Social democracy is more egalitarian than liberalism. However, it is less radical than

Marxian socialism and may be said to stand at the intersection of these two ideologies. Indeed, it has been said that social-democracy is more than democracy and less than socialism.

Social democrats argue that all individuals should get an equitable share of society's resources, in order to realise their own plans of life. If poverty or disability or belonging to a minority are obstacles in this respect, then it is the duty of the state to remove such obstacles. Social democracy is thus particularly concerned with providing the conditions for the well-being of workers, women, the disabled, the elderly, members of cultural minorities, and so forth. It is basically interested in creating the conditions for equality, so that all citizens can enjoy their democratic rights to the same extent. It sees democracy as not only a form of government, but also a principle that should inform collective life in society as a whole.

5. Cosmopolitan Democracy

Cosmopolitan democracy is an idea advanced by political theorists in the context of globalisation. With the coming into being of forms of supranational organisation such as the European Union and 'with the advance of economic and cultural globalisation', it is believed that democracy must also respond to these challenges beyond the borders of the nation-state. The idea of cosmopolitan democracy is a response to this challenge. The new solidarities being forged across national borders give rise to the notion of cosmopolitan citizenship. As the world is getting more rapidly and close and connected through the communications and internet revolutions, the implications of these developments for democracy are uncertain.

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Discuss the meaning of democracy?

-
-
2. Explain the evolution and growth of democracy?

-
-
-
3. Discuss various conceptions of democracy?

-
-
-
4. Explain various types of democracy?

3.4.7 LET US SUM UP

In this unit, we examined the historical evolution of democracy from ancient Athens to the modern world. Drawing a distinction between procedural and substantive democracy, we also examined various types of democracy, including representative

democracy, participatory democracy, deliberative democracy, social democracy, and, of vital concern for the future, cosmopolitan democracy.

3.4.8 EXERCISES

1. How does the concept of popular sovereignty underpin the functioning of modern democratic systems?
2. What are the key differences between procedural democracy and substantive democracy, and why is the latter considered essential for true equality?
3. How did the historical evolution of democracy in Britain, France, and the United States shape modern democratic principles?
4. In what ways does participatory democracy, as described by Rousseau and Mill, contribute to fostering active citizenship and public-spirited governance?
5. How does cosmopolitan democracy address the challenges posed by globalization, and what are its implications for traditional nation-state-based democratic systems?

3.4.9 SUGGESTED READINGS.

Lessnoff, Michael (ed.), *Social Contract Theory*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990. Lucas, J.R., *The Principles of Politics*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1967.

Macpherson, C.B., *Democratic Theory-Essays in Retrieval*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973.

-----, *The Web of Government*, New York: The Free Press, 1965.-, *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

-----, *The Real World of Democracy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1966/ 1972.

Plamenatz, John, *Democracy and Illusion*, London: Longman, 1978. Schwartzmantel,

John, *The State in Contemporary Society-An Introduction*, New York: Wheatsheaf, 1994.

-----, *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

-----, *The Real World of Democracy*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1966/1972.

4.1 LIBERALISM: CLASSICAL, MODERN AND CONTEMPORARY

Deepak Choudhary and Seema Rohmetra

STRUCTURE

4.1.0 OBJECTIVES

4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.2 LIBERALISM

4.1.3 Meaning

4.1.4 Historical Background of Liberalism

4.1.5 Types of Liberalism

4.1.6 Principles of classical Liberalism

4.1.7 Liberty : the essence of a classical Liberalism :

4.1.8 MODERN LIBERALISM

4.1.9 Meaning

4.1.10 Causes of the Emergence of Modern Liberalism

4.1.11 Prominent Exponents of Modern Liberalism

4.1.12 Basic Principles of modern Liberalism

4.1.13 Neo Liberalism or contemporary liberalism

4.1.14 LET US SUM UP

4.1.15 EXERCISES

4.1.16 SUGGESTED READINGS

4.1.0 OBJECTIVES

The Unit deals with the principles of classical liberalism. After going through this unit, you should be able to discuss:

- Origin & Meaning of Liberalism
- Factors which have contributed to the growth of Liberalism
- Development of Liberalism principles of Classical Liberals
- To know the modern liberalism
- To understand the causes of emergence of modern liberalism and
- To know the basic principles of modern liberalism.
-

4.1.1 INTRODUCTION

What is Liberalism? This is a question raised to reassess the content and meaning of liberalism at various points of time. The question is raised to emphasise the focus and locus of liberalism as in the view of the answering party. While acknowledging the roots of liberalism in the world view that arose at the end of feudalism and rise of modern industrial society in the West and England in particular, Liberalism is primarily concerned with freedom and its safeguards

4.1.2 Liberalism

4.1.3 MEANING

The term 'Liberalism' has been derived from Latin word 'Liber' which means Liberty or freedom. Its origin cannot be attributed to a single thinker, infact Liberalism evolved in a particular period of history in reaction to the prevailing system as well as an

alternative to it. Its origin can be traced to the fifteenth and sixteenth century Europe when European society was challenging feudalism. Forces of Renaissance, Reformation and the Scientific Revolution were mainly responsible for the appearance of Liberalism in Europe as a counter to repressive feudalism. In general understanding, we can say that liberalism stands in opposition to any kind of coercive interference in any walk of life – moral, religious, social or political, and the like. Basic essence of liberalism is to aim at freedom which can give full expression to human spirit. Liberalism stands for creating conditions for human life where freedom is maximised. Liberalism can be understood both in narrow and broader manners. In its narrow understanding one can be a liberal economist who stands for freedom in respect of producing and distributing goods. In its broader perspective, it is a mental attitude which integrates the varied intellectual, moral, religious, social, economic and political relationship of human beings.

Liberalism is the philosophy of the modern age which has lessened the control of religion over human's thought and which has put much faith in reason and logic. Liberalism has three important spheres – social, economic and political.

4.1.4 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF LIBERALISM

Liberalism arose as a reaction to a particular age. This age was the middle age featured by an absolutist and arbitrary order. So Liberalism came up as an opposition to the authoritarian and arbitrary order. Its appearance in Europe is a particular historical setting. In order to have a clear understanding, it is important to have an idea about different features which characterized this particular age because these features contributed a lot to the emergence of liberalism.

These features of middle age reflected themselves in all walks of human life – social, economic, political, religions and philosophical.

a) Social Order :- Feudalism created a hierarchical society in which every human had a master over him/her. Privileges were divided unequally and in arbitrary manner. Right from humble Serf (tiller) at the bottom to Emperor at the top, no body was without a master. Emperor was subordinated to church clergy which was expressing God Will.

b) Economic Order : In this age, agriculture was the main basis of economy,

most important input for which is land. So when land was in few hands, it is clear that there was no freedom in economic activity. Tillers (Serf) had no control over both land and produce.

c) **Religious Order :** Religion had supreme role in human's life. Religion of this age was what was interpreted by Pope. Clergy interpreted religion in such a manner that control church over human mind was near total. Religion was being used to perpetuate the privilege position of church by keeping large masses illiterate and away from power.

d) **Moral and Philosophical order :** Meta-physics and theology had virtual control over all walks of life. Superstition and obscurantism in day to day life were common feature. Human logic and rationality were not given any role and anything challenging the existing order was put as devil's work or as destructive thought.

Presence of such features in the life of people led to the disadvantaged portion of majority. Different sections of the society were suffering under this order. Hence there arose some reactions to the prevailing order which manifested themselves in the following :

- 1) Renaissance
- 2) Reformation
- 3) Industrial Revolution

These new forces created their own impact and did break the old order gradually and replaced it with a new set of social, economic, political and moral ideas. These ideas became the foundation of liberalism, which became a coherent thought in Europe in 18th century. Now we will discuss how these new forces brought changes in the earlier one.

1 **Renaissance:**

The age of renaissance was featured by new Revolutionary ideas. These ideas opposed both the manner in which the feudal Lords suppressed the tillers, as well as the system

in which handful of capitalists controlled the economy and politics. This the new ideas formed the initiation of the modern age. Individual and his welfare formed the main focus of this age. All the metaphysical thoughts of the church were rejected and worldly values gained importance. Science and Rationally began to form the basis of thinking. So this modern age paved a way to Liberalism.

2 Reformation:

Reformation formed as essential feature of the modern age. Reformation age, therefore, launched a forceful attack against the Religious supremacy of the Pope. The attack manifested itself in the form of a number of protests which opposed the religious bondage everywhere. It was because of Reformation of the modern age that individual came to be liberated from the evils of control of religion over varied aspects and the way towards religious freedom was paved.

3 Industrial Revolution:

Things began to change after the industrial revolution took place in Europe in 18th century. This revolution transferred the nature of economic system to a large extent. It changed the pattern of production. Production through machines lessened the dependency over land. Consequently a new class of industrialists appeared on the scene. This class began to control the economy and gradually also the politics of the country. These capitalist sections posed a serious opposition to prevailing economic order which imposed restrictions on the accumulation of wealth. It is this freedom from limitations in economic sphere which formed the basis of Liberalism. Where as on the one hand the feudal lords had all the ownership rights over the property and produce, on the other hand, the tillers led a miserable life, having no rights to own property or produce. So the industrial class targeted both political and economic systems of feudal order.

Definitions

Different definitions have been put forward as far as Liberalism is concerned.

1) Hobhouse : According to Hobhouse, Liberalism is the belief that society can safely

be founded on the self-directing power of personality. It is only in this foundation that a true community can be built. Its foundations are so deep and so wide that there is no limit place to the extent of the building. Liberty thus becomes not so much a right of the individual as a necessity of society.

2) Laski : “Liberalism is the expression less of a creed than of a temperament. It implies a passion for liberty, and that the passion may be compelling, it requires a power to be tolerant, even sceptical, about opinions and tendencies you hold to be dangerous which is one of the varest human qualities.”

3) K.M. Panikar : “It (Liberalism) is an open approach to problems, a curiosity towards and interest in new ideas and a continuous endeavor to evaluate them in terms of the individual’s position in society.”

4) Sabine: Liberalism is “the theory and practice of individual liberty, judicial defence and the constitutional state.”

5) W.M McGovern : “Liberalism as a political concept is a compound of separate elements. One of these is democracy, the other is individualism.”

Check Your Progress 1

Note: Use the space given below to write your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1 What are the different factors which contributed to the growth of Liberalism?

2 How would you define the Renaissance period of the middle age ?

3 Give some definitions of Liberalism

4.1.5 TYPES OF LIBERALISM

Broadly speaking, the development of Liberalism took place mainly in two phases: 1. Classical Liberalism; 2. Modern Liberalism. However we are primarily concerned with classical Liberalism

Classical Liberalism

Classical Liberalism is known by different names like negative liberalism, individualist liberalism, a Laissez faire liberalism, free market liberalism, integral liberalism and original liberalism. This liberalism refers to the early phase of liberalism. The original liberalism is based upon the basic assumption that Man is a rational being. He can look-after his affairs. This liberalism also stresses upon the free will of the individual which forms the basis of all socio-economic and political systems.

Another important assumption of classical Liberalism is that 'Man is Masterless and supreme. Consequently only limited functions' were given to the state. The role of state was negative in nature in the sense that it was regarded to be an enemy of natural liberties and rights of the individuals. Liberals, therefore regarded it as a necessary evil.

In this context, it is important to note that Liberalism found its clearest exposition in the writings of John Locke. He enunciated the fundamental principles of classical liberalism.

4.1.6 PRINCIPLES OF CLASSICAL LIBERALISM

The classical liberalism manifested itself in different spheres. Some of the important areas, where classical liberalism found its expression are:

Philosophical Sphere

Philosophical basis of liberalism (classical) is based upon following features:

- a) Faith is the absolute value and spiritual equality of men.
- b) Secondly, classical Liberals emphasize upon minimum possible restraints in the freedom of choice of individuals.
- c) It has an ardent faith in the rationality the individual, therefore wants to promote the autonomy of the individual.
- d) Classical liberals stress that the rights of men are unalienable. They are based upon the laws of nature. The important rights which occupied the dominant position included the right to life, liberty and property. Infact, the right to private property formed the focus point of early liberals.

Religious Sphere

As far as the religious sphere is concerned Liberalism (Classical) was directed against the power of the church. Consequently, a demand was made by early liberals for the religious freedom. Rationality of Man formed the essence of Liberalism. It also

highlighted the principle of secularism. According to the classical liberalism, religion as altogether a personal affair. It had nothing to do with the public affairs. Based upon this notion, liberalism opposed the interference of church in the affairs of the state and governments.

Economic Sphere

Economic sphere forms the most important area, in which classical liberals contributed to a great extent. This sphere finds its basis in the attack launched by the emerging capitalist classes. These classes were fighting against the state, feudal, socio-economic and political order existing in the middle age. The main supporters of this economic aspect of classical liberalism are Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Thomas Malthus and so and so forth. The advocates of this view stressed upon the free economy, with free trade, contract, exchange and competition. According to this view every individual has the right to further his interest in the manner in which he may like to. Adam Smith, in his treatise, *The Wealth of Nations*, advocated the establishment of a system of 'natural liberty' leaguering every man free to pursue his own interest in his own way in order to bring both his industry and capital in competition with those of any other man."

This classical liberalism was further elaborated by Ricardo and Malthus. They stressed upon a self regulating market. This market according to them was to operate without any intervention. Thus, 'Liberty to choose ones employment, freedom of contract, free competition, free trade, free banks and a free, competitive rate of interest' formed the cardinal features of liberalism in the economic sphere.

Others who contributed to this sphere included the names of Jeremy Bentham and James Mill. Both of them developed the idea of liberalism from the utilitarian point of view. They did support the pre market economy but simultaneously introduced the element of utility and market to the sphere of politics. They advocated the principle of Greatest happiness of greatest numbers.

According to Bentham, Man was the best judge of the sources of pleasure and pain, and that the best government provided the greatest happiness of the greatest number.

These liberals stressed upon the freedom of each individual to decide for himself, his own way to happiness. So, free competition, free suffrage, free individual initiative and free elections became the central points of focus for classical liberals.

Political Sphere

In the political sphere, classical liberalism raised its voice against the arbitrary and authoritarian state. In the content of political sphere, John Locke is regarded as the father of political liberalism. The important features of this political liberalism are:

- 1 State is not a natural institution. It is an artificial structure which has come into existence as a result of social contract among the members of the society.
- 2 The relationship which binds individual and the state is this social contract.

According to this contract, state exists for the sole purpose of protecting the natural rights of the individual's in the state of nature. The most important rights, according to Locke are Right to Life, Liberty and Property. Therefore so long as the state operates for the purpose for which it was created, its institution should be maintained. But, if it fails to perform its duty for which it was created it would be overthrown. The state therefore 'was entitled to govern only with the 'consent' of the governed'.

3. Laws are the best means of social control and these laws find their basis in the Rationality of man.
4. Classical Liberals consider state as a necessary evil, so it should be given minimum functions.

It is pertinent to note that as far as political sphere is concerned, classical liberals demanded a need for constitutional restraints, representative government as well as the individual Rights. This can be attributed to the fact that since the state's existence was based upon certain conditions, so state could, never exercise absolute authority. Its authority was to be limited by the 'laws of nature'. These 'laws of nature' were

supposed to be superior to the evil laws. This means that classical liberalism never permitted the state to create its own laws, contrary to the law of nature.

Social Sphere

Classical Liberalism in the social aspect stressed upon equal dignity of all individuals. It was opposed to all kinds of discriminations on the basis of race, ethnic origin or sex. Consequently the Classical Liberalism paved the way for the extension of suffrage to all the sections of the society including women and other adults without any discrimination. In the very beginning, an attempt was made to restrict the political rights to the property owning sections. This can be attributed to the belief of classical liberals in the notions that riches were the reward for capacity, foresight, prudence and enterprises, and poverty, punishment for those who lacked these virtues. Consequently the new middle class which opposed the feudal lords and landed aristocracy wanted to have for itself certain privileges which were to be abandoned to the other working classes. However, in the later phase of classical liberalism, when large working classes began to develop, liberalism could not ignore the demands of these sections for political rights. The natural outcome of these demands was therefore, an extension of suffrage to all the lower classes.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1 Into how many phases can development of Liberalism be divided ?

2 What kind of role has been assigned to the state according to classical liberalism ?

3 Discuss the various principles of liberalism

4 What are the important features of political liberalism ?

5 Who gave the most lucid exposition of classical liberalism ?

4.1.7 LIBERTY: THE ESSENCE OF CLASSICAL LIBERALISM

The discussion regarding the principles of classical liberalism is bound to remain incomplete without dealing with the essential element of Liberalism. According to classical Liberalism, Liberty forms the most important ingredient of classical liberalism. In fact, the essence of Liberalism is located in different forms of liberty, through which it manifests itself.

According to Hobhouse, the important liberties which form the basis of classical liberalism are :

a) Civil Liberty

The basis of civil liberty finds its roots in the notion that classical liberalism launches its first attack against the arbitrary government. Therefore the first right which was stressed upon by this ideology is the right to be invented in accordance with the law. This right is known as civil liberty. According to Locke “freedom of men under government, is to have a standing rule to live by, common to every one of that society and made by the legislative power erected in it.”

One of the essential conditions of this civil liberty is the universal freedom. It also implies a universal restraint, in the sense that where as law gives all the rights to free to do all his will but at the same time law restrains other not to impose their will upon the former. The important reference which can be drawn from the above argument is that Law is essential to liberty. “Law, of course, restrains the individual, it is therefore opposed to his liberty at a given moment and in a given direction. But equally, law restrains others from doing with him as they will.” So law according to classical liberals liberates man from the fear of arbitrariness or coercion. In this context, it is important to note that civil liberty is based upon an important assumption that law guarantees liberty to the whole community. However the essence of this liberty is based upon the notion that law is impartial. That is it equally applied to all. According to Hobhouse, ‘If there is one law for the Government and another for its subjects, one for noble and another for commoner, one for rich and another for poor, the law does not guarantee liberty for all. Liberty in this respect implies equality. Hence the demand of liberalism

for such a procedure will ensure the impartial applications of law. Hence the demand for the independence of the judiciary to secure equality as between the government and its subject. Hence the demand for cheap procedure and accessible courts. Hence the abolition of privileges of class.

b) Fiscal Liberty

Another important liberty emphasised upon by classical liberals is the fiscal liberty. This liberty for the subject implies restraints upon the executive. It means that the powers of executive must be restrained not only by the established or written laws but it should also be under the direct suppression, checks and balances. So classical liberals stress upon the cry, “No taxation without representation” rather than the cry, “No legislation without representation”. This fiscal liberty later on came to be known by the name of political liberty.

c) Personal Liberty

Personal Liberty is another essential ingredient of classical liberalism. It stands for the freedom of thought and expression manifested in forms like writing, painting or peaceable discussions. For Hobhouse, the area of personal liberty is most difficult to be defined. According to him it is an area of the fiercest strife of passion and the deepest feelings of mankind. At the basis lies liberty of thought – freedom from inquisition into opinions that a man forms in his own mind the inner capital, where, if anywhere, the individual must rule.’

d) Social Liberty

It stands for a kind of equality to be made available to all according to which men are liberated from the vestrainty imposed by hierarchical organisations of the society. The most extreme form of such an organisations is the caste system which imposes restraints in different forms, like monopoly of certain occupations, reservations of public appointments and so and so forth. So classical liberalism basically implies a struggle for equality. Focus is laid on the freedom of all to choose and follow any occupation. Also it stresses upon the rights of individuals in the sense that the social relevance of the corporations like trade unions or the like cannot be sidelined.

e) Domestic Liberty

Classical Liberalism contributed a lot in bringing about a domestic liberty. This liberty was attained in the sense that the liberalism was launched against the authoritarian state which manifested itself in the form of an authoritarian structure of the family. In this authoritative structure, husband was considered to be absolute lord of his wife and children. So classical liberalism played an important role in securing the domestic rights of women and children. So the liberal movement consisted of firstly considering the wife as a responsible lady, who is capable of holding property, suing and being sued, conducting business on her own account, and enjoying full personal protection against her husband. Secondly, in establishing marriage as far as the law is concerned on purely contractual basis, and leaving the sacramental aspect of marriage to the ordinances of the religion professed by the parties. Thirdly it securing the physical, mental, and moral care of the children, partly by imposing definite responsibilities on the parents and punishing them for neglect, partly by elaborating a public system of education and of hygienic.

f) Local Racial and National Liberty :

This liberty implies a struggle for the liberation of states against the alien rule. The struggle involved in liberation of a weaker country from alien rule according to classical liberals, presents the problem of liberty in its simplest form. As Hobhouse says, “from the smallest social unit we pass to the largest. A great part of the liberating movement is occupied with the struggle of entire nations against alien rule, with the revolt of Europe against Napoleon, with the struggle of Italy for freedom, with the fate of the Christian subjects of Turkey, with the emancipation of the Negro, with the national movements in Ireland and in India. Many of these struggles present the problem of liberty in its simplest form.”

g) International Liberty :

International Liberty according to classical Liberals lays focus on non-use of force. Force, according to them, forms the basis of all tyranny.

Check Your Progress III

Note: Use the space given below for your answers. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1 What is civil Liberty? How does classical liberalism perceive of it ?

- 2 Which liberty finds its manifestation in the freedom of thought and expression?

- 3 In what sense, does domestic liberty form an essential element of classical liberals?

4.1.11 MODERN LIBERALISM

During the 19th century, the result of free capitalist socio-economic order, which was based on negative liberalism led towards the miserable conditions of the working

class. The working class was the creation of industrial development. This working class was property less, exploited and had nothing to sell in the capitalist free market, except its labour power. Free development of capitalism caused unlimited miseries to this class. The exploitation of working class was so brutal that many humanist thinkers and writers of the age - literary figures like Carlyle, Ruskin, William Morris capitalists like 'Robert' Owen, writers like Sismondi, Buret Southey, Coleridge-drew the attention of the general masses towards the miserable conditions of majority of the people. During this period, the working class, concentrated in the major cities of Europe, was getting organised, and was prepared to throw a formidable challenge to the whole of the liberal system. During these times, the revolutionary philosophy of the working class-Marxism-emerged and it suggested a revolutionary way for the independence of the working class, and appealed to the working class to get organised and overthrow the exploiting, oppressive, irrational socio-economic order of capitalism through a socialist revolution. Under these pressures, classical liberalism was crumbling. The principle of free contract emerged as the principle of free exploitation of the working class, and liberties of the workers were swallowed up by the slavery to physical wants. Apart from these, now the state power was no more in the hands of the feudal class and it had firmly come into the hands of the capitalist class. As Ruggiero remarks, "from a principle of social criticism, liberalism had become actual governmental practice, and in the process its original ideology had inevitably undergone a certain transformation." Now, it was no more afraid of the state power, and it no more regarded the state as the enemy of liberties – a necessary evil. Now, it required a powerful state apparatus to meet the challenges of the revolutionary working class. It had now stakes in maintaining the status quo and from a progressive philosophy of change it was transformed into a philosophy for the maintenance of the system.

4.1.9 MEANING

In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the methods and policies of classical liberalism were progressively revised. The new liberalism which developed during this period is known as 'modern liberalism'. It is also described as 'positive liberalism'. The new liberalism emphasized the positive aspect of liberty: the opportunity to form and accomplish self-appointed goals rather than mere absence of restraint.

Check Your Progress I

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Write a note on the conditions of working class during negative liberalism.

2. What is the another name of positive liberalism ?

4.1.10 CAUSES OF THE EMERGENCE OF MODERN LIBERALISM

The following are the main causes which led to the development of modern

liberalism :-

1. The weakness of the economy based on free contract, competition, trade and exchange was apparent, as these had proved insufficient to bring natural harmony in society and economy. The need for state interference in the economic affairs of society was felt.
2. The emergence of strong and organised working class and its challenge to the weak capitalist state, - strengthens the state.
3. Extreme exploitation of the vast majority and because of this, the crisis of moral, cultural and humanitarian values and to improve these, welfare functions by the state was supported.
4. As the state power came into the hands of the capitalist class, their attitude towards the state changed and, instead of a necessary evil, they started regarding it as a moral institution.
5. In order to appease the working class and restore its faith in the state, welfare measures by the state were deemed necessary.
6. Change in the concept of liberty from negative to positive, which required positive functions of the state in order to create the conditions necessary for the realisation of freedom.
7. As the expenses of the state increased due to the increase in bureaucracy and welfare measures of the state, progressive taxation by the state was supported.
8. The crisis of capitalist economy necessitated interference of the state in the economic affairs, and the state control of individual capitalists was thought necessary to safeguard the aggregate interests of the capital class.
9. Due to the development of political democracy and grant of voting rights to the working class, support to the socio-economic demands of the workers was necessary to get their votes.
10. Need for social economic reforms which were necessary to meet the challenge

of socialism.

11. In order to meet the challenge of revolutionary socialism and resist the march of the working class, increase in the powers of the state was supported by liberals.
12. There was need to increase the powers of state due to the imperialistic policy and due to two great World Wars.
13. There was need for nationalisation and other state measures to check economic crisis like economic depressions and unemployment.

4.1.11 PROMINENT EXPONENTS OF MODERN LIBERALISM

The philosophy of modern liberalism has been given by liberal thinkers and philosophers like J.S. Mill, T. H. Green, J. M. Robertson, L.T. Hobhouse, J.A. Hobson, A. D. Lindsay, G.D.H. Cole, Webb, Barker, H.J. Laski and J. K Galbraith.

4.1.12 BASIC PRINCIPLES OF MODERN LIBERALISM

The basic principles of modern liberalism are as under :-

1. It has firm faith in the liberty and rights of the individuals, and it gives importance to free and open society. It believes in the concept of positive liberty. It believes in the principle of “freedom through the state” rather than “freedom from the state.”
2. It believes in the concept of welfare state. The state can be instrumental in the development of human personality through social reform and welfare measures. The state has positive role to play and is capable of performing social welfare functions.
3. It is against the concept of free enterprise or the theory of laissez-faire an

unregulated free economy is improper. Modern liberalism advocates that the state should regulate and plan the economy in the overall interest of the society. The state can check individual capitalists and can collect money for social welfare measures through progressive taxation.

4. Liberty and equality are complementary to each other. Without equality, there cannot be democracy and without democracy liberty is not possible.
5. Rights and liberty are not natural, but are given to individual for social welfare, as well as his own moral, spiritual and intellectual upliftment. No individual can be given any rights against the social welfare and the state can check the rights of the individuals in the overall interests of the society.
6. Society is plural in nature and it is composed of individuals. The state has to co-ordinate different interests and classes in the society. It must recognise the claims of different associations and groups. Only a welfare state can perform these functions well.
7. It believes in evolutionary changes. Evolutionary development of society is better than abrupt revolutionary or unconstitutional changes. Instead of class struggle, it is better to have class harmony in the society.
8. Modern liberalism believes in constitutional democratic and parliamentary methods of bringing about desired change in the society and for co-ordinating the interests of the different class.

4.1.13 NEO LIBERALISM OR CONTEMPORARY LIBERALISM

Neo-liberalism, neo-classical liberalism or libertarianism stands for contemporary version of classical liberalism which seeks to restore laissezfaire individualism. It denounces the welfare state, opposes state intervention and control of economic activities. Champions of neo-liberalism stand for 'rolling back' the state which has immensely expanded its sphere of activities. The chief exponents of neo liberalism include F.A. Hayek (1899-1992), an Austrian thinker, Milton Friedman (1912-2006), an American economist, and Robert Nozick (1938-2002) an American philosopher.

In the second half of the twentieth century these thinkers realized that the theory of welfare state was inimical to individual liberty, as it involved the forced transfer of resources from the more competent to the less competent. In order to restore individual liberty, they sought to revive the principle of laissez-faire not only in economic sphere, but also in social and political sphere. In a nutshell, neo liberalism upholds full autonomy and freedom of the individual. It seeks his liberation from all institutions which tend to restrict his vision of the world, including the institutions of religion, family and customs of social conformity apart from political institutions. Philosophically it repudiates the deterministic outlook of human life, and maintains that human personality, character, thought and actions cannot be construed as the outcome of his circumstances. In other words, it treats man as the maker of his destiny. It is, therefore, hostile to all social and legal restrictions on individual's freedom of action. In the political sphere, neo-liberalism particularly insists that man's economic activity must be actively liberated from all restrictions to enable him to achieve true progress and prosperity. All neo-liberals believe in the primacy of the 'spontaneous order' of human relationships as exemplified in free markets. They deplore any politics (notably socialism) which pretends to have definitive knowledge of human needs. No government can have such knowledge. Human needs manifest themselves through the myriad unpredictable transactions between individuals living in a free or open society. If government tries to regulate these activities, it would amount to curtailing their freedom without fulfilling their genuine needs. It would therefore be advisable to transfer such decisions to the market which will maximize their choice. In the economic sphere, market exemplifies the genuine democracy. In the political sphere, market represents a model of genuine democracy, where votes are traded against welfare benefits, and the cost is borne by the most productive members of society

Check Your Progress II

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Explain the basic principles of Modern Liberalism.

-
-
-
2. Discuss the main causes of emergence of modern liberalism.
-
-
-

4.1.14 LET US SUM UP

Contemporary liberalism upholds representative democracy on the assumption that the state represents the interests of all groups within society and, that it ensures reconciliation of conflicting interests. This could be true in the case of some societies but it cannot be demonstrated as a universal phenomenon. In developing nations, it is particularly evident that various groups are not equally conscious of their interests, nor are they equally well-organized, nor equally vocal. Usually, these countries are dominated by 'vested interests'. For instance, in India a handful of business interests are very well-organized, active and vocal while the tremendously large body of consumers is not adequately organized. Thus, in spite of decisions being taken by representative institutions, in practice, there is an obvious imbalance in the sphere of protection of the interests of the various groups.

4.1.15 EXERCISES

1. How did the historical conditions of feudalism and the forces of Renaissance, Reformation, and Industrial Revolution contribute to the emergence of liberalism in Europe?
2. What are the key differences between classical liberalism and modern liberalism in their approaches to the role of the state and the concept of liberty?
3. How does neo-liberalism critique the welfare state, and what alternative does it propose for achieving individual freedom and societal progress?
4. In what ways did John Locke's principles of social contract and natural rights shape the political sphere of classical liberalism?
5. How does modern liberalism balance the principles of liberty and equality, and why does it advocate for state intervention in economic and social affairs?

4.1.16 SUGGESTED READINGS

Jain, M. P. *Political Theory: Liberal Marxian*, New Delhi: Kaveri Printers, 1993.

Gauba, O.P. *An Introduction to Political Theory*, New Delhi, Macmillan India Ltd., 1999.

Ruggiero, Liberalism in E.R.A Seligman (ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. IX New York, 1937.

Ernest, Barker, *Principles of Social and Political Theory*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1951/1956.

John, Bowle, *Hobbes and his Critics: A study in the seventeenth century constitutionalism*, London : Alden Press, 1951.

Arnold, Brecht, *Political Theory, The Foundations of 20th Century Political Thought*, Delhi: Surjeet Publications, 1988.

**4.2 SOCIALISM : EVOLUTIONARY (FABIAN)
AND REVOLUTIONARY (MARXIST)**

Anurag Gangal

STRUCTURE

4.2.0 OBJECTIVES

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION

4.2.2 SOCIALISM

4.2.3 Meaning

4.2.4 Two Forms of Socialism (Evolutionary and Revolutionary Socialism)

4.2.5. EVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM

4.2.6. Fabian Socialism

4.2.7. German Social Democracy

4.2.8. Revisionism

4.2.9. Syndicalism

4.2.10. Guild Socialism

4.2.11. Criticism

4.2.12 REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM (MARXIAN SOCIALISM)

4.2.13 LETS US SUM UP

4.2.14 EXERCISES

4.2.15 SUGGESTED READINGS

4.2.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this topic, you may be able:

- To understand the meaning of socialism.
- To know the two dimensions of socialism.
- To understand Marxian concept of socialism.
- To explain the fabian socialism in detail.

4.2.1 INTRODUCTION

Socialism is a set of doctrines or a cluster of ideas and a political programme that emerged at the beginning of the 19th century. It arose out of a revolt against bourgeois property. Property in all 'civilized' societies has been considered sacred. In bourgeois society, it loses its sacredness but gets, a new type of sanction; it now becomes an inalienable right. (Inalienable is anything which cannot be separated from the person, something entrenched with the individual.) What then are the implications of property rights as inalienable? Socialism did not grow into any clear-cut doctrine, but a set of values and beliefs held together by the view that private ownership of production should be replaced. But there was unanimity about 'replaced by what.' There were common currents of thinking that some or other form of common ownership of productive property should be the basis of social organisation of society. Socialism is not against property per se. For example, owning a flat does not militate against the spirit of socialism. All these are consumable items. When socialists talk against the private ownership of property, it means such property, which is productive and yields profit, or rental income; that is, the private ownership of means of production. Early socialists thought that property is theft. This comes to mean that the owners of means of production cheat the workers, the direct producers of whatever production which takes place over and above the wages paid to them. This denial of what they produce is theft. The accumulation of this theft is property in the form we see it in our societies. Being a theft it is morally unacceptable. So it must be abolished and as a form, private ownership must be converted into one or another form of common ownership.

4.2.2 SOCIALISM

4.2.3 MEANING

The term 'socialism' is variously understood and defined by various thinkers and schools of thought. The Oxford English Dictionary defines socialism as 'a theory or policy that aims at or advocates the ownership or control of the means of production-capital, land, property, etc. by the community as a whole and their administration in the interests of all'. This definition, though not very comprehensive, indicates the chief method and goal of socialism. A more elaborate definition of socialism is found in Joseph A. Schumpeter's *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (1942) where it is defined as:

that organization of society in which the means of production are controlled, and the decisions on how and what to produce and on who is to get what, are made by public authority instead of by privately-owned and privately-managed firms.

In short, socialism stands for an economic system under which the major instruments of social production (that is the instruments by which production is carried out for consumption by the larger society) are placed under the ownership and control of public authority in order to ensure that they are properly utilized to secure the public interest. It is based on the view that liberty and equality granted to citizens in the political sphere will remain an empty form unless they are accompanied by a reorganization of the economic life of society so as to convert them into substantive rights for citizens. How can socialism be established in society?

4.2.4 TWO FORMS OF SOCIALISM (EVOLUTIONARY AND REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM)

It is interesting to note that the varieties of socialism differ from each other because of their different answers to this important question. The distinction between them will help us understand the true character of socialism.

4.2.5 EVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM

In popular parlance, the term 'socialism' is usually applied to indicate 'evolutionary Socialism', that is the kind of socialism achieved by evolutionary process or by degrees, not by whole sale transformation of society in a single stroke. In fact, evolutionary socialism admits an attitude of 'compromise', compromise between capitalism and socialism, so that the capitalist system is allowed to continue with some changes here and there in the socialist direction. It therefore belongs to the liberal tradition. Evolutionary socialism relies on the democratic method, parliamentary reform and even economic planning on the plea that the interests of the underprivileged sections, especially the working classes, might be represented and taken care of by their representatives and leadership. It is, therefore, coterminous with 'democratic socialism'

It is important to note that evolutionary socialism aims at securing the rights of the working classes, especially their economic rights, as a part of the supposed common interest of the community. In other words, it seeks to accommodate or reconcile the interests of the working classes with those of other classes. Thus, it subscribes to the theory of harmony or equilibrium as the governing principle of social relationships, corresponding to the position taken by modern liberalism.

Check Your Progress I

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Define Socialism?

2 What is evolutionary socialism?

4.2.6 FABIAN SOCIALISM

This was the first systematic doctrine of 'evolutionary socialism', as a substitute for the Marxian 'revolutionary socialism'. Fabian socialism or Fabianism was first developed in England by the Fabian Society (founded in 1884) from which it derived its name. The term 'Fabian' was adopted after the name of a great Roman General, Quintus Fabius (275-203 B.C.), whose tactics in the fight against Hannibal served as a guide for the Society. Thus its motto read: 'For the right moment you must wait, as Fabius did, most patiently, when warring against Hannibal, though many censured his delays; but when the time comes you must strike hard, as Fabius did, or your waiting will be in vain and fruitless.'

It will be recalled that Marxian socialism, developed in the late forties of the nineteenth century, had envisaged revolution as an essential medium of change from capitalism to socialism. However, Fabian socialism regarded the transition from capitalism to socialism as a gradual process; it looked forward to the socialization of industry by the peaceful use of economic and political agencies already in hand. Marxian socialism had relied on the working class to bring about the transition from capitalism to socialism; Fabian socialism sought to make use of the services of the middle class for developing the technique of bringing about a new social order; it considered arousing the social conscience of the community in favour of the socialist ideal as a significant achievement.

With the new approach, Fabianism was able to attract some very brilliant men of England who became its exponents. Among them George Bernard Shaw (1856-1950), Sydney Webb (1859-1947), Beatrice Webb (1858-1943), Sidney Olivier (1859-1943), Graham Wallas (1858-1932), and G.D.H. Cole (1889- 1959) are the most illustrious figures.

AIMS AND OBJECTS OF FABIANISM

1. **Emancipation of Land and Industrial Capital** In pursuance of its socialist mission, the Fabian Society sought reorganization of society by the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership, and vesting them in the community for the general benefit, so that the natural and acquired assets of the community could be equitably shared by all.

2. **Equality of Opportunity** The Fabian Society was convinced that the emancipation of land and industrial capital from individual and class ownership would create conditions under which rent and interest would be added to the reward of labour. The idle class, living on the labour of others, would necessarily disappear and political equality of opportunity would be maintained by the spontaneous action of economic forces with much less interference in personal liberty than the existing system entailed.
3. **Dissemination of Socialist Ideas** The Fabian Society aimed at spreading socialist ideas, especially regarding the relation between individual and society in its economic, ethical and political aspects, including the establishment of equal citizenship for men and women. For this purpose, the Fabian socialists sought to use the democratic method of a slow and gradual turning of the popular mind to the new principles of social reorganization
4. **Universal Education** Sydney Olivier, writing on the moral basis of socialism in the Fabian Essays, insisted on the provision of universal education as an essential means of emancipation of the working class. He pointed out that the educational system was an essential instrument of fostering social morality. The idea of the school implied leisure to learn. This meant 'the release of children from all non-educational labour until mind and physique have had a fair start and training'.

Check Your Progress II

Note: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

- 1 Define the meaning of Fabianism?

2. What are the main objectives of Fabianism?

4.2.7 GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

German social democracy, as developed by Ferdinand Lassalle (1825-64), was another important version of evolutionary socialism. Lassalle accepted the Marxian doctrine of

economic interpretation of history so far as it implied that the rise of the working class and the consequent decline of capitalism was inevitable in the future society.

4.2.8 REVISIONISM

Another important school of evolutionary socialism that emerged in Germany itself was the revisionist school led by Eduard Bernstein (1850-1932). It also sought to revise some of the basic tenets of Marxian theory, particularly on the following lines:

- (a) The class struggle had become less intense because the conditions of the working class had improved rather than deteriorated;
- (b) The middle class had, in fact, expanded rather than shrunk; and
- (c) Large areas of industry had remained in small-scale production rather than concentrated in large-scale industries.

4.2.9 SYNDICALISM

The socialist movement developed in France and Latin countries in the form of Syndicalism. In fact, Syndicalism originated as a trend in the French labour movement which considers labour unions and their federations as cells of the future socialist order. It insists on the complete independence of labour unions from political parties.

4.2.10 GUILD SOCIALISM

In the first quarter of the twentieth century, there was another socialist movement in England, known as Guild Socialism. In fact, Guild Socialism originated as a trend in the British labour movement which enjoyed great ideological success in the period from 1916 to 1926. It tried to combine the good points of socialism with those of the ancient guild system. In short:

- (a) It upheld the Marxian emphasis on class struggle.
- (b) It stood for the abolition of the wage system and demanded representation of the

workers in industrial control.

(c) It sought to modify syndicalism by introducing the importance of consumer side by side with the worker.

(d) It sought to abolish the old state which was an instrument of exploitation.

4.2.11 CRITICISM

1. No Coherent Doctrine

Evolutionary socialism is criticized because it has no coherent doctrine. There are so many varieties of evolutionary socialism- Fabian socialism, revisionism, syndicalism, guild socialism, parliamentary or democratic socialism, etc. that it is difficult to identify its essential contents.

2. Not Based in the Working Class

Some forms of evolutionary socialism, such as syndicalism and guild socialism, are, of course, based in the working class. But other forms are not so based. For instance, Fabian socialism was exclusively based in the intellectuals of the middle class, with hardly any links with the working class.

3. Legitimization of the Bourgeois State

Evolutionary socialism seeks to accommodate socialist goals in the operation of the capitalist system. Since capitalism has accepted 'liberal democracy' as its political framework, characterized by universal franchise, periodic elections and free competition for power, it is felt that the people's urge for economic equality cannot be evaded for long by granting them formal equality in the political sphere. It is alleged that the adoption of socialist goals reassures the people, and serves as a 'safety valve' for the capitalist system.

4.2.12 REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM (MARXIAN SOCIALISM)

Marx's importance in the history of the struggle for socialism lies in the fact that he was the first man who compounds a theory of socialism, which could rival and stand on an equal footing with the theory of capitalism developed by Ricardo and Adam Smith. Marx did not simply propound a theory in the old style, but developed a doctrine which unified, or at least so he claimed, theory with practice such that theory could guide practice and practice could rectify the errors in theory. In short, what Marx did was to build up a theory of revolutionary action identifying the class, which will carry out the revolutionary task of replacing capitalism with socialism

In Marx view, every mode of production (sum total of forces and relations of production) gives rise to two classes, in perpetual opposition to each other. One is the ruling or the exploiting class and the other is the oppressed or the exploited class. The constant conflict and opposition between these two classes to get the better of the other is class struggle. Marx remarks in the very beginning of Communist Manifesto that 'The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle'.

It was in term of this that Marx had concluded after a very detailed study of the capitalist mode of production (in Capital, Vol.1) that contradictions within it would go on intensifying leading to increasingly intense struggle between the capitalists and the working class. This would give rise to a revolutionary consciousness among the workers and teach them that only a takeover of power from the minority of capitalists could create conditions to free the working class from exploitation and lead to the emancipation of society.

The another pole Marxian analyses which looks the future of class struggle from the view point of the process of accumulation of capital and the rate of exploitation. These two are internally related to each other. There is first the appropriation of surplus value (S.V.) from the labourer. The labourer who is given a wage is paid at the cost of reproducing his labour power, that is, what it costs to buy the subsistence goods for living. In other words, the labour power of the worker is bought in the same way as any other commodity, say iron or cloth or whatever else is needed to produce further goods, i.e. at the cost of its production. So labour power is like a commodity among other commodities. It has been established that he reproduces that much of value in 4/5 hours of work, whereas a worker normally works for 8/10 hours. The extra hours of work that he puts in is the basis of additional value that he produces which is appropriated by the capitalist. This Marx calls exploitation, a 'built-in structural and relational feature of capitalist production, which has nothing to do

with cheating or theft. It is legal and necessary for capitalism.

Such a process goes on along with improvements in the technical means of production. Over a long period of time, the cost of machinery and other fixed capital known as Constant Capital (C.C.) becomes more and more expensive in relation to the cost of hiring labour power referred to as Variable Capital (V.C.). In other words, in the overall (composition) of capital, there is an increase in the relative importance of C.C. vis-a-vis V.C. This goes on as the capitalist mode of production progresses. This Marx shows leads to the centralisation of capital; that is, the ownership of capital gets into fewer and fewer hands, the big fish eating the small ones, as we popularly hear. This Marx further shows leads to a fall in the rate of profit. To compensate for this, the capitalist tries to intensify exploitation, which means he tries to increase the rate of exploitation and this is resisted by the workers. This results in the Impoverishment of the working class in relative as well as absolute terms vis-a-vis the capitalist.

This Marx demonstrates will necessarily lead to greater and greater class struggles leading eventually to the overthrow of capitalism and the capture of power by the workers. 'That is why Marx could say in the Manifesto that 'What the bourgeoisie therefore produces, above all, are its own grave-diggers.' The first stage of the working class rule is the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat which prepares the way for the establishment of socialism which then paves the way for communism, the stage where everyone works according to capacity and takes according to need; the world of choice other words, Revolutionary socialism seeks to introduce socialism in its totality so as to replace capitalist system by the socialist system. In other words, revolutionary socialism seeks to transform the social system thoroughly instead of accepting small concessions for the underprivileged sections. It also makes a direct attack on the prevailing contradictions of the social order. It therefore belongs to the Marxist tradition. Revolutionary socialism, also insists on organizing the working classes for fighting against capitalism so as to overthrow the capitalist order and establish complete socialization of the instruments of production and distribution, by revolution. It also repudiates the theory of equilibrium or reconciliation between different interests in society. It seeks to reverse the position of the dominant and *dependent* classes of capitalist society, and ultimately to destroy the conditions of domination itself so as to secure a *classless* society.

Check Your Progress III

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What is secularism?

2 Discuss evolutionary and revolutionary socialism in detail?

3 Discuss Karl Marx's Theory of socialism?

5) Explain Fabian socialism ?

4.2.13 LET US SUM UP

In spite of some shortcomings, evolutionary socialism is an effective instrument for mitigating the rigours of capitalism. It is definitely better than the crude form of capitalism—a free market economy with unrestrained competition. Evolutionary socialism provides an opportunity to the common people to resist and reduce the harshness of the capitalist class within capitalist society itself. It fails to transform capitalism precisely for want of adequate, organized and consistent public pressure. The Marxian socialism postulates the emergence of class consciousness and a strong organization of the exploited class for bringing about revolution. If necessary consciousness and organization are present among the exploited sections, it should not be difficult for them to transform the capitalist system even through the ballot box. A combination of democracy and socialism is now regarded as not only possible, but logical and even inevitable.

4.2.14 EXERCISES

1. How does socialism differ from capitalism in its view of private property, particularly regarding the ownership of the means of production?
2. What are the key distinctions between evolutionary socialism and revolutionary socialism in their approaches to achieving a socialist society?
3. How did Fabian Socialism propose to transition from capitalism to socialism, and what role did the middle class play in this process?
4. According to Marx, how does the process of capital accumulation and exploitation contribute to the inevitability of class struggle and the eventual overthrow of capitalism?

5. What are the main criticisms of evolutionary socialism, particularly regarding its lack of a coherent doctrine and its relationship with the capitalist system?

4.2.15 SUGGESTED READINGS

Chang, Sherman H.M., *The Marxian Theory of the State*, New York: Russel & Russel, 1965.

Maguire, John M., *Marx's Theory of Politics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978.

_____, Karl, Marx, *Economic and Philosophic Manuscripts of 1844*, Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1977.

_____, Friedrich Engels, *Manifesto of the Communist Party* (Communist Manifesto), Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975.

George H. Sabine and T.L. Thorson, *A History of Political Theory*, New Delhi: 1989.

Frank A. Fetter, *The principles of Economics*, 2nd ed. New York: The Century Company:1910.

V.I.Lenin, *State and Revolution*, New York: 1917.

4.3 SECULARISM: WESTERN AND INDIAN PERSPECTIVES

D. S. Jamwal

STRUCTURE

4.3.0 OBJECTIVES

4.3.1 INTRODUCTION

4.3.2 SECULARISM

4.3.3 History (Western Perspective)

4.3.4 Secularism (Indian Perspective)

4.3.5 LET US SUM UP

4.3.6 EXERCISES

4.3.7 SUGGESTED READINGS

4.3.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this topic, you may be able:

- To understand the concept of secularism in general.

- To understand the western concept of secularism.
- To explain the history and development of the concept in the western and Indian context.
- To discuss the features or characteristics of Indian concept of secularism.

4.3.1 INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary world, for organizing any of the diverse religious and cultural human life of a society, it cannot be denied that the secularism and secular state has become the need of the hour and essential foundation for a democratic state. But despite a very long discourse and debate over centuries on it we have not universally accepted yet any precise concept of secularism. This can be seen from the fact that the nature of secularism varies from state to state, even almost each country in the West is a secular state yet each has its own distinctive characteristics. Consequently, different states have developed and adopted different strategies and diverse forms of secularism which differ from one another in principle and in practice in their context. Therefore, it can be said that secularism and their underlying principles should not lose sight of the fact that concrete experiences of secularism are always coloured with its history, civilization, culture, context, by the web of facts and meaning specific to each society.

4.3.2 SECULARISM

The word first time was used by Augustine, who identified saeculam (Latin word for world, a century, or age) and secular with the terrestrial city. But today the meaning of the word Saeculam is seen as an absence of religious feeling, a worldly rather than an otherworldly approach to life. Secularism is the first and foremost doctrine that opposes all forms of inter- religious domination. Separation, loss and sufferings are endemic to the human condition, while large part of our suffering is man-made and hence eliminable, at least some of our suffering is not manmade. Religion, art and philosophy are responses to such sufferings. Secularism too accepts this and therefore it is not anti-religious. Religion has its own share of some deep-rooted problems. In religions such as Hinduism, some sections have been persistently discriminated. For example- Dalits

have been barred from entering Hindu temples. In some part Hindu women cannot enter temples. When religion is organised, it is frequently taken over by its most conservative faction, which does not tolerate any dissent.

4.3.3 HISTORY (WESTERN PERSPECTIVE)

With the rise of pope's power which led Christianity into a form of organized institution in the middle age, which proved victory of the sacred over secular and faith over reason but ever since then the power of the sacred was declining. In the later medieval period, the element of modern rationalism emerged and then in the nineteenth century, the concept of secularism came to be known as the exclusion or at least reduction of the role of religion in public life, in politics, in education, in all branches of learning. Hence, the separation of state and church has been an issue in western discourse. In the course of development of secular thought upon which Saint Augustine and Aquinas had a debate between Christian and non-Christian culture, but they were non secularist. In this way, it is found that there has also been debate over relationship of reason and faith (which also concern Kant, Rousseau and Hegel) as well as the church and state issue. While on the other side, Dante, Machiavelli, Locke, Rousseau and Marx were against the papal power and the role of religion in the politics. Which certainly shows the evolution of the secular principle in the west?

During the Renaissance period, the gap between a more powerful papal and state were increasing in the city-state, therefore, the war of Thomistic conception from reason to revelation had changed to the relation of church and state. A great reformist Luther's broke up with the Catholic Church and his followers, which establishes a Christendom in Europe on one side and on the other side Europe emerged a religiously plural Europe and America which became a sources for the modern diversity and the ideas of secularism. Consequently, repression has always been found as a one of the key manifestation of the secularism. John Locke, who saw the dismay and the sectarianism of the English civil war, therefore, he said that "everyone is Orthodox to himself" and that government should not meddle in religion. Kant, like David Hume, has been source of modern atheism and agnosticism and inspiration of nineteenth and twentieth century European Protestant which shift more on more onus of Christian dogmatism and externalism.

There is no doubt that almost each country in the West emerged as a secular state, but

despite being a secular country each has its own distinctive characters and differences. Secularism, of course, was an ingredient of the French Revolution that spread over European countries after 1789. French model of a secular state which always seek to create a public space in which religion is virtually banned in the name of reason and emancipation. The treaty of Westphalia of 1648 that ended the religious war in the Europe and finally broken the long-held assumptions of the official religion of the state was that of its ruler, as was in the England Henry VI Monarch of the England was the head of the Anglican Church. According to Berman and Beaman, who argued that secularism originated in a distinctive western historical experience, it is a liberal revolution in the United States, which generated regime of separation of church and state and also argued that there has been a gradual evolution of it that led non establishment of religion in the state. So this form of idea has been imposed on colonized state and society. Thus, this model of church and state was profoundly broken by radical ideas emanating from the American Revolution. And then framer of American constitution decided that people were sovereign, since a religiously diverse and sovereign people should not have a single religion as the official religion. Consequently, a new understanding of the Church and state emerged that a state had no established religion at all. The first amendment of American constitution made clear that "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, in this way, the mutual exclusion is adopted as a necessary step to resolve the conflicts between different Christian denominations. Secularism in the Canada (Cubic model) which has not come into being as consequence of the act or legislature process but it has evolved and accepted by the moral consideration of the citizens which later became as part of governance. It is not result of act or legislation but have evolved and accepted by moral consideration and Despite the fact that the secular character of western society in general and the US, France, and Canada in particular developed in the context of a single religion society to solve the problems of one religion, namely Christianity. So we do not find the same sets of secular principles in these western countries. Charles Taylor argues that secularism and their underlying principles should not lose sight of the fact that concrete experiences of secularism are always colored by history and context, by the web of facts and meaning specific to each society, in that sense, there is no pure model of secularism attempt to reconcile to citizen's moral equality and their freedom of conscience always vary

with the specific context.

Generally, the concept of secularism has been debated and it has various interpretations. The conception of secularism in the western liberal democratic tradition is found different from the secularism of the Marxist communist tradition, which possesses the active hostility to religion. Donal Eugene Smith has given very precise conception of the secular state in which he says that a secular state is a state which guaranteed individual and corporate freedom of religion, deals with individual as citizens irrespective of his religion, is not constitutionally connected to a particular religion nor does it seek either to promote or interfere with religion. In this way he sees a secular state involves three distinct but interrelated sets of relationships concerning the state, religion, and the individual. But secularism that is quietly known is separation of Church and the state.

According to Charles Taylor there is true in claim that secularism has Christian roots and secularism is itself a Christian word that find its original meaning in a Christian context Saeculum. State arm were called secular to distinguish itself from the religious order or 'regular clergy'. So secularism in the west can be deified as mutual exclusion of state and religion. The oxford University Dictionary defines 'secularism as a doctrine of moral philosophy which hold the morality should be based on regard to the wellbeing of mankind in the present life, to the exclusion of all consideration of from belief in God or in future state. George Jacob Holyoake (English Secularism 1896) is known as a precursor of the contemporary doctrine of secular humanism, 'defined secularism in philosophy as the belief that life can be best lived by applying ethics, and universe can be best understood by process of reasoning, without reference to a God or Gods or Other supernatural concept. Charles Taylor says that "a secular state respect individual freedom of conscience or moral autonomy that is their right to conduct their life in the light of their own choices of consciences.

SECULARISM (INDIAN PERSPECTIVE)

In case of India, the concept of secularism and its condition are totally different from the West, because there has been neither a church authority nor religious authority as it existed in the West nor it had the concept of organized religion as it was in the west. Here, in Bharat, the situation is largely different it is not a totally individualistic character of society, a men can worship a God in a manner he chooses therefore, has been

entitled full liberty of choice. The concept of religion of the Hindu is different from other hence the concept of secularism when social condition, history, the concept of religion and god is historically different, therefore, concept and nature of secularism is distinct. The essence of the Vedic culture has been founded on the principles of Sarva Dharam Sambhav. A Hindu has never believed in a single God in the quest of ultimate truth, Hinduism has acknowledged the plurality has never believed in one God or one path as the Rigveda mentioned that, (truth is one, but wise men describe it differently) this has been the philosophy on which Vedic civilization has been founded and background on which the Hindu ethos has evolved. In the Ashoka seventh edict, he says that in 'Ashoka's ideal world people should mix and practices Dhamma: listen to a plurality of voices, control the tongue, and be critical but moderately and with reason'. So for him it was not just living back to back, but face to face in search for that common ground and he wrote the 7th edict (3rd B.C) an ethical guide to pluralism, which still today is valuable.

Religion in Bharat is known to have co-existed and evolved together for many centuries before the arrival of Islam in the 12th century, followed by Mughal and colonial era. Ashoka about 2200 years ago, Harsha about 1400 years ago accepted and patronized different religions. The people in ancient South Asia had freedom of religion, and the state granted citizenship to each individual regardless of whether someone's religion was Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism or any other (Brockman, 2011) Ellora cave temples built next to each other between 5th and 10th centuries, for example, shows a coexistence of religions and a spirit of acceptance of different faiths.

Dharma is one of the more complicated concepts in the history of Indian ideas. The notion of dharma was deeply contested after the post-vedic to early classical period in ancient India, a period that is basically known for the composition of the epics, the decline of the rauta sacrifice, with the rise of the heterodox religions like Buddhism, Jainism and Jvikism, Charvaka Philosophy and Bhakti and Suffi traditions, It can be chronologically explained as Vedic Brahmanism, Buddhism, Jainism, Puranic Hinduism, Bhakti, Shakta, Islam. The evolution of religion in India is seen only through textual sources with a predisposition to privileging the Brahmanical sources and socio-legal codes like the Dharmashastras but other religion and sects projected other ideas.

Panth Nirpeksha is already found embedded in Bhartiya culture, the testimony of the fact is that anybody can follow any sect or path for instance Vaishnava had no antagonism to the *Saiva, Brahmana and Shramana* had no antagonistic relation but dialogue, argument and assimilation were features of during that period. This kind of harmony, coexistence and spirit of assimilation rather than suppression and homogenization has been there in ancient India. The word secular as an ideal instituted in the constitution was not clearly defined, the secular world as in the west in the English language cannot be translated or understood as in Hindi or India context because the word religion does not depict the same meaning as in West. Literally Dharma Nirpeksha means neutral to all Dharma (religion) although some of the scholar characterizes it as Sarva Dharam Sambhav but this is not spelt out in constitutional. Since, the Preamble of the Indian constitution clearly says that India is a Panth Nirpekshanot Dharma Nirpeksha which means state must be neutral to all Panth not Dharma because the Dharma has been understood as performance of one's duty while performing its duty, a state can be neutral to Panth or sects. In this way, the idea of secular state has been the outcome of a political expression of the separation of church and state in the west therefore, it is not possible to translate it exactly in Indian cultural context, since the meaning of Dharma, *Panth*, is not identical to European tradition, it has had its own tradition of meaning and significant in its own context. So what does *Dharma/ Dhamma* means, according to the A L Basan Derived from the Sanskrit root dhr - to bear, support, to maintain - to word dharma has literal meaning of that which is established that is law, duty, or custom. Hard to translate it into English it may be said to refer to all matter of law and custom, preferred values and behaviours and to the ethical standards that govern the public.

Some of the eminent Indian scholars also argued, for example T N Madan says that secularism as incompatible with societies such as India's. According to Nandy, "this ideology is nothing but part and parcel of a hegemonic language, popularized by the Western knowledge. Rajeev Bhargava in his article Distinctiveness of Indian Secularism looked at the Indian secularism in its context and cultural context that is why he differ from the ideas of Nandy and Chatterjee, who see it in different ways, as each argues that secularism is linked to a flawed modernization, to a mistaken view of rationality.

The Characteristics of the Indian Secularism

The preamble of the Indian constitution mandates that India is a secular country. According to the Constitution of India, only a secular state can realize its objectives to ensure the followings

1. One religious community should not dominate another.
2. Some members do not dominate other members of the same religious community
3. That the state does not enforce any particular religion nor take away the religious freedom of individual

Indian state works in various ways to prevent the various forms of domination and hegemony of one over other. It does not recognize a particular religion as official religion. All the government spaces like law courts, police stations, government schools, and offices are not supposed to display or any one religion because doing this thinks may bring sense of exclusion of other religion or promoting any particular religious belief and ideas that would be considered as gross violation of the government policy of treating all religion equally. But these rules do not apply to private sphere. In this way, it is said that Indian state has adopted its own strategy of distancing itself from the religion and involving itself with religion.

Since some of the scholars think that secularism is western concept which is the product of European history and it has been implanted in India. Although secularization of polity and constitution has taken place despite when people are strongly committed to religion faith. Whereas other group of scholar argued that secularism is Indian experience, for example Hinduism is itself great secular religion diversity if faith, diversity of ideals, sects, accommodation, tolerance, coexistence an essential essence of Hinduism. According to Ashish Nandy in his book, *Romance of the state* also raises some fundamental questions about the reliability of this concept in India as he traces out the European or Western basis of the concept of secularism. He believes that the Western ideology rests on a peculiar view of society and politics, involving a variety of polarities in human thinking like the modern and the primitive, the secular and the non-secular, the scientific and the unscientific, the normal and the abnormal." According to Nandy, "this ideology is nothing but part and parcel of a hegemonic language, popularized by the Western knowledge. In response to Ashish Nandy, Imtiaz Ahmed in her article argued that secularism in India has a break

with India's past secular tolerant tradition and this is only a myth. She justifies the statement by saying that India's social system was based on principle of inequality that was sanctioned and conditioned in the religious tradition. Rajeev Bhargava in his article Distinctiveness of Indian Secularism looked at the Indian secularism in its contextual and cultural context that is why he differs from the ideas of Nandy and Chatterjee who see it in different ways, as each argues that secularism is linked to a flawed modernization, to a mistaken view of rationality, but Bhargava recognized the internal threat of Indian secularism in which he said that failure and criticism of Indian secularism is due to not recognizing the distinctive character of Indian secularism. According to Bhargava these critics fail to see that India developed a distinctively Indian and differently modern variant of secularism. Broadly speaking, secularism, anywhere in the world, means a separation of organized religion from organized political power inspired by a specific set of values .

The Policy of Non-Interference

This is one of the tactics adopted by the Indian state in the case of dealing in the matter of religious affairs. Indian state works to prevent the above domination by adopting a strategy of non interference. Thus, state, in order to respect the sentiments of the individual of a particular religion or organization of the religion, it does not interfere in the internal matter of the religious practices and belief as it is mentioned in the Article 25 of Constitution that freedom of conscience and free profession, practice and propagation of religion. Despite the policy of non interference, states make certain exceptions for the particular religious community for example, since the wearing of Puggi (Turban) is central to Sikh's religious practice therefore, in order to not interfere with this allows an exception in the law.

The Policy of Interference

Indian state also works to prevent the domination of the one religion over other and also to prevent the social injustices through the policy of the Intervention. The distancing of religion from the state became necessary, both in India and the west, to protect individual citizens from their own oppressive religiously sanctioned social customs. There is Dignity of life that everyone is entitled to life has many implications, one of them is that no one should suffer what he chooses to. In a democratic secular country

we have to keep the faith of majority and need of minority.

Check Your Progress I

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. What is secularism?

2. Explain western perspective on secularism?

3. Critically examine Indian concept of secularism?

4. Explain the distinction between western and Indian perspective of secularism?

4.3.5 LET US SUM UP

Thus in conclusion, it can be said that meaning of the secularism is dynamic and it keeps on changing with the change in the consciousness of the individual and the society. What exist its meaning in the in Europe and America could not be possible applied in the other country.

Ancient Indian had very tolerant policy to all faith like Ashoka, some scholar argued that western secularism does not fit to India the way it is practiced in the west original design of constitution did not mentioned it but all the core principle which are universally accepted today, are present in constitution. The meaning of the secularism in Indian is highly contested used and misused for the sake of the self-interest and political purpose. This may be one of the reason that its meaning has not been defined in the constitution of India.

4.3.6 EXERCISES

- 1 How does the historical evolution of secularism in the West, particularly through events like the Renaissance and the French Revolution, differ from the development of secular principles in India?
- 2 What are the key differences between the Western model of secularism, focused on the separation of church and state, and the Indian model of secularism based on Sarva Dharma Sambhav and Dharma Nirpeksha?
- 3 How does the Indian state balance its policies of non-interference and interference to prevent religious domination and promote social justice, as seen in examples like Sikh turban exemptions or interventions against oppressive customs?
- 4 Why do scholars like Ashis Nandy and T.N. Madan argue that Western secularism may be incompatible with Indian society, and how does Rajeev Bhargava counter this by emphasizing the distinctiveness of Indian secularism?

- 5 In what ways does Charles Taylor's argument about the context-specific nature of secularism apply to the variations in secular practices across Western countries like France, the United States, and Canada?

4.3.7 SUGGESTED READINGS

- Bhargava, Rajeev, *Secularism and its Critics*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Jacobsohn, G.J, *The wheel of Law: India's Secularism in Comparative Constitutional Context*, Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Madan , T.N., *Locked Minds: Secularism and Fundamentalism in India*, New Delhi: Delhi Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Srinivasn, T.N. *The Future of Secularism*, Delhi : Delhi Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Holyoake, C.J., *The Origin und Nature of Secularism*, London: Watts & Co, 1988
- Taylor, Charles, *Mode of Secularism?* in Rajiv Bhargava (ed.), *Secularism and Its Critics* ,New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Furnivall, J.S. 1956. *Colonial Policy and Practice*, New York: New York University Press.

4,4 FEMINISM: MEANING AND ISSUES

: D. S. Jamwal

STRUCTURE

4.4.0 OBJECTIVE

4.4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.4.2 FEMINISM

4.4.3 Meaning

4.4.4 Types of Feminism

4.4.5 ISSUES

4.4.6. Patriarchy

4.4.7 The sex / Gender Distinction

4.4.8 Feminist Critique of the Public / Private Dichotomy

4.4.9 LET US SUM UP

4.4.10 EXERCISES

4.4.11 SUGGESTED READINGS

4.4.0 OBJECTIVES

After going through this topic, you may be able:

- To understand the meaning of feminism.
- To discuss the different issues of feminism.
- To understand the debate on sex and gender.
- To analyse the position of women in public and private sphere.

4.4.1 INTRODUCTION

Feminist theory and politics is marked by intense internal debates, and it is generally recognized by now that it would be more accurate to talk about 'feminisms' in the plural, rather than one single feminism. Nevertheless, what all feminist positions share is recognition that women are placed in an inferior position in society and that this hierarchy is based on gender. Further, although this hierarchy is justified on grounds of natural differences between men and women, feminists told that it is in fact based on socio-cultural and economic power structures which have little to do with the biological difference between the sexes.

4.4.2 FEMINISM

4.4.3 MEANING

The origins of the term feminism are not clear. There are several opinions, but the generally accepted version is that it was first used by the Utopian Socialist Charles Fourier in the 19th century, to refer to the question of equal rights for women. In the West, women emerged in the early 19th century as a distinct interest group, partly because by that time it was clear that the, promise of equality made by the bourgeois democratic revolutions of the 17th and 18th centuries excluded women, and partly because the Industrial Revolution had led to the increasingly visible presence of women in public employment. The woman question emerged at about this time, articulating the questions arising from exclusion of women from the fruits of enlightenment thought.

4.4.4 TYPES OF FEMINISM

Over a century of feminist thought and politics in different parts of the world has produced a rich body of work. The conventional analysis of feminist thought has tended to group it into three streams - liberal, socialist and radical feminism.

1. Liberal feminism

Liberal feminism is understood to work within the framework of the liberal state, theorising equality, freedom and justice in the context of liberal philosophy, pointing out that these concepts are inadequate until the gender dimension is taken into account.

2. Socialist feminism

It stood women's oppression to class society, and their critique draws from the Marxist categories of analysis, while simultaneously being critical of gender-blindness in Marxist theory.

3. Radical feminism

It theorises patriarchy as a system of male dominance independent of and prior to all other systems of domination that is, in the radical feminist understanding, all other forces of exploitation and oppression are in a sense shaped by oppression based on sex, since that is historically the oldest form of oppression.

4.4.5 ISSUES

The key issues in feminist thought are categorised into three specific themes -

1. Patriarchy,
2. The sex-gender distinction and
3. The critique of the public/private dichotomy

4.4.6 PATRIARCHY

This term is central to feminist analysis, and refers to an overarching system of male dominance.

1. Views of Kate Millet

Kate Millet, one of the earliest radical feminists to use the term in the 1970s, developed on sociologist Max Weber's conception of domination to argue that thorough history, the relationship between the sexes has been one of domination and subordination, in which men have exercised domination in two forms - through social authority and

economic forces. The emphasis is on patriarchy as a system, to establish that men's power over women is not all individual phenomenon, but is part of a structure.

2. Gerda Lerner's Views

The historian Gerda Lerner defines patriarchy thus: 'the manifestation and institutionalisation of male dominance over women and children in the family and the extension of male dominance over women in society in general. It implies that men hold power in all the important institutions in society and that women are deprived of access to such power.' This does not mean that every individual man is always in a dominant position and that every individual woman is always in a subordinate position.

3. Control over Women's Sexuality and Labour Power

A part from the control of women's sexuality under patriarchy through the strictly policed institution of monogamous marriage, women's labour power is also controlled by men. Women's productivity within the household and outside is controlled by men who will determine whether women will work outside the household or not. To maintain this control over women's sexuality and power they are deprived of access to and ownership of productive resources.

4. Different forms

Patriarchy takes different Forms in different geographical regions and different historical periods. For instance, as the historian Uma Chakravarty has pointed out, the experience of patriarchy is not the same among tribal women as among women in highly stratified caste society. It is not the same today as it was in the 19 century, and it is not the same in India as it is in the industrialised countries of the West.

4.4.7 THE SEX/GENDER DISTINCTION

1. Sex is to Nature as Gender is to Culture

One of the key contributions of feminist theory is the making of a distinction between 'sex' and 'gender'. Sex as referring to the biological differences between men and women and gender as indicating the vast range of cultural meanings attached to that basic difference. This distinction is important for feminism to make because the subordination of women has been fundamentally justified on the grounds of the biological differences between men and women.

2. Masculinity, Femininity and Cultural Differences

Feminist anthropologists, pre eminent among whom is Margaret Mead, have demonstrated that what is understood as masculinity and femininity varies across cultures. In other words, not only do different societies identify a certain set of characteristics as feminine and another set as masculine. But also, these characteristics are not the same across different cultures.

Thus, feminists have argued that there is no necessary co-relation between the biology of men and women and the qualities that are thought to be masculine and feminine. Rather, it is childrearing practices which try to establish and perpetuate certain differences between the sexes.

3. Sexual Division of Labour and Work Place

This sexual division of labour is not limited to the home, it extends to the 'public' arena of paid work and again, this has nothing to do with 'sex' (biology) and everything to do with 'gender' (culture). Certain kinds of work are considered to be 'women's work', and other kinds men's, but more important is that whatever work that women do, gets lower wages and is less valued.

4. Ideological Assumptions behind Sexual Division of Labour

The fact is that it is not natural biological difference that lies behind the sexual division of labour, but certain biological assumptions. So, on the one hand, women are supposed to be physically weak and unfit for heavy manual labour. But both in the home and outside, they do the heaviest of work. But at the same time, when the Manual work that women do is mechanized making it both lighter and better paid, then it is men who receive training to use the new machinery, and women are edged out.

4.4.8 FEMINIST CRITIQUE OF 'THE PUBLIC/PRIVATE DICHOTOMY'

In liberal theory the distinction between 'public' and 'private' answers the question of the legitimate extent of the authority of the law. The public realm is understood in this context to be open to government regulation while the private realm is to be protected from such action

- Sexuality and the family being understood to be private. In Marxist theory too, this distinction is central, although from a different point of view. Engels argued that women's oppression begins with the transformation of housework from a public to a private service. The 'private' in this sens, is the arena of oppression and only when women

emerge into the 'public' sphere of production will they become truly emancipated. Since for Engels the motor force of history is provided by changes in the relations of production (defined, in the context of capitalism as the relations between capital and labour), housework is not 'work', Women participate in history only to the extent that they emerge from the 'private' and enter the industrial workforce.

1. Feminist Criticism

Feminist scholarship emerging from both liberal and Marxist traditions has contested this distinction as being conceptually flawed and politically oppressive. From within the liberal tradition comes the argument that the dichotomy assumed between 'public' and private has enabled the family to be excluded from the values of 'justice' and 'equality' which have animated liberal thought since the seventeenth century beginnings of liberalism. The 'individual' was the adult male head of the household, and thus his right to be free from interference by the state or church included his rights over those in his control in the private realm. Thus, oppression within the family was rendered invisible to political theory.

2. Lack of Consensus among Feminists

However, there is no consensus on the consequences of this understanding for feminist practice. From one kind of feminist position, characteristics of US women feminism, it is possible then to argue that many claims important to feminists, from reproductive rights to protection against sexual harassment, are most effectively grounded on the claims to privacy. In fact, the rhetoric of the individual's right to privacy has been used in the USA to secure some rights for women against the patriarchal family. For example, the landmark judgment on abortion in *Roe v. Wade* (1972) is based on the belief in the individual woman's right to privacy. Feminists, who support privacy as a ground for securing rights for women, while challenging the traditional public/private dichotomy, make the argument that the virtues of privacy have not been available to women since they did not have the status of individuals in the public sphere. In this view therefore, the task of feminist practice is to transform the institutions and practices of gender so that a genuine sphere of privacy, free of governmental and legal intrusion, can be ensured for both men and women. This is not a position taken within the Indian women's movement.

Check Your Progress I

NOTE: Use the space given below for your answer. Use separate sheet if space is not sufficient.

1. Trace the origin of the term feminism?

2. Enumerate the different types of feminism?

3. Explain the meaning of patriarchy with reference to the views of some feminist scholars??

4. Describe some forms of patriarchy?

5. What distinction do feminists make between sex and gender?

6. What is the public-private dichotomy in political discourse?

4.4.9 LET US SUM UP

In this unit, the origin of the term has been traced and the three broad strands of feminism - liberal, socialist and radical have been explained. Feminism and patriarchy are inextricably linked and thus, the latter has been analysed in detail. One of the key contributions of feminist theory is the making of a distinction between 'sex' and 'gender'. The unit also tells in detail about the developments in the sex/gender distinction in feminist theory. It should be realised that the sex/gender distinction is not as simple and straight as it may first appear.

4.4.10 EXERCISES

1. How do the different streams of feminism—liberal, socialist, and radical—approach the issue of women’s oppression and propose solutions to achieve gender equality?

2. What role does the concept of patriarchy play in feminist analysis, and how does it manifest differently across various cultural and historical contexts?
3. Why is the sex-gender distinction significant in feminist theory, and how does it challenge traditional justifications for women's subordination based on biological differences?
4. How does the feminist critique of the public/private dichotomy reveal limitations in liberal and Marxist theories, particularly regarding the oppression of women within the family?
5. In what ways has the use of the right to privacy in feminist movements, such as in the Roe v. Wade case in the USA, both advanced and complicated the struggle for women's rights?

4.4.11 SUGGESTED READINGS

Gauba, O.P, *Dimensions of Social Justice*, New Delhi: National, 1983.

- ----- : *Social Justice*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

Vincent, Andrew, *Modern Political Ideologies*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.

Varma, S. P., *Modern Political Theory*, New Delhi: Vikas, 1983. Vincent, A., *Modern Political Ideologies*, Oxford, 1992.

Held, David, *Political Theory and the Modern State*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.

Heywood, Andrew, *Political Ideologies: An Introduction*
Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003